GÜNEŞ TUNÇ

INVESTIGATING ACADEMIC DISCOURSE SOCIALIZATION OF UNDERGRADUATE ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE STUDENTS THROUGH LITERATURE CIRCLES

A MASTER'S THESIS

BY

GÜNEŞ TUNÇ

TEACHING ENGLISH AS A FOREIGN LANGUAGE

İHSAN DOĞRAMACI BILKENT UNIVERSITY

ANKARA

MARCH 2019

2019

To the memory of my grandmother…

Investigating Academic Discourse Socialization of Undergraduate English Language and Literature Students through Literature Circles

The Graduate School of Education
of
İhsan Doğramacı Bilkent University

by

Güneş Tunç

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of
Master of Arts
in
Teaching English as a Foreign Language

Ankara

March 2019

İHSAN DOĞRAMACI BILKENT UNIVERSITY

GRADUATE SCHOOL OF EDUCATION

Investigating Academic Discourse Socialization of Undergraduate English Language and Literature Students through Literature Circles

GÜNEŞ TUNÇ

March 2019

I certify that I have read this thesis and have found that it is fully adequate, in scope and in quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Arts in Teaching English as a Foreign Language.

---------- ----------

Asst. Prof. Dr. Patrick Hart (Supervisor)

Asst. Prof. Dr. Deniz Ortaçtepe (2^{nd} supervisor)

I certify that I have read this thesis and have found that it is fully adequate, in scope and in quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Arts in Teaching English as a Foreign Language.

Asst. Prof. Dr. Hilal Peker (Examining Committee Member)

I certify that I have read this thesis and have found that it is fully adequate, in scope and in quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Arts in Teaching English as a Foreign Language.

Prof. Dr. Julie Aydınlı, ASBU (Examining Committee Member)

Approval of the Graduate School of Education

Prof. Dr. Alipaşa Ayas (Director)

ABSTRACT

INVESTIGATING ACADEMIC DISCOURSE SOCIALIZATION OF UNDERGRADUATE ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE STUDENTS THROUGH LITERATURE CIRCLES

Güneş Tunç

M.A., Program of Teaching English as a Foreign Language
Supervisor: Asst. Prof. Dr. Patrick Hart
2nd Supervisor: Asst. Prof. Dr. Deniz Ortaçtepe

March 2019

This study aimed to examine the academic discourse socialization of undergraduate English language and literature (ELIT) students through literature circles. In this respect, the researcher explored the expectations of ELIT faculty members and experiences of first-year undergraduate ELIT students who were studying at a foundation university in Turkey. The data were collected through interviews with ELIT faculty members and students, and students' literature circle discussions, role sheets and reflective journals. All the qualitative data were analyzed using Boyatzis' (1998) thematic analysis.

The findings of the study pointed out that in order to socialize into ELIT academic discourse, faculty members expect undergraduate students to develop a culture of reading and strategies to study literary texts better. However, the students faced challenges in meeting these expectations due to their educational background, low level of English language proficiency, lack of familiarity with the historical and cultural references, and heavy course loading. In that sense, using literature circles

facilitated students' socialization into the ELIT academic discourse community to a certain extent.

This study is in line with the existing literature in reaching the following conclusions: undergraduate ELIT students not only need to improve their English language skills to make sense of the language used in literary texts but also gain an understanding of the values and practices of the ELIT academic discourse community. During this process, texts, peers and ELIT faculty members played key roles as socializing agents.

Key words: Academic discourse socialization, literature circles, undergraduate students, English language and literature, socializing agents, EFL

ÖZET

İNGİLİZ DİLİ VE EDEBİYATI LİSANS ÖĞRENCİLERİNİN OKUMA ÇEMBERİ TEKNİĞİ ARACILIĞIYLA AKADEMİK SÖYLEME SOSYALLEŞMESİ ÜZERİNE BİR ARAŞTIRMA

Güneş Tunç

Yüksek Lisans, Yabancı Dil Olarak İngilizce Öğretimi
Tez Yöneticisi: Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Patrick Hart
İkinci Tez Yöneticisi: Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Deniz Ortaçtepe
Mart 2019

Bu çalışma, İngiliz dili ve edebiyatı lisan öğrencilerinin okuma çemberi tekniği aracılığıyla akademik söyleme sosyalleşmesini incelemeyi amaçlamıştır. Bu hedefe ulaşmak için Türkiye'de bir vakıf üniversitesinde çalışan İngiliz dili ve edebiyatı öğretim üyelerinin beklentileri ve yine aynı kurumda eğitim gören birinci sınıf lisans öğrencilerinin deneyimleri mercek altına alınmıştır. Çalışmada veriler öğretim üyeleriyle ve öğrencilerle yapılan sözlü mülakatlar; öğrencilerin okuma çemberlerindeki tartışmaları, bu tartışmalarda kullandıkları rol kağıtları ve yansıtıcı düşünme günlükleri aracılığıyla toplanmıştır. Tüm nitel bulgular Boyatzis'in (1998) tematik analizi kullanılarak çözümlenmiştir.

Bulgulara göre İngiliz dili ve edebiyatı öğretim üyeleri lisans öğrencilerinden bir okuma kültürü ve edebi metinleri da iyi anlayabilmelerini sağlayan stratejiler geliştirmelerini beklemektedir. Ancak öğrenciler; eğitim geçmişleri, İngilizce dil bilgisi seviyelerinin yetersiz olması, metinlerdeki tarihi ve kültürel referanslara aşina olmayışları ve ağır ders yükleri nedeniyle bu beklentileri karşılamakta zorluk

çekmektedir. Bu bağlamda okuma çemberlerinin kullanımı öğrencilerin akademik söyleme sosyalleşebilmelerine belirli seviyede katkıda bulunmuştur.

Bu sonuçlara bakıldığında, çalışma mevcut literatürü şu açılardan desteklemektedir: İngiliz dili ve edebiyatı lisans öğrencileri akademik söylem topluluğuna sosyalleşmek için edebi metinleri anlamak amacıyla İngilizce dil becerilerini geliştirmenin yanında aynı topluluğun değer ve uygulamalarını da öğrenmelidir. Bu süreçte okudukları metinler, akranları ve İngiliz dili ve edebiyatı öğretim üyeleri önemli roller oynamaktadır.

Anahtar kelimeler: Akademik söyleme sosyalleşme, okuma çemberleri, lisans öğrencileri, İngiliz dili ve edebiyatı, sosyalleşme aracıları, yabancı dil olarak İngilizce öğretimi

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Writing this thesis was one of the most challenging tasks of my life. It required perseverance, dedication and hard work on my part; however, without guidance, encouragement and support of some people, it would not be possible for me to complete it.

First of all, I would like to thank my supervisor Assist. Prof. Dr. Patrick Hart for allowing me to observe his classes and work with his students. He has patiently helped throughout the process. Secondly, I am grateful to my second advisor Assist. Prof. Dr. Deniz Ortactepe. She guided me from the very beginning till the end with her insightful comments and constant feedback. I am also very thankful to my examining committee members, Prof. Dr. Julie Aydınlı and Assist. Prof. Dr. Hilal Peker. Both of them were very understanding during the process.

I owe my deepest gratitude to all English language and literature (ELIT) faculty members and students who agreed to take part in this study. I especially would like to thank ELIT students who were the biggest contributors of this study. No words can repay what they did for this research. Thank you all!

I feel incredibly lucky because I met great people thanks to MATEFL Program. Şeyma Kökçü, Tuğba Bostancı, Nesrin Atak, Kamile Kandıralı, Esma Kot Artunç and Kadir Özsoy all supported me incessantly while I was writing this thesis. I feel grateful for the time we spent together and I do hope that there will be more to share and celebrate.

Last but not least, I want to thank my dearest family; my mother and lifelong mentor Gülistan Tunç, my beloved father Kenan Tunç, my best friends of all times Özge Tunç and Işık Güngör and my aunt Nermin Güngör for their affection and love.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

Introduction

Today, more and more students are participating in post-secondary education. This increase in student numbers has had great effects on educational institutions, their communities, students and teachers (Duff & Anderson, 2015). When students attend a university, they need to find ways to socialize into an academic discourse community to succeed in their classes and receive an undergraduate degree. This is, in Duff's (2010) terms, "a dynamic, socially situated process that in contemporary contexts is often multimodal, multilingual and highly intertextual as well" (p. 169). Therefore, academic discourse socialization is a complex yet an important issue that needs to be investigated.

In Turkey, many students prefer to study at universities at which English is the medium of instruction. However, as the baseline study by the British Council and Economics Policy Research Foundation of Turkey (TEPAV) (2015) indicates, students in Turkey generally start to study at a preparatory school with low levels of English language proficiency. The report also states that preparatory schools mainly deliver English for General Purposes classes instead of lessons that concentrate on English for Academic Purposes. Thus, it becomes more difficult for undergraduate students who study in a language other than their own to be socialized into the academic discourse of their undergraduate programs.

To date, a lot of research has been conducted on academic discourse. Most of this focuses on end products such as written academic texts and spoken language, taking corpora as their bases (e.g., Biber, 2006). Mastering communicative

competence in the language that is used in their target community of practice is an important step for students who study at English-medium universities but that is not enough. In order to socialize into their discourse communities, students need to know how to negotiate with institutional and disciplinary ideologies, and interact with their peers and instructors. Hence, academic discourse is "a site for internal and interpersonal struggle for many people, especially for newcomers and novices" (Duff, 2010, p. 170). That is why, rather than solely taking the development of linguistic abilities such as reading and writing as its focus, current research often tries to understand how students get involved in disciplinary communities through active interactions, sharing knowledge, and conducting joint work (Fujieda, 2015). The present study aims to explore the academic discourse socialization of undergraduate English language and literature (ELIT) students who study at a university at which English is used as the medium of instruction by investigating their work in literature circles.

Background of the Study

Academic discourse socialization can simply be described as a process in which people who are new to an academic community gradually become a legitimate member of it through taking part in its oral and written discourse (Duff, 2010). It is closely related to Vygotsky's (1978) socio-cultural learning theory that emphasizes the importance of mediation in the development of knowledge and abilities, Schieffelin and Ochs's (1986) language socialization, and Lave and Wenger's (1991) legitimate peripheral participation, which is described as "a way of gaining access to sources for understanding through growing involvement" (p. 37). As Morita and Kobayashi (2008) point out, there are many studies conducted both to explain general academic discourse (e.g., Hutchinson & Waters, 1987; Johns, 1997), and

discipline specific discourses (e.g., Casanave & Hubbard, 1992; Holmes, 1997) with the purpose of helping learners gain academic communicative competence. However, for some scholars (e.g., Street, 1996; Zamel, 1997), academic discourse should not be seen as one-way assimilation but regarded as a complex negotiation process between the instructors and students. In other words, when introducing academic discourse, participants' perspectives should be taken into consideration.

Since academic discourse socialization means more than speaking the language used by the academic community well, it is challenging for both non-native speakers and native speakers. That is to say, for those who study in a language other than their mother tongue, just having communicative competence in the target language is not enough to succeed in an academic setting. They need to be knowledgeable about the ideologies and practices of the target community and develop ways to socialize into it. Thus, one should not assume that just being a native speaker ensures legitimate participation in a community of practice. In other words, in terms of academic discourse socialization, not only non-native speakers but also native speakers usually begin participating in the discourse community peripherally.

Most of the academic discourse socialization studies take graduate students as their unit of analysis (e.g., Guo & Lin, 2016; Mathews 1999; Morita, 2000; Wang, 2009; Wang & Slater, 2016). According to Hagen (2015), graduate students are usually preferred because they have had more exposure to the process of academic enculturation than undergraduate students. In addition to this, graduate students are expected to publish papers, attend conferences, and/or write a thesis which all require them to be more socialized into their specialized disciplinary discourse community. Unlike graduate students, undergraduate students are not supposed to publish papers or participate in conferences. However, in order to get a Bachelor's degree and

participate legitimately in their community of practice, just like graduate students, they need to socialize into the academic discourse of their departments through interacting with their instructors and peers. Whether undergraduate students should be socialized into specific or general academic discourse remains a question of debate (Severino & Traschel, 2008). Nevertheless, being at the periphery of their academic community, undergraduate students face many challenges and to overcome those difficulties, they need to learn about the ideologies and expectations of their target community and find ways to negotiate with them.

In higher education institutions, students are required to take part in various forms of oral tasks such as class presentations or group discussions. These tasks play a crucial role in in-depth examination of the topic because they allow students to study independently first to find the necessary information, organize their ideas and then share them with their peers, get their comments and open up new discussions. The difference between class presentations and group discussions is that during presentations students formally present a topic in front of the class for a certain period of time. In group discussions, students relatively share the responsibility of finding necessary information, make sense of it together, generate new ideas about it, and if required, present it to others. In both of them, the students are expected to be prepared in advance, have the ability to improvise where necessary, and answer the questions coming from the listeners. To be able to deliver successful oral presentations and participate in group discussions actively, students should be aware of and be able to use the appropriate disciplinary discourse.

With the development in technology, students have greater access to online platforms. In addition to oral activities, researchers also explored academic discourse socialization through online discussions (e.g., Beckett, Amaro- Jiménez, & Beckett,

2010; Yim, 2011). To illustrate, in their study investigating the academic discourse socialization through online discussions, Beckett et al. (2010) found out that students can develop their discourse competence (i.e., ability to use research methods, identifying the gaps in literature, getting to know noted scholars, journals and professional organizations, and following publication and presentation opportunities) by participating in virtual academic communities. The researchers also pointed out that these online discussions can also be regarded as the extension of the in-class discussions. By writing their reflections on the topics that are debated in the classroom, and commenting on or asking for clarification about the ideas, students can gain further insights into the discourse of the academic community.

Students socialize into academic communities through acquiring its written and oral discourse. Although students' oral performance and participation in oral and nowadays online activities is of great importance for disciplinary enculturation, few studies have explored academic discourse socialization through oral practices (e.g., Cho, 2013; Ho, 2011; Zappa & Holman, 2007) and online discussions (e.g., Beckett et al., 2010; Yim, 2011). To explore the academic discourse socialization of undergraduate students, in-class and online literature circles can be used.

Literature circles, also known as 'reading groups' (Daniels, 2002), could be regarded as situated learning in which students read a text outside the class and discuss it during the lesson by using a specific framework. This framework is usually constructed through role sheets. In their small groups, students take up different roles to discuss the text from various dimensions. The role sheets allow students to understand the text better by interpreting it in different ways, making connections with various other texts, sharing their ideas with their peers and conducting a joint

work. Students can also keep reflective journals during these discussions to take notes of their responses to their reading.

Statement of the Problem

Several researchers examined the role of oral and online academic activities on the academic discourse socialization of tertiary level students. The studies conducted so far focused on open-ended discussions, oral presentations, small group discussions, and online discussions. Most of these studies (e.g., Ahmadi & Samad, 2015; Cho, 2013; Guo & Lin, 2016; Ho, 2011; Morita, 2000, 2004; Zappa-Hollman, 2007) concentrated on graduate students. When compared to oral academic discourse socialization studies that focused on graduate students, the ones that concentrated on undergraduate students (e.g., Kobayashi, 2003; Mahfoodh, 2014; Yang, 2010) are few and these studies focused on oral presentations. Furthermore, researchers studied academic discourse socialization in various other disciplines such as international relations (Mathews, 1999), electrical and computer engineering (Vickers, 2007), and psychology (Hagen, 2015), but to the knowledge of the researcher, there is no study investigated the academic discourse socialization of undergraduate literature students through small group discussions called literature circles.

In Turkey, there are many students who study English language and literature. These students face with many challenges because they have to study the literature of a language other than their own mother tongue. Therefore, their socialization process into the target discourse poses many problems. Literature circles, as a form of small group discussions, can be used to discover more about undergraduate literature students' academic discourse socialization in their disciplines. So far, a lot of studies focused on literature circles technique but most of them investigated how it improves students' reading comprehension (e.g., Agustiani,

2016; Jacobs, 2015) and critical thinking skills (e.g., De Brún, 2016). However, there is no study that investigated the academic discourse socialization of undergraduate students through literature circles.

Research Questions

The purpose of this qualitative study was to investigate the academic discourse socialization of undergraduate ELIT students through literature circles. In this respect the study addressed the following research questions:

1. What are ELIT faculty members' expectations of students in regards to their socialization into ELIT academic discourse community?
2. To what extent did literature circles contribute to undergraduate ELIT students' academic discourse socialization?
    2.1. What were ELIT students' perceptions on studying literature before literature circle discussions?
    2.2. How did literature circle discussions reflect ELIT students' ongoing academic discourse socialization?
    2.3. To what extent did students' perceptions on studying literature change after literature circle discussions?

Significance of the Study

The present study can contribute to the field of English for Academic Purposes (EAP) studies in many different ways. First of all, many studies concentrated on the academic discourse socialization of graduate students through oral activities such as open-ended class discussions, academic presentations or small group discussions, and most of them were conducted in Western settings such as the United States or Canada. However, few studies investigated the academic discourse socialization of undergraduate students and the ones that did used only oral

presentations as their unit of analysis. So far, no researcher has examined the academic discourse socialization of undergraduate students through small group discussions. Furthermore, academic discourse socialization was studied across various disciplines such as international relations or engineering but no researcher, to this day, has focused his/her attention on literature students. However, this study will fill in the gap in the literature by investigating the academic discourse socialization of undergraduate literature students through small group discussions called literature circles in a setting at which English is used as a foreign language.

In this study, the participants consist of students who study literature in a language other than their mother tongue. Studying literature students who discuss various texts in small groups called literature circles can shed more light on academic discourse socialization. Compared to open class discussions or oral presentations, more dialogic interactions take place in small group discussions. Observing literature circles also allows the researcher to learn more about how undergraduate students prepare for and collaborate during small group discussions. By viewing each literature circle as situated learning, the researcher can trace the patterns that students demonstrate from one discussion to another and try to explore how the literature circles technique can be improved to help them gain both discipline-specific and general academic discourse competence.

ELIT faculty members and students in Turkey can benefit from this study. Through the interviews with the faculty members, ELIT students can learn what is really expected from them to be regarded as a legitimate part of the academic discourse community. In other words, this study will make the expectations of academics explicit, which will make it easier for students to learn practices that may lead to success in their disciplines. Last but not least, ELIT faculty members can gain

new insights into processes that students go through when they are trying to become socialized into community of practice.

Conclusion

This chapter introduced a brief overview of the academic discourse socialization and literature circles. Following the overview, the statement of the problem, the significance of the study and the research questions were presented. In the next chapter, the relevant literature is reviewed in details. In the third chapter, the methodology of the study is explained. In the fourth chapter, the results of the study were described and in the final chapter, the conclusions were drawn by taking relevant literature and findings into consideration.

CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

This chapter will review the literature on academic discourse socialization and literature circles by elaborating on the issues discussed in the first chapter under the following sections. The first section depicts a short historical background of academic discourse socialization and its aspects as socially mediated phenomenon. In the second section, the roles of oral and online academic activities on students' academic discourse socialization will be discussed and the findings of the relevant studies will be introduced. The third section defines the use of literature circles technique, and reviews the studies that focused on it.

Academic Discourse Socialization

Academic discourse socialization basically deals with how newcomers to an academic culture learn to take part in oral and written discourse and practices of that particular academic community (Duff, 2010). When being socialized into an academic community, newcomers interact with their peers, instructors and others, which, presumably, facilitate their socialization process. In other words, the acquisition of academic discourse is a socially mediated process (Guttierez, 1995).

Academic discourse socialization is closely related to language socialization (LS) theory. LS studies first started with examining how children gain communicative competence in their communities of practice, and gradually expanded into classroom settings. The researchers who studied the LS of individuals did not solely focus on how they learn to speak because language acquisition involves the acquisition of discourse and it requires appropriating not only linguistic

but also social knowledge (Mehan, 1979). In other words, in addition to having linguistic knowledge, members of a particular discourse community also need to know how to act, talk, interpret and think according to the norms of that social group (Guttierez, 1995). That means learners also gain cultural knowledge about ideologies, identities, non-linguistic content and practices valued by the community (Schieffelin & Ochs, 1986). Regarding learners as the newcomers to a community, others who are more proficient in the language and its cultural practices provide them with suitable uses of the language and of the worldviews, values, and ideologies of the members of the community (Duff, 2010). In that sense, it draws on Vygotsky's (1978) socio-cultural learning theory.

When LS is focused on in classroom context, it has to be kept in mind that students bring their previous knowledge and values with them. In other words, they cannot be regarded as blank slates who are ready to absorb what the teachers or other mediators present. Only by relating what they already know to what the teacher/mediator provides, they can learn new things. To put it another way, students continually reinterpret their understandings when they take part in classroom practices. However, socialization should not be regarded as uni-directional. It is not merely the novices that are affected by the LS process. Their mentors also gain new insights and abilities while mediating others to the practices and values of the community. Furthermore, as Duff and Anderson (2015) note, peers also play a complementary role on each other's socialization.

Another theory that academic discourse socialization is usually associated with is legitimate peripheral participation. Lave and Wenger (1991) state that novices are seen as individuals who are at the periphery of the community of practice at the beginning. When they get involved in the practices of the target community, they

also gain access to sources of understanding, which, in turn, help them gradually become the legitimate member of it. As it can be understood from the preceding paragraphs, just gaining linguistic competence is not enough to help newcomers fully participate in their target community of practice. They are also required to be aware of the norms of the that community. Therefore, to move into a community, newcomers are supposed to acquire discourse competence, which consists of sociocultural knowledge and linguistic knowledge. This is possible by newcomers' participation in mediated activities, and their interaction with competent others in their social group (Vygotsky, 1978). However, as Garrett and Baquendo-Lopez (2002) note, one should not expect all novices to simply internalize the linguistic and ideological resources in a short time. Another point is that socialization process should not be seen as a mindless passive conditioning; just being exposed to the discourse of the particular community might not produce desired homogeneous responses or competencies (Duff, 2007). The novices may not aim at full mastery of target genres or simply reject the ideologies valued by the community.

Drawing on language socialization, socio-cultural learning theory and legitimate peripheral participation, academic discourse socialization should be regarded as a dynamic and socially situated process (Duff, 2010). To this day, research (e.g., Biber 2006, Connor & Upton, 2004) on academic discourse mostly focused on conventions of different written texts and genres by taking corpora as their bases. Instead of gaining insights to the effects of socialization on students' understanding and production of target genres, these studies focused solely on the difficulties that both undergraduate and graduate students encounter when they are asked to write an academic text. In other words, these studies simply present what students need to know by examining specific genres and expectations of the

instructors. However, as Zamel (1997) claims, discourse socialization should not be regarded as one-way assimilation. It should be seen as a dynamic, co-constructed process and complex negotiation (Leki, 2001; Morita, 2000, 2004). Therefore, learners' perspectives need to be taken into consideration when investigating academic discourse socialization.

Academic Discourse as Evolving and Socially-Mediated Phenomenon

In a highly globalized world where English is used as lingua franca, more and more students prefer either to study abroad or at a university where English is the medium of instruction. Problems related to their linguistic competence pose great difficulties for these students, and they also need to find ways to negotiate with discourse and communication found in class discussions or other formal and informal academic interactions. Although academic discourse traditionally refers to conventionalized oral and written language and communication according to which instructors and institutions assess students' products, it is continually evolving. Now it is multimodal, multicultural and highly intertextual; therefore, it should be seen as social construction by individuals in accordance with their background, relations with their learning communities, their audience and aims (Duff, 2007, 2010). Hence, investigating the social and cognitive processes that students go through when gaining academic discourse competence is a better idea than just providing them with conventions of academic discourse associated with specific discipline, and expecting them to acquire it in a short time (Duff, 2010).

The Role of Peers as a Mediator

When ideas about the modeling and feedback provided by instructors taken into consideration, it should be noted that just being an expert does not guarantee an instructor to be the best mediator. An instructor might have great knowledge about

the content or be very good at delivering lessons. He/she might raise interest through adequate challenge or help learners complete a task through various activities such as pair-work or group work. However, no matter how well-intentioned the instructor is he/she may be completely unaware of the implementation of these arrangements (Leki, 2001). As it is pointed out by Duff (2007), students might find teacher's instructions unclear or simply subvert the guidelines in accordance with their own sense of agency. It should be also noted that, from time to time, institutional factors might influence instructors' decisions. In these cases, novices search for complementary resources independently to ease their own enculturation into the academic community. Here, peers play a great role on each other's enculturation. To illustrate, in their case study conducted with five Korean English as a Second Language (ESL) graduate students from various disciplines such as music, political science, and Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL) at an American university, Nam and Beckett (2011) concluded that students found it more useful to get help from their peers more than their advisor's or department recommendations in their access to and use of resources in the process of their socialization into American academic writing discourse. Similarly, in his study investigating the peer collaboration of students to achieve oral academic presentation task at a content based ESL program, Kobayashi (2003) worked with three Japanese undergraduate exchange students at a Canadian University. The researcher found out that while preparing their presentations, students tried to meet their instructors' expectations and task requirements through sharing their experiences with their peers, constructing collaborative dialogues, rehearsing and peer coaching.

The Role of Texts as a Mediator

It is not only the instructors, tutors or peers that serve as mediators in discourse socialization but also, according to Duff (2010), textbooks and other publications such as journals have an apparent socializing role. By giving Mertz's (2007) study as an example, she states that it is common in the US to socialize law students to authority of legal texts by using past legal cases to investigate or solve current ones. Mertz (2007) states that through Socratic classroom questioning, the students are expected to build analogies between the cases in their hand and the earlier ones.

The Dichotomy Between Native and Non-native Speakers in Academic Discourse Socialization

It is a common belief that native speakers (NSs) are better than non-native speakers (NNSs) in both mediation and socializing into academic discourse. NSs might be more competent in language but discourse socialization is a socially and interactionally constructed phenomenon; therefore, it requires more than linguistic knowledge. In other words, both NSs and NNSs are regarded as novices; therefore, being at the periphery of community, both of them need to find ways to negotiate with the practices and values of it. This was pointed out in many studies. For instance, in her study focusing on how native and non-native English speaking graduate students in a Teaching English as a Second Language (TESL) program at a Canadian university acquired oral academic discourses which are required to perform successful oral academic presentations (OAPs), Morita (2000) concluded that both native and non-native students socialized into academic oral discourses as they prepared for, observed, performed and reviewed OAPs.

Academic Discourse Socialization through Oral and Online Academic Activities

Acquiring the discourse of a particular community depends on participating in its communicative practices. According to Guttierez (1995), it is in these practices that people acquire both linguistic and sociocultural knowledge. If individuals can develop communicative competence (Hymes, 1972) in their ability to interact in culturally suitable ways with other members of the community, they can be regarded as a legitimate member of it.

Academic Discourse Socialization through Oral Academic Activities

In a real world, knowledge is built and shared mostly through oral activities. That is why qualified collaboration and communication are vital skills that need to be developed in academia. In other words, just having text book knowledge or theory is not enough. Many lecturers and students are also supposed to share and develop their ideas with others through various oral activities.

Research to this day has mostly focused on written academic discourse. Thinking of oral and written academic discourse as two modalities, we cannot say that they are completely distinct because, as it is suggested by Duff (2010), presentations or lectures typically draw on a variety of written texts. In order to deliver good presentations or contribute to discussions, students need to know how to benefit from written materials.

Academic Discourse Socialization through Open-ended Class Discussions

When we think about the classroom context, there are many forms of oral interaction such as Initiation, Response, Evaluation (IRE), open-ended discussions, presentations, group project work and small group discussions. In IRE, students are usually expected to display the ‘right’ answers after the instructor asks a question. It is one of the most common oral academic activities. Another form of oral academic

activity is open-ended discussions. To illustrate, in her study about the academic discourse socialization experiences of graduate Japanese L2 learners in a Canadian university, Morita (2004) observed the open-ended class discussions and found that negotiating competence, identities and power relations posed a great challenge for the participants.

Academic Discourse Socialization through Oral Academic Presentations

As Duff (2007) points out, oral presentations and group project works are more stressful; however, when students start their professional life they are expected to be capable of giving presentations or working in groups. That is why, some researchers focused on OAPs in their studies. For example, in one of her other studies about how graduate students acquired the oral academic discourse which is required to perform successful OAPs, Morita (2000) indicated that students need to be able to develop their epistemic stance, collaborate with their instructors and peers, ask appropriate questions, lead a discussion after the presentation, and handle critique well. Zappa-Hollman (2007) also observed the OAPs of six non-native graduate students in regular content courses at a Canadian University and concluded that L2 academic discourse socialization is a complex process that may be found challenging even by students with advanced language proficiency. The researcher stated that students whose home academic discourse values differ strikingly with those in their new contexts might resist negotiating with the ideologies of the academic community. Another researcher who examined academic discourse socialization through oral presentations was Mahfoodh (2014). His study with six international undergraduate students enrolled in an English for Professionals program in a public university in Malaysia revealed that students faced difficulties due to their linguistic knowledge, insufficient presentation skills and content-related problems.

Academic Discourse Socialization through Small Group Discussions

Small group discussions are another form of interactive activity used in academic settings. According to Guttierez (1995), "students develop valued literacy outcomes in instructional contexts that allow them to actively co-construct discourse, its topics, and the literacy activities in which discourse knowledge is used and developed" (p. 30). In one of her studies which focused on the development of academic literacy of elementary school-aged Latino children, she reached the conclusion that in teacher-dominated classrooms where students' participation was limited to one word or short responses to teacher's questions, students were not able to generate sustained oral and written discourse although they answered their teacher's questions accurately. According to Guttierez (1995), the above-mentioned valued outcomes can be listed as follows;

> (a) elaborated discourse (oral and written), (b) use of evidence, (c) integrating texts and personal experiences into discourse, (d) developing a critical stance towards a text (oral and written), (e) participation in sustained discourse, (f) initiating topic, (g) gaining access to floor. (p. 30)

Small groups in which students discuss topics from various perspectives can be regarded as micro communities of practice (CoP) proposed by Lave and Wenger (1991). According to Wenger (1998), three dimensions constitute CoPs; (a) *mutual engagement* which entails shared practice "connecting participants to each other in ways that are diverse and complex" (p. 77), (b) *joint enterprise* creating "relations of mutual accountability" (p. 78), and *shared repertoire* of resources in order to negotiate meaning to ease "discourse by which members create meaningful statements about the world" (p. 83), and express their membership and identities as members. In small groups, students have specific task goals and share responsibility

to attain them. While doing this, they also share and develop their discourse competence which is an indicator of their legitimacy.

Small group discussions allow researchers to investigate academic discourse socialization from various perspectives. Ho (2011), for example, observed small group discussions of native and non-native English speaking TESOL post-graduate students at a state university in the USA. According to the researcher, small group discussions provided the students with the context in which they gradually socialize into discipline specific discourse. Similarly, Cho (2013) observed small group discussions and conducted in-depth interviews with three Korean students who were studying at an MATESOL program in the USA and concluded that multiple factors such as supportive networks and institutional support influenced participants' peripheral participation or non-participation into their CoP. Another study that focused on small group discussions in a TEFL graduate program was conducted by Ahmadi and Samad (2015). Unlike the other studies, their study took place not in the U.S. but in Iran. According to the researchers, through interactions with their peers and active participation into practices, the student teachers were socialized into the values of their discourse community. Academic discourse socialization of graduate students was also investigated in Taiwan by Guo and Lin (2016). In their studies, Guo and Lin (2016) audio-recorded the group discussions of the students in a TESOL graduate course and observed that students took part in the discussions by asking open-ended questions and answering them through linking their self-experiences and knowledge of the world, which, in turn, helped them develop their epistemic stance in their CoP.

All in all, as it is suggested by Duff (2010), since oral academic discourse is more spontaneous and public than written discourse, many people find it more face

threatening as they are commented upon when the speaker is talking or after he/she is finished. However, students develop their discourse competence mostly through interacting with their tutors and peers orally, and find ways to negotiate with the practices and values of the academic community if possible. Hence, no matter how difficult it is, their active participation in oral academic activities is crucial in terms of their socialization into academic discourse and the processes that they go through needs to be further investigated by the researchers.

Academic Discourse Socialization through Online Academic Activities

Many researchers, so far, investigated academic discourse socialization through face-to-face courses. Some other researchers, on the other hand, also investigated online teaching and learning discussions to gain insights into academic discourse socialization.

To illustrate, in their two-phase qualitative study in a large mid-western university in the USA, Beckett et al. (2010) collected data form online academic discussions (OADs) of multi-ethnic, multilingual, multicultural, and multilevel master's and doctoral TESL students, and one faculty member. All the participants discussed various issues in the same platform. When the researchers analyzed the data in terms of their content, it was seen that students constructed an academic community in which they developed their discourse competence. They achieved this by continuing the discussions in their face-to-face classes and starting their own further discussions to better understand the topics, encouraging each other to take part in discussions, by asking questions to clarify concepts and relating them to their personal experiences and intertextual knowledge. They also used OADs to clarify homework as well as provide and receive advice. In short, participants viewed OADs as virtual CoPs for socialization in which they got help from experienced others such

their professor and more knowledgeable peers. Beckett et. al. (2010) also pointed out that while master's students referred more to their personal and professional experiences, doctoral level students mentioned more to the academic content of the courses.

Literature Circles

Literature circles, also known as reading groups/circles, are student-led small group discussions in which students get together with their peers and discuss a text from various perspectives. Through these discussions, students co-construct the meaning of a text. According to Richards (2008), literature circles help students (a) understand the text in-depth, (b) recognize a purpose for reading, (c) use language in multiple ways, and (d) engage in higher order thinking.

Literature Circles and a Reader Response Theory

When students engage in literature circles, they are expected to generate personal responses to something in the text, not just fill in the gaps to show their comprehension. This necessitates the production of original discourse. Therefore, it can be said that the text serves as a mediator for the students to develop their academic discourse. It is also important to note that we cannot talk about the meaning of a text without taking the reader's interpretation into consideration (Selden, 1989). In other words, "readers are not passive spectators *of* the text but are active performers *with* the text… During the reading activity, the reader and the text mutually act on each other, each affecting and conditioning the other" (Karolides, 1997, p. 8). This view called Reader Response Theory is important for researchers who investigate literature circles because while analyzing a text in literature circles, students continuously bring their interpretation into discussions.

Reader response theory is related to transactional theory which suggests that meaning cannot be found solely in a text but rather in the transaction between the reader and the text. Rosenblatt (1978) is one of the earliest authors of reader response theories, and she stated that an individual reads a text either to find information in it or pays attention to the experience of reading. That is to say, he/she concentrates on what he/she is feeling during the reading. The former is called efferent stance (mode) and the latter is aesthetic stance (mode), and the stance a reader takes when reading a text will have an influence on the meaning that the reader builds (Richards, 2008). When reading a text, the student should decide on which stance to take in accordance with the task at hand. However, they can also adopt both. Actually, as Richards (2008) suggests, the ideal curriculum ought to address both, and literature circles are a great opportunity for students to experience literature. When students are developing their ideas about the text, they make connections with their own experiences which let them better understand the text. It should also be kept in mind that the responses that the students give to a text may change over time either as a result of experiences or by the ideas of other people. They may confirm, extend, and modify their interpretations in accordance with their classmates' considerations (Almasi, 1996). That is why, literature circles technique is closely related to sociocultural learning theory, which suggests that social interactions determine individuals' knowledge building.

In his study about how teachers can utilize literature circles and the reader response theory, Pierre (2016) worked with all male 8th graders in the southern region of the USA. He evaluated reader engagement, motivation, and students' identifying themselves with a text. According to the results, many students identified with the texts connected with the characters in the stories, and had positive

experiences with their literature circle groups. Moreover, each student experienced their own reactions and ways of identifying with characters, their families, and themselves throughout the novels, whether negative or positive. These ways of connecting consisted of situational connections, personal connections, and cultural connections. This study indicated that if we give students texts that are based in similar life situations to theirs, they could have more intrinsic motivation and willingness to read them.

The Roles of an Instructor in Literature Circles

As Richards (2008) states, in literature circles, an instructor can take various roles such as a facilitator, participant and a coach. The researcher notes that teachers do not have to take up one role, on the contrary, they may rely on different roles to varying degrees. When the teacher becomes the facilitator, he/she responds to students when needed instead of directing them during the discussions. To do this, the teacher should be able to assess students' needs and act in a way to support and extend their learning. As a participant, the teacher interacts genuinely with the students. Sitting in the discussion groups, she discusses the texts with the students as the students are supposed to do. Here, the significant thing is that, he/she should assure students that the things he/she has said are not the correct answers but just ideas. In order to achieve this, he/she can use hedging comments such as "I may be mistaken but…", "maybe", "I don't know exactly" and so on. No matter how much effort the teacher makes to act like a real participant, it is inevitable for students to take him/her as model. However, this is not necessarily something disadvantageous. The students may see him/her as a model and this is an opportunity to provide them with the academic discourse which otherwise may not arise if he/she were not present. Another role that a teacher can take up during literature circles is the coach.

In this role, the teacher gives the guidelines at the beginning, and during the discussions he/she sits outside the circles and take notes. After the discussions, the teacher gives feedback to students on their talk and thinking. This is another opportunity to offer students scaffolding which will contribute to their academic discourse competence. This can also be done in the form of an explicit instruction, which, as mentioned elsewhere in this chapter, is a good way to help students enhance their discourse competence.

To illustrate, in her qualitative study exploring the teacher's role and third-year elementary school students' participation within literature circles, Maloch (2002) noted that it was not easy for students to transform from teacher-lead to student-led discussion format. In order to approximate their discussions to teacher's protocol, and develop their understanding of conversational strategies, students needed explicit instruction. According to Maloch (2002), this explicit instruction should actually be done at the beginning of the discussions by explaining to students what small-group text discussions are and demonstrating the processes and interaction patterns such as turn-taking and discussion initiation.

The Organization of the Literature Circles

In terms of the organization of the literature circles, it is stated that they may vary in line with the context in which they are held. However, the ideal group number is six to eight because in this way each member in a group can have more responsibility, and they may have the chance to participate actively and develop their perspectives. It is either the teacher who forms the groups or the students themselves. When arranging groups, potential group dynamics should be taken into account. Students may also be given an opportunity to select their own texts. The teacher can provide the students with a list of texts and ask students to choose for themselves.

Daniels (2002) says that allowing students to choose the books themselves may motivate them to participate more in discussions.

Using Role Sheets in Literature Circles

Students are usually asked to read a text before the classes. In order to supply the discussions, the teacher might assign each student different roles such as a questioner, connector, and word-wizard. These roles were suggested by Daniels (2002), however, he later said that the idea of assigning roles to students received criticism because they ended up being misused. Instead of creating authentic discussions in literature circles, the role sheets caused students to discuss the text solely according to their role sheets. Similarly, by referring to the results of a study conducted by Wolsey, Bowers-Campbell (2011) points out that students tended to read responses from their role sheets and did not react to or question each other, and after each student talked about his/her role, they ended up the discussions. Although role sheets are not free of limitations, they help teachers create a framework and students read the text with a specific purpose. Furthermore, they also assist researchers to gain new insights into students' perceptions and skills.

Some researchers reached some interesting conclusions about the students' perceptions on using role sheets in literature circles. For instance, in their short, qualitative study about using literature circles to teach academic English, Graham-Marr and Pellowe (2016) worked with ten engineering students at a university in Japan studying English in an elective course. In the study, students were asked to read an article about an engineering topic before they came to class. During the class they got into small groups. Each student in a group were assigned roles such as a leader, summarizer, detail master and a vocabulary master. Actually, the researchers' main aim was to explore students' ideas about using non-fiction as source material in

literature circles. However, in their set of research questions, they also asked questions related to role sheets, and they found out that although the article used in the class was easy, summarizing it was difficult. Therefore, when students were questioned about which role they found the most difficult, students gave the answer summarizer. Nonetheless, even the students struggled with this role, they stated that it was also the most useful because it helped them improve their English. Since summarizing a text requires one to deeply comprehend the text, it was difficult for students with lower level proficiency to clearly and quickly identify the important points and pick out peripheral support from them.

Keeping a Journal of the Literature Circle Discussions

During their literature circle discussions, students can also keep a reflective journal. As it is suggested by Spalding and Wilson (2002), reflective thinking starts when an individual has doubts, hesitations or finds something perplexing, and starts to search for materials that will address, resolve or clarify the questions in his/her mind. In addition to students' notes, reflective journal entries can consist of diagrams, pictures or even sketches. According to Campbell-Hill (2007) keeping a reflective journal helps students comprehend the text better and start a discussion. In other words, by keeping a journal, students can have time to think about the text more deeply before the discussions.

Literature Circles as Online Group Discussions

Internet has transformed education in profound ways. Among many other things, threaded discussion are regarded as beneficial by many researchers (Andresen, 2009). Among those benefits are promoted energetic interactions between students and their teachers and opportunities for easier discussions of controversial topics (Kirk & Orr, 2003). Literature circle discussions can also be conducted online.

To illustrate, in her study with 8th graders in a high school in the USA, Moreillon (2009) asked students to use wiki-based discussion forums for their conversations. The researcher stated that this was done with the aim of sharpening their writing and communication skills, and presenting their responses to authentic audiences such as grade-level peers and other students in the campus, in short, a worldwide readership. She also noted that this study allowed the students to experience the powerful benefits of the 21st century collaborative learning environment. Similarly, in his study with graduate students who were either pre-service or early career teachers registered for a summer class called Creating Literate Communities, Bowers-Campbell (2011) explored the virtual literature circles and came to conclusion that participants' posts showed engaged reading processes. He also added that since online discussions were not real-time chats, students were able to continue to re-read their ideas.

Further studies about Literature Circles

Studies about literature circles to this day have mostly been conducted by taking L1 elementary or secondary school students as their focus and concentrating on how literature circles improve students' reading comprehension skills. For instance, in her study about how literature circles improve fifth-grade students' comprehension when reading expository, scientific texts, Nolasco (2009) concluded that using this technique allowed students to cooperate effectively. Similarly, in their study investigating literature circles as a tool for self-determination, Blum, Lipsett, and Yocom (2002) let students choose the book themselves and provided them with task organizers. The results indicated that the target group, students with special needs, made a significant progress when their survey results were compared to the rest of the class. Interviews with the educational specialists also pointed out that

small group discussions promoted communication, risk taking, listening skills as well as self-assessments.

A great number of studies that examine literature circles in ESL/EFL classes were also conducted by the researchers. For example, Shelton-Strong (2011) investigated the use of literature circles in a classroom consisting of Vietnamese children at different levels of proficiency. He divided the students into two groups. The first group consisted of higher level students aged between 15-17. For twenty-four weeks, students read two works of fiction by George Orwell and short stories by a contemporary writer. The researcher stated that although it is widely accepted that there should be a minimum of unknown lexis for learners to benefit from extensive reading, the significant degree of scaffolding provided in literature circles help higher level L2 learners read and enjoy authentic, unabridged literature as well. The results also indicated that reading with a specific purpose and constant contact with their peers provided students with opportunities to adjust reading strategies; therefore, increased their reading speed and comprehension. With lower level L2 learners, aged between 13-17, he conducted literature circle discussions for sixteen weeks. In addition to discussion, the students also had 20-minute feedback and noticing activities about the language in the story. The findings demonstrated that learners initially found it difficult to maintain and develop a discussion but with encouragement and awareness raising discussions after literature circles, they improved their language and discussion skills.

In his study, Shelton-Strong (2011), also mentioned the implications related to SLA. He stated that there were many opportunities to for incidental learning and noticing directed by the students themselves through meaningful input. For example, as learners revisit the text while preparing for their individual roles, they met words,

phrases, and whole passages several times frequently in a very concentrated way. According to Spada and Lightbown (2010), these noticing activities are regarded as vital in transforming input into language acquisition.

Another interesting study that explored the use of literature circles in an ESL classroom was conducted by Morales and Carroll (2015). In their case study of a basic English course at the University of Puerto Rico where literature circles were deployed to help students make sense of a novel focusing on the issues of race, class and privilege, the researchers concluded that students benefited from the use of their first language because it served as a tool that allowed them to scaffold each other in a collaborative way.

Several researchers explored the effects of literature circle discussions in university settings. For instance, in their study with L2 literature learners from a Victorian literature class, Yahya and Abd Rahim (2009) concluded that literature circles are a promising approach to help L2 learners learning literature. Similarly, in their study with university students who took a course about adolescent issues, Randall and DeCastro-Ambrosetti (2012) asked students to read adolescent trade books and then discuss them in small groups. The researchers found out that literature circles promoted transactional reading by assisting students to build on their prior knowledge and experience and therefore greatly expanded their content knowledge.

In addition to literature circle studies that took students in elementary, secondary and post-secondary schools as their focus, some researchers also examined how this technique can be used in professional development (PD). In their qualitative study investigating educators' participation in PD and literature circles, and how these experiences contribute to their understanding of teaching and learning,

Monroe-Baillargeon and Shema (2010) stated that all of the participants consisting of teachers from different levels, a school counselor and a librarian commented that the literature circles were different from other PD activities in which they had taken part in. However, they were pleased to be a part of them because literature circles provided them with the opportunity to reflect and interact with colleagues. They had the opportunity to connect their experience in the literature circle with their teaching. The participants provided new ideas to each other and reinforced current useful practices.

Limitations to Using Literature Circles in the Classroom

There are limitations to literature circles. Clarke and Holwadel (2007) mentioned several problems they encountered when running literature circles in a middle-school classroom. They stated that it was impossible to maintain group coherence once the teacher left the classroom. Furthermore, curricular and extracurricular activities such as days of testing and celebrations respectively as well as chronic absenteeism were other problems that emerged during the implementation.

Conclusion

This chapter has presented a review of literature on academic discourse socialization as a socially mediated phenomenon and literature circles. In an attempt to gain better understanding of the academic discourse socialization which emphasizes the interaction and negotiation rather than conventional end products, oral and online academic activities and studies that investigated them were presented. In the last section, literature circles technique and studies that focused on it were discussed.

The next chapter will present the methodology of the present study and cover the participants, setting, data collection and data analysis procedures.

CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY

Introduction

This study aimed to explore academic discourse socialization of undergraduate English language and literature (ELIT) students who studied at an English-medium university through investigating their work in literature circles. To achieve this aim, the researcher conducted interviews with the ELIT faculty members and students, recorded students' literature circle discussions and collected students' reflective journals. In this respect, the study addressed the following research questions:

1. What are ELIT faculty members' expectations of students in regards to their socialization into ELIT academic discourse community?
2. To what extent did literature circles contribute to undergraduate ELIT students' academic discourse socialization?
    2.1. What were ELIT students' perceptions on studying literature before literature circle discussions?
    2.2. How did literature circle discussions reflect ELIT students' ongoing academic discourse socialization?
    2.3. To what extent did students' perceptions on studying literature change after literature circle discussions?

This chapter consists of seven main sections. In the first section, the setting of the study and the participants are described in detail. In the second section, the research design of the study is explained. In the third section, three different data collection instruments; semi-structured individual interviews with the faculty

members, semi-structured focus group interviews with the students, and students' literature circle discussions are presented. In the fourth section, the steps followed in research procedure are mentioned. In the fifth section, the overall procedure of data analysis is presented. In the sixth section thematic analysis used in this study is described. In the final section, the researcher is introduced to help readers better understand the processes of the study as well as the researcher's role in it.

Setting and Participants

The data in this study were collected in a first-year course called Critical Reading offered at a foundation university in Turkey. The course was offered by an assistant professor during the 2016-2017 academic year. The class met for three hours every week. The aim of this course was to help students become more active and critical readers who can develop personal responses to both literary and non-literary texts. Since there were sixty-five students enrolled in the course, the class was divided into two sections. The first section met on Monday and Thursday and the second section met on Tuesday and Friday.

For each section, before the class each week, the students were expected to complete the reading on the topic of that week from a book called Ways of Reading: Advanced Reading Skills for Students of English Literature (Montgomery, Durant, Fabb, Furniss & Mills, 2012). The first two classes of the week introduced a particular topic, element, focus or approach to critical reading. In these classes, the instructor gave a brief summary of the key elements of critical reading such as understanding the metaphorical and figurative language, juxtaposition, allusion and irony. Students were also expected to come to class with their questions about any part of the reading they did not understand or would like to explore more.

The procedure of the literature circles

At the beginning of the spring term of the 2016-2017 academic year, the instructor provided the students with a list of novels and asked them to rank their preferences. The goal of the instructor in providing the students with the opportunity to rank their preferences was to motivate them to take part in the discussions more by selecting a text they would like to read. According to their first or second preference, students were formed into literature circle groups.

Students in each circle chose a group name for themselves and they all read the same text. In the third hour of class students met up with their group members. Nine of these meetings took place in the classroom, face-to-face, and once students met online using an online learning management system called Moodle. The students were asked to prepare for the third hour of the class by taking on a particular role and by completing a simple worksheet. They brought this worksheet to class to share and discuss their answers and comments to the questions with their group members.

As the students read the text, they kept a reflective journal where they recorded their insights about the text. The students were supposed to benefit from what they learnt in the course to help them develop these insights but they were also free to explore what most fascinated and bothered them about the text they were reading. At the end of each discussion, students were also expected to add what others (i.e., their group members and other critics) said about the text. Students followed this procedure for ten weeks.

The participants in this study consisted of three ELIT faculty members, ELIT students enrolled in the Critical Reading course and the researcher. One of the faculty members was the lecturer of the Critical Reading course. Two of the ELIT faculty members were British and one of them was Turkish.

As it was mentioned above, there were sixty-five registered students in the course. Hence, the lecturer decided to divide the students into two sections. In section one, there were thirty-one students and in section two there were thirty-four students. Of all the students who were taking the course, sixty-three of them were Turkish, one of them was Chinese and the other was from Pakistan. The researcher conducted the first semi-structured interview at the beginning of the semester and the second one at the end of the semester with the students in both sections. However, she only recorded the literature circle discussions of the students in the first section due to time constraints. Table 1 below presents the name of each group and the text they were reading.

Table 1

Names of the Discussion Groups and Books

Group Name	Book & Author
Pokol	Dracula by Bram Stoker
The Britts	The Mayor of Casterbridge by Thomas Hardy
Bloodsuckers	Dracula by Bram Stoker
Jacob's Angels	Jacob's Room by Virginia Wolf
Persuassssion	Persuasion by Jane Austin

In the first section of the course, there were five literature circles and each one consisted of five to six students. Most of these students were taking the Critical Reading course for the first time during their second semester in the ELIT program. These students were called regular students. The others, also called as irregular students, were either repeating the course or taking it not as a first year student. One of the students was majoring in psychology and minoring in ELIT. During the

semester, two students dropped out of the course and one of them changed her group with the consent of the lecturer because she found the text that her group was discussing (i.e., Jacob's Room) difficult.

During the data collection process, the researcher recorded the discussions of all literature circles but transcribed and analyzed only two of them due to time constraints and technical problems related to voice recording. The next section will introduce the instruments that were used during the data collection process.

Instruments

Data in this study were collected through three instruments: semi structured individual interviews with the ELIT faculty members, first set of semi-structured focus group interviews with the ELIT students at the beginning of the semester, students' literature circle discussions, and second set of semi-structured focus group interviews with the ELIT students at the end of the semester.

Individual Semi-structured Interviews with the Faculty Members

At the beginning of the semester the researcher contacted four ELIT faculty members to interview them about their expectations of undergraduate ELIT students regarding their socialization into ELIT academic discourse community. Three out of four ELIT faculty members consented to take part in the study. One of the participants was the British assistant professor who was also the lecturer of the Critical Reading course. The other two lecturers were also teaching undergraduate students during the academic year 2016-2017. The faculty members were interviewed at the beginning of the semester. These interviews were audio recorded and then transcribed by the researcher. The researcher assigned pseudonyms for each faculty member. Table 2 below shows information about the duration of the interviews.

Table 2

Duration of Semi-structured Individual Interviews with ELIT Faculty Members

Faculty Member	Duration (hh:mm:ss)
Dr. Çelik	00:28:50
Dr. Jones	00:15:49
Dr. Collins	01:22:19

During these semi-structured interviews, the researcher asked questions to learn about what difficulties they encounter when they teach ELIT students and what they expect from the students in regards to their socialization into ELIT academic discourse community (See Appendix C for the interview questions). The interview questions were designed by taking relevant literature about the role of socializing agents into consideration (e.g., Duff, 2007, 2010; Seror, 2008). However, in order to gain better insights into participants' viewpoints, the researcher asked further questions based on their answers.

First Focus Group Semi-structured Interviews with the Undergraduate ELIT Students

The researcher conducted the first semi-structured focus group interviews with the undergraduate ELIT students enrolled in the Critical Reading course at the beginning of the semester. The questions addressed in these interviews were determined by taking the studies mentioned in the literature review section of this study as the bases (e.g., Duff & Anderson, 2015; Kobayashi, 2003; Morita, 2000; Nam & Beckett, 2011). Nevertheless, the researcher also asked some further questions based on students' answers when she wanted to better understand their ideas.

In the first semi-structured focus group interview which was conducted at the beginning of the semester, all undergraduate ELIT students who took the Critical Reading course were interviewed to gain insights into their perceptions on studying literature before their participation in literature circles. The questions asked in this interview were designed to learn about their educational background, and the problems they encountered while studying literature in the ELIT department (see Appendix A for interview questions). Initially, the course instructor and the researcher worked together to schedule the interviews and then the instructor informed the students about the date, time, and the content. The researcher first held the interview with Section 1 and the next day she had the interview with Section 2 of this course. Table 3 below displays detailed information about the duration and the number of participants of the first semi-structured focus group interview conducted with the students.

Table 3

Duration and the Number of Participants in the First Semi-structured Focus Group Interviews with Undergraduate ELIT students

Section #	Duration (hh:mm:ss)	Number of Participants
Section 1	01:28:14	27
Section 2	01:24:27	21

Students' In-Class and Online Literature Circle Discussions

The researcher also collected data from students' literature circle discussions which includes the recording of the discussions, the copies of the students' online discussion entries, role sheets and journals. Each week students discussed a particular chapter/chapters of their chosen book with their group members as part of their

literature circle discussions. During the discussions, the course instructor visited each group, listened to them carefully and gave prompts where necessary. Each group's discussion was audio recorded by the researcher. While the discussions were being audio-recorded, the researcher also observed the groups and took field notes. Sometimes, when the students finished discussions earlier than expected, the researcher gave prompts to help them sustain the discussion while the course instructor was dealing with the other groups.

Not all the literature circle discussions were held in class. One of them took place in an online learning management system called Moodle. The course instructor asked students to post their comments using their role sheets and asked them to comment on their peers' posts. The researcher took the records of all the comments that students made during the online discussion.

In week nine of the course, the course instructor gave students fifteen minutes to discuss the text and asked them to use the rest of the class time to come up with themes for the question that they would focus upon in the final exam. In week ten, he allocated two hours for the discussion but instead of discussing the book they were reading, students collaborated with their group members to work on the question(s) they would write an answer to in the final exam.

The audio recordings of three groups (i.e., Jacob's Room, Bloodscukers, Persuassssion) were not all audible due to the technical issues such as the problems with the recording devices; therefore, among five literature circles the researcher chose two of them (i.e., The Britts, Pokol) to transcribe and analyze. The information about the duration of the focus literature circle discussions are given in Table 4 below.

Table 4

Duration of the Literature Circle Discussions of the Focus Groups

Discussion #	The Britts (hh:mm:ss)	Pokol (hh:mm:ss)
Discussion 1	00:39:46	00:38:23
Discussion 2	00:49:10	00:49:50
Discussion 3	00:31:23	00:38:30
Discussion 4	00:35:29	00:41:12
Discussion 5	Online Discussion	
Discussion 6	00:33:23	00:40:24
Discussion 7	00:33:43	00:36:05
Discussion 8	00:44:08	00:47:55
Discussion 9	00:24:51	00:40:57
Discussion 10	01:09:16	01:22:49

For each discussion, the students were assigned a particular role (i.e, director, connector, illuminator, summarizer, word watcher, responder) according to which they needed to complete a worksheet (See Appendix D for the role sheet descriptions). They brought this worksheet to class to share with their group members while discussing the text. At the end of each discussion the course instructor asked students to return their role sheets back to him. The researcher copied these role sheets and benefitted from them while analyzing the transcriptions of the discussions.

During the Critical Reading course, as part of the course requirements, ELIT students were expected to keep a reflective journal in which they wrote their ideas and insights about the text that they were reading. The course instructor asked

students to explore their own responses to their reading, ask questions about the text and start to explore the text and its context. The students were required to write on their reflective journal on a regular basis in the form of connected prose but they could also include notes, diagrams and pictures. At the beginning of the study, the researcher explained the participants that they were required to share their reflective journals with her and when the course instructor collected them, she copied and analyzed them.

Second Focus Group Semi-Structured Interviews with the Undergraduate ELIT Students

In the second semi-structured focus group interview which was conducted at the end of the semester, the researcher interviewed the students to understand to what extent students' perceptions on studying literature changed after literature circle discussions. Through this interview, the researcher wanted gain further information about students' socialization process and to learn what they thought about discussing a text in in-class and online literature circles, working with the role sheets, keeping a reading journal and finding out an argumentative question for their final paper (See Appendix B for the interview questions). Unlike the first semi-structured focus group interview, the second one was conducted by grouping students because it was thought that when students were interviewed in groups of four to five, they would have more time to express their ideas. The researcher and the lecturer of the Critical Reading course worked together to design the interview schedule and the lecturer then informed the students about it. The researcher first conducted the interview with Section 1 and next day she had the interview with Section 2. Table 5 below displays detailed information about the duration and the number of participants of the second semi-structured focus group interview with the students.

Table 5

Duration and the Number of Participants in the Second Semi-Structured Focus Group Interviews with Undergraduate ELIT students

Section #	Duration (hh:mm:ss)	Number of Participants
Section 1	01:36:01	16
Section 2	01:38:27	17

Data Collection Procedures

At the beginning of the study, the researcher contacted the Critical Reading course instructor and received detailed information about the course. After that the official permission was granted by the Ethics Committee of the university where the study was conducted, the researcher visited the Critical Reading course class to inform the students about the study and sought their consent. In section 1, there were thirty-three students in the class list, and all those that were present in the classroom agreed to take part in the study. In section 2, there were thirty-two students in the list but only twenty-one students consented to participate in the study.

During the first week of the Spring 2017 semester, the researcher conducted the first semi-structured student interviews with two sections. These interviews were audio-recorded and then transcribed. In the following week (Week 2 of the semester), at the third hour of the Critical Reading course at which literature circle discussions were supposed to be held, the course instructor gave some detailed information about literature circles so the researcher did not collect any data.

At the beginning of the spring semester, the researcher contacted the four ELIT faculty members and explained them the content of the study. Three of them consented to take part in the study. The researcher later arranged the interview

schedule with the faculty members and conducted interviews in the seventh week of the spring semester.

Since Critical Reading was a crowded course with many students, the researcher decided to interview both sections but audio-record only the literature circle discussions of Section 1. The role sheets and reflective journals of the students in Section 1 were collected but the researcher did not collect any role sheets and reflective journals from Section 2.

The researcher started to collect data from the literature circle discussions in the third week of the spring semester; however, it was a piloting session to see how to record and observe the discussions properly. Each group discussion was recorded with a recording device but when the researcher listened to them later, she understood that it was difficult to hear what the students had said. Therefore, the course instructor and the researcher decided to conduct the class in a bigger room. On the fourth week, the researcher observed and recorded the literature circle discussions in another classroom to hear what the students had said better. During the following week, the researcher conducted the individual interviews with the ELIT faculty members. All the interviews and literature circle discussions were audio-recorded. The researcher then transcribed all the interviews and the literature circle discussions of two groups (i.e., Pokol, The Britts).

In week thirteen of the spring semester, the lecturer and the researcher arranged students in Section 1 and Section 2 in groups of four or five to conduct the second semi-structured interviews. During the class that preceded the interviews, the lecturer informed students about the schedule and in which group they were in. The researcher then conducted the interviews first with Section 1 and the next day with Section 2. There were three groups both in Section 1 and Section 2.

While conducting the interviews both at the beginning and at the end of the semester, the researcher paid attention to asking questions in a way that faculty members and students could understand. In other words, she tried not to use any terminology that they could not make sense of.

Data Analysis

In this qualitative study, the data consist of the transcriptions of three semi-structured individual interviews with three ELIT faculty members, two sets of semi-structured focus group interviews with the undergraduate ELIT students, twenty literature circle discussion recordings, forty-seven online discussion entries, forty-eight role sheets and about eighty-one journal entries.

In qualitative research, data collection, data analysis and report writing are not always distinct steps and usually happen simultaneously during the research process (Creswell, 2007). Similarly, in this study, while the researcher was still collecting the data from the literature circle discussions, she started to transcribe the interviews conducted at the beginning of the semester with the faculty members and the students to have an overall view of the expectations and perceptions of the participants. She then began to transcribe the literature circle discussions and dissect students' reflective journal entries to gain further insights into their ongoing academic discourse socialization process. After the transcription of the interviews held at the end of the semester, the data collection process was over. In order to analyze this large data set rigorously to get meaningful and accurate results, thematic analysis (Boyatsiz, 1998) was used. The researcher benefitted from the six phases offered by Braun and Clarke (2006) during the data analysis process (See Table 6).

Table 6

Six Phases of Thematic Analysis Process (adapted from Braun and Clarke, 2006, pp. 16-23)

Phase #	Process
Phase 1	Familiarizing yourself with the data
Phase 2	Generating initial codes
Phase 3	Searching for themes
Phase 4	Reviewing the themes
Phase 5	Defining and naming themes
Phase 6	Producing the report

It is important to note that thematic analysis should not be regarded as a strictly linear process as shown in Table 6 above (Braun & Clarke, 2016); it is possible to move back and forth between the phases and even merge some phases with others. Therefore, during the transcription process, some tentative codes started to emerge and the researcher took notes of them. During the data analysis, the researcher read the printed copies of the transcriptions of the interviews and discussions, and students' journals several times and color coded them to find the themes related to the aim of the study. The researcher then reviewed the codes and categorized them under the following themes using the NVivo software program:

1. Faculty members' expectations of the undergraduate students regarding their socialization into ELIT academic discourse

2. Students' perceptions on studying literature before their literature circles

3. How students' ongoing academic discourse socialization is reflected in literature circles

4. Students' perceptions on studying literature after literature circles.

The details of the themes can be found in the data analysis section of this study.

Trustworthiness of Qualitative Research

In order for a qualitative study to be recognized as reaching accurate and reliable findings, Lincoln and Guba (1985) introduced the criteria of credibility, transferability, dependability and confirmability. There are many other expansive markers of quality in qualitative research; however, according to Nowell, Norris, White, and Moules (2017), the criteria introduced by Lincoln and Guba is a more pragmatic choice for the researchers who want their study to be acceptable and useful for other researchers, practitioners and policy makers.

According to Nowell et al. (2017), when the reader can recognize the experience presented by the researcher, the credibility of a study is determined. They also suggest several techniques such as prolonged engagement, persistent observation, data collection triangulation and peer debriefing. In order for this study to be credible, the researcher did not solely conduct interviews with the faculty members and the students to investigate their perspectives on undergraduate academic discourse socialization but also followed students' literature circle discussions for the whole semester, read the novels they read in their groups, and attended the first hour of the Critical Reading course and took field notes. She was also in constant contact with the lecturer of the course and her co-supervisor who had research experience in socialization studies.

Transferability is simply described as the generalizability of the study (Nowell et al., 2017). It is not possible for the researcher to know all the sites that this study can be transferred to; however, it can be useful in second language

socialization studies, English as a foreign language studies or academic discourse studies. With the aim of making this study as transferable as possible, the researcher provided the reader with thick descriptions as it was suggested by Nowell et al. (2017) by referring to Lincoln and Guba.

Nowell et al. (2017) point out that a study is dependable when it is logical, traceable and documented clearly. To achieve dependability in this study, the researcher transcribed everything that the faculty members and the students said during both the interviews and literature circle discussions of two groups and keeps the records of audio recordings and the photocopies of students' reflective journals. Moreover, she paid close attention to provide the readers with the details of the data collection and data analysis processes.

By referring to Tobin and Begley, Nowell et al. (2017) state that confirmability is achieved when the researcher can demonstrate how she reached the conclusions and interpretations. For this study to be confirmable, the researcher used direct quotes from the interviews, literature circle discussions and students' reflective journals to provide the reader with the raw data. She also linked her conclusions to theories and other studies that were mentioned in the literature review.

The Researcher

According to Sutton and Austin (2015), researchers who conduct a qualitative study try to access the thoughts and feelings of the participants; therefore, they are required to be reflexive during the research process. Sutton and Austin (2015) also state that it is likely to be impossible for the qualitative researchers to avoid their subjectivities such as their world views, biases and perspectives. From their point of view, instead of regarding the subjectivity of the researcher as negative, it should be regarded as unavoidable and it needs to be clearly articulated so that the reader can

better understand the data collection, data analysis and reporting processes. As it was stated above, while collecting, analyzing and reporting data, my interpretations played a significant role. Therefore, it is important to provide information about me to give the rationale that lies beneath this research and indicate to the extent to which the findings of the study might have been influenced by my preferences and previous experiences. At this section the subject *I* is used purposefully to introduce myself and how this study is related to me.

When I received my university entrance exam score, I had two options; either studying at the department of English language teaching or English/American literature. I opted for the second option and decided to study American Culture and Literature at the Faculty of Letters in a public university in the western part of Turkey. I had always enjoyed my classes. We were reading and analyzing various texts from American and English literature, watching films and drawing analogies between themes and issues in them and in the American society, studying American history, and trying to identify the effects that historical events had on literary work. Although it was difficult at the beginning to do all these, as I gradually socialized into the discourse of my academic community, I realized that I turned out to be a more critical reader who always tries to gain a deeper understanding of any phenomena that I am interested in. In other words, studying at a literature department provided me with the opportunity of developing into a person who constantly asks critical questions.

After I graduated from the university, I started to work as an English language instructor at a language school where I was teaching various age groups from young learners to adults. Three years later, I joined the academic staff of a preparatory school of a foundation university in Izmir, Turkey. Having worked as a

language instructor at language schools and university for years, I had the chance to observe the challenges that my students faced while being socialized into the academic discourse in their departments.

After working as an English language teacher for eight years, I decided to pursue my Master's degree in Teaching English as a Foreign Language program at a foundation university in Turkey. As a research topic, I selected academic discourse socialization of literature students because I was familiar with the processes of studying the literature of another language and the challenges involved.

Having studied literature at university and conducting this research as a graduate student contributed a lot to my reflexivity. My prior knowledge about literature and experience both as a student and a teacher guided me throughout my study. However, while conducting the interviews both with the ELIT students and faculty members, I tried not to interrupt my participants in order to allow them to share their ideas and experiences in details. While I was observing the literature circle discussions, I received some questions about the procedure and the requirements of the course. I did my best to help them but when I could not do so, I got help from the course instructor. In addition to this, during the discussions, I sometimes sat together with the groups and listened to the students carefully and gave prompts to move the discussions forward. All these helped me gained better insights into academic discourse socialization process.

Conclusion

This chapter provided information about the participants and the setting of the study. After that, the research design, instruments, data collection procedures and data analysis were described in detail. The credibility of the thematic analysis used in this

study and the profile of the researcher were also discussed. The next chapter will report the findings of the data analysis.

CHAPTER 4: DATA ANALYSIS

Introduction

This study aimed to investigate academic discourse socialization of undergraduate English language and literature (ELIT) students through literature circles. In order to attain this aim, the researcher conducted interviews with the ELIT faculty members and undergraduate students who took a first-year course called Critical Reading, recorded the literature circle discussions and collected the role sheets and reading journals of the students. The following research questions were addressed in the study:

1. What are ELIT faculty members' expectations of students in regards to their socialization into ELIT academic discourse community?
2. To what did literature circles contribute to ELIT undergraduate students' academic discourse socialization?
    2.1. What were ELIT students' perceptions on studying literature before literature circle discussions?
    2.2. How did literature circle discussions reflect ELIT students' ongoing academic discourse socialization?
    2.3. To what extent did students' perceptions on studying literature change after literature circle discussions?

In order to answer the first research question, the researcher conducted semi-structured individual interviews with three ELIT faculty members. The answer to the second research question was sought through three sub-questions. To answer

question 2a, the researcher conducted semi-structured focus group interviews with undergraduate ELIT students who took a first-year course called Critical Reading the beginning of the spring semester. With the aim of answering question 2b, the researcher recorded the literature circle discussions and collected the copies of students' role sheets and reading journals for ten weeks. And, for answering question 2c, the second semi-structured focus group interviews were conducted with the students at the end of the spring semester.

All data collected from the interviews and literature circle discussions were transcribed by the researcher. The researcher analyzed the above-mentioned qualitative data using Boyatzis' (1998) thematic analysis. Upon identifying the codes on the printed copies and tracing the patterns among these codes and considering the studies mentioned in the literature review section, the researcher reached themes. By using a software program called NVivo, she then revised the codes and categorized them under the following themes. Below the reader can find the list of the research questions that were focused upon in this study, and the themes that are related to them:

Table 7

The Research Questions and the Themes Related to Them

1. What are ELIT faculty members' expectations of undergraduate students in regards to their socialization into ELIT academic discourse community?	
a. To develop a culture of reading	b. To develop strategies to study literary texts better

Table 7 (cont'd)

The Research Questions and the Themes Related to Them

2. To what extent did literature circles contribute to ELIT undergraduate students' academic discourse socialization?	
2.1. What were ELIT students' perceptions on studying literature before literature circles?	
a. Experiences of studying literary texts before starting to study at the ELIT department	b. The challenges they encounter while studying literature in the ELIT department
2.2. How did literature circles reflect students' ongoing academic discourse socialization?	
a. Lack of experience in having discussions about literary texts	b. The use of resources in literature circles
2.3. To what extent did students' perceptions on studying literature change after literature circle discussions?	
a. Perceptions on discussing literary texts with others	b. Perceptions of strategies to study literary texts

The following section will present the findings in relation to the three research questions of this study.

Findings

Faculty Members' Expectations

ELIT faculty members' expectations regarding undergraduate students' academic discourse socialization were investigated with semi-structured individual interviews with three faculty members. One of these faculty members was the lecturer of the Critical Reading course. Table 8 demonstrates the themes and codes that emerged from the interviews with the faculty members.

Table 8

Themes and Codes for Faculty Members' Expectations of Students in Regards to their Socialization into ELIT Academic Discourse Community

Themes	Codes
To develop a culture of reading	- Self-fashioning - Reading extensively - Developing a critical methodology while reading literary texts
To develop strategies to study literary texts better	- Developing English language proficiency to understand the language used in literary texts - Being familiar with the historical and cultural references - Developing study skills

To develop a culture of reading. The first theme that emerged from the interviews with the faculty members was the necessity for students to develop a

culture of reading. Self-fashioning, reading extensively and developing a critical methodology while reading literary texts are the codes that construct this theme.

Self-fashioning. According to Dr. Collins, who was also the lecturer of the Critical Reading course, studying literature requires the development of a person as a whole. Therefore, he strongly emphasized that ELIT students should see their cultural life as something to be developed and talk about. He stated that in academic term it is called self fashioning, which refers to how we create ourselves and how we show ourselves to the outside world. In order to do that, students must see themselves as a kind of a project. However, he admitted that majority of the undergraduate ELIT students do not make effort to develop their cultural life in accordance with the things they are interested in:

> Some of the students do but most of them do not have a sense of themselves as cultural beings. It should matter what music you listen to, what art you like. You should have opinions on these things. At this stage it does not matter what they are particularly, it matters if they have some kind of passion or enthusiasm for something.

Reading extensively. All three ELIT faculty members mentioned the importance of reading extensively during the process of undergraduate students' socialization into ELIT academic discourse.

Dr. Collins claimed that he could understand which students "are going to be good" through the conversations he has with his students about the books. According to him, they do not have to talk particularly about the texts assigned during the classes or the texts from English literature. He stated that sometimes he asks students

which Turkish writers he should read. At this point he does not expect students to talk about the Turkish writers and books in academic way but simply show interest in sharing their ideas about the books with him. He stressed that reading should be a part of a student's life who is studying literature.

For Dr. Çelik, ELIT department is not a place for students who do not like reading and writing but for those who are friends with words, texts and books. However, she also admitted that internalizing it is a problem for the students. To overcome this obstacle, she suggested ELIT students to 'read more in their spare time, and select books not for the sake of this and that course but for their own interest.'

Dr. Jones also pointed out the significance of reading extensively and enthusiastically and retain that enthusiasm throughout their studies in the ELIT department. She said that many students decide to study literature because they love books yet when they reach an academic context, very often because of the analysis they require of them, they lose that love. Although it is challenging for students to do all the literary analyses, they should not feel overwhelmed and give up on reading.

Therefore, it is significant for the students who study at the ELIT department to read extensively. Undergraduate ELIT students are not expected to read solely the books that are assigned to them in their course syllabi but anything that interest them. In other words, they should be keen readers who do not feel tired of reading.

Developing a critical methodology while reading literary texts. In addition to caring for their self-fashioning and reading extensively, ELIT faculty members stated that students should develop a critical methodology while reading literary texts. In

order to attain this aim, they should not be passive receivers who expect someone else to show them the way all the time but ask questions and develop arguments.

Firstly, faculty members claimed that Turkish ELIT students feel more comfortable when they have a leader to show them the way at all times. They find this inclination problematic because, for them, not being a passive receiver is more valuable than waiting for someone to lead you.

For Dr. Çelik, Turkish students have the tendency to lead the stage to others most of the time instead of speaking up their minds. She said that she finds it difficult to make students speak in the classroom. She thinks most of the time students are passive receivers who "expect a director, a leader, an instructor and a moderator to motivate them or to lead them to certain places or ideas." However, she emphasized that instead of doing what others say, it is more crucial for students to think "freely and critically." When the researcher asked her what she meant by thinking 'freely and critically,' she described it as "not encoding the same ideas stated in the classroom, not reflecting the ideas they got from secondary resources but coming up with something new which tells their own interests." In that sense she suggested students to listen to their lecturers, listen to their peers, give themselves some time to understand the text and finally come up with a new approach for themselves. She stressed the importance of developing personal ways to approach a text:

> I would like to let my students know the importance of reading alone, making notes and thinking of new possibilities of analyzing works. In the classroom environment, we only suggest a few ways of approaching the texts. You can look at it this way. You can look at it that way. However, after thinking about it, I expect them to find another way which is going to be something creative

and personal for them. This is more valuable than the ways we show them in the classroom.

Similarly, Dr. Jones pointed out that students almost always see their professors as resources that can guide thoughts yet instead of doing that she claimed they, as ELIT faculty members, "provide them with mechanisms through which they can put their own thoughts into use." According to Dr. Jones, for students to create their own critical methodology and to study literature in an academic context, they need to study a lot.

Secondly, for ELIT faculty members, asking questions is so important for undergraduate ELIT students to be more active in their learning process. Instead of waiting for someone to ask questions all the time, faculty members encourage students to come up with their own. In other words, although students tend to think that they are supposed to find an answer to the questions that their lecturers ask, faculty members expect them to think up their own questions. However, ELIT faculty members told that it was not easy for undergraduate ELIT students to do so.

Dr. Jones stated that when she talks to students one-to-one, they are full of questions but it is challenging for them to ask questions in the classroom for several reasons. Firstly, she thinks that students come from an educational system where they are not used to asking questions but finding answers. Secondly, she is of the opinion that students, as young adults, "do not want to look stupid." However, she emphasized that "no question is stupid" and strongly recommended students to ask questions because "very often the questions that students find the most embarrassing to ask can lead to the most interesting discussion in class." Thirdly, she finds the classes quite crowded. She pointed out that it is not possible to have intensive discussions in a class of fifteen to thirty people. When asked about the ideal class

size for a literature course, she said “eight is sort of ideal for the discussion of a text”. Dr. Jones also told that she strives to “make the classroom safe enough space so that all students can feel they can ask questions in front of the other students in class.”

Thirdly, both Dr. Jones and Dr. Collins asserted that undergraduate ELIT students not only find asking questions challenging; it is also difficult for them to admit that in literature studies there may not be one single answer to a question. According to Dr. Jones, although “literature can provoke multiple different readings and multiple different answers” students are “really scared to realize that there is no one single answer.”

In the same way, Dr. Collins explained how misleading it is to think that there is always one single answer to the question(s) when studying at a department which is regarded as a part of humanities:

> You are looking for one right answer and three wrong answers. Studying humanities at university is about being able to say 'all these answers may have a kind of value' but that is not to say 'there are equally valuable or there is nothing more to say about'. It is about saying: 'How can we use this answer to get deeper into a text' or 'Maybe answer d is less satisfying but what can we find in it'.

According to Dr. Collins, the fallacy of looking for one correct answer impedes the ability to think critically. He gave an example from his classes at which he talked about historical and social events:

> I find it much more difficult that majority of the students struggle with this idea that how we tell history is in itself kind of political, debated and contested. They want me to tell them ‘Okay! This is what happened.’ They want me to tell them that the Renaissance was a period of enlightenment or

> they want me to tell them that Renaissance was a period of barbarism, religious intolerance. They want me to tell them one answer that they can learn and they can repeat.

Last but not least, the interviews with the faculty members pointed out that when students start to ask questions and look for multiple different answers to them, they should take other people's such as their peers', lecturers', or critics' ideas into consideration, filter it from their worn understanding and establish their own viewpoints. In other words, they need to be able to develop arguments and find ways to extend the arguments in accordance with their own understanding. According to Dr. Collins this is one of the most significant ways by which students could socialize into their academic discourse communities.

> The way you get ideas about the text is by reading what the other people have said about it and that is where your arguments come from and how you start entering into these kinds of circles of discourse.

To sum up, in order to socialize into the ELIT academic discourse community and gradually become a legitimate member of it, undergraduate ELIT students should take an active part in their learning instead of waiting for someone to lead them all the time. To do that, they need to ask questions and admit that there might not be one single answer to them all the time, look for what others have said about these questions, filter it from their own understanding and create their own responses. That is to say, they need to be able to develop arguments about literary texts and expand them.

To develop strategies to study literary texts better. Another theme that emerged from the interviews with the faculty members was developing strategies to study literary texts better. Developing English language proficiency, being familiar

with the historical context and developing study skills are codes that constitute this theme.

Developing English language proficiency to understand the language used in literary texts. Students' language proficiency problem was the first issue that was mentioned by Dr. Collins, who was also the lecturer of the Critical Reading course, during an interview with him. According to Dr. Collins, to study the literary texts better, the first requirement for students is to have a high level of English language proficiency skills. He strongly emphasized that one of the biggest challenges that majority of the ELIT students face is their level of English. For him, undergraduate ELIT students' English language proficiency level is not enough for them to feel comfortable in reading difficult literary texts:

> 15% of our students have strong enough English to have no problems with the texts that they are studying; however, the majority have to work quite hard. They are not at a level where they can engage at all with the text as literature. They cannot get a basic comprehension of the text.

However, solely improving their language proficiency is not enough for students to fully comprehend the literary texts. They also need to understand how language works in literature. Dr. Jones noted that the language in literature works differently than the way it works in daily conversation. She pointed out that that to understand the language in literature, which is usually very ambiguous and has multiple meanings, students need to work hard with a dictionary and pay close attention to how language works in a literary text that they are analyzing:

> It is something we do as literary scholars. We also look up its etymology, where it comes from; if a poet is choosing to use very Latin based words or if a poet is choosing to use very Greek based words, or very French Romance

words or Germanic words. All of these different words are parts of the English language.

Dr. Jones also mentioned that not only students who study the literature of their second or foreign language encounter these problems:

> I think that these are the challenges that students face while studying literature even if it is their native language. It is a challenge of language because language in literature works differently in language in normal communication.

Being familiar with historical and cultural references. Being familiar with the British historical and cultural context was another important issue which was mentioned by ELIT faculty members when they were interviewed about their expectations of undergraduate ELIT students.

For Dr. Jones, students need to pay attention to the historical context in which the literary work that they are working on was created. In other words, they need to incorporate historical thinking into their literary studies. She also stated that there are multiple different traditions in Western cannon. ELIT students who are studying British literature need to be knowledgeable about these traditions and try to make sense of how a literary work sits within these multiple traditions. She said: "England, Scotland, Ireland and Wales that all have slightly different political and literary traditions that the writers incorporate in their work"; therefore, students should learn about these traditions and take them into consideration while they are working on a literary text.

Dr. Collins also admitted that most of the historical and cultural references are unfamiliar for the students. However, he later added that it is not only the Turkish students who experience these problems:

> Turkish students come from a different cultural background. I think in most cases that is not a huge problem. Those things are also a problem for most of the students in Britain or the USA. For example, not many students of ours have detailed knowledge about the Bible. For English literature, at least up until about 1900, and in many cases and well past that, the majority of literature is constantly making references to the Bible and the Christian tradition. That is also true for most British students. Most British students do not have a good knowledge of Bible. It might be because they are coming from backgrounds that is not Christian or although they are coming from a Christian background, they might be identified as Christian as much as our students identify themselves as Muslims. They do not know necessarily a great deal about the religion.

To learn about how ELIT department addressed this problem, the researcher asked whether they offer British History course or not. As an answer to this question, Collins said that they had been offering the course but then they changed the curriculum. He explained the reason behind this change as follows:

> The original reason was we felt what students really needed was to learn the history that is related to what they are working on and how to think about the relationship between literature and history because when we had that course, students were trying to cover 1000-year British history in one semester. You only do things very shallowly that is not very helpful. The logic was to have literature in its context course which will teach students how to find out about the history that is related to the text that they are studying.

He added that later they offered an elective course in British history from the History Department but the university administration changed the rules and said

students should take Maths and Sociology courses instead. According Dr. Collins, this did not work well for the students. By referring to his conversation with one of the students who just graduated, he said, “They are all very upset that the British history course was removed because actually they really wanted the course that just teaches them history. I think it is something that we have to bring back.”

Developing study skills. In order to study literary texts better, students also have to develop their study skills. In accordance with the interviews with the ELIT faculty members these study skills can be listed as creating individual study periods to develop skills, taking notes, benefitting from secondary resources and collaborating with peers.

Dr. Çelik remarked that it is vital for students to have a kind of individual study periods for themselves. However, she admitted that it is not easy for Turkish students because “Turkish students who receive their fundamental skills before coming to university are not familiar with individual study for the skills.” When she was asked what she meant by ‘individual study for the skills,’ she explained it as follows:

> Student can think of his/her own interests and do not limit his own or her own understanding to the discussions that continue the classroom environment. What I mean is this if a student is interested in a particular topic or subject, I believe instead of waiting for next meetings, he/she should start finding data, exploring that idea and start reading secondary sources and bring those to class just to discuss further with the peers or the moderator in the classroom.

According to ELIT faculty members, being fond of reading and writing is of great importance for students who are at the periphery of academic discourse

community. Here, writing should not be regarded solely as writing academic essays but also as taking notes while they are reading literary texts and other things that interest them.

As it was mentioned above, Dr. Çelik stressed that students ought to have individual study periods during which they work on the subjects that interest them. Dr. Çelik adds that while doing this, it is imperative for students to develop a note-taking method for themselves. According to Dr. Çelik, while students are taking notes they do not have to write complete sentences all the time. They can simply use words, signs, passwords or short phrases which may lead them to get a broader understanding of the text later on.

When the researcher asked if Turkish students are familiar with taking notes, she answered "Not always." The researcher then asked if she shows them how to take notes. Dr. Çelik said she does not because she expects them to do it themselves. She admitted that it is problematic at the beginning because students come from different educational backgrounds and while some of them are good at expressing themselves clearly in English, some others are "really backwards in speaking and writing in English and they cannot understand English." However, according to Dr. Çelik as the students move on with their studies, they get the whole idea: "They start from the sign but then they can expand it in an understandable way after several years."

In the same way, Dr. Collins stated that he asks students to take notes while they are reading not only literary texts but other texts as well:

> I am trying to get the students read with a pencil in their hand. They should have a conversation with the text that they are reading, even if it is just underlining the bits they like or the ones that interest them, squabbling in the

> margin or keeping a notebook of their thoughts. They need to have a kind of literary relationship with what they are reading, and they need to do that not just with the text that they are reading in the class but with everything that they are reading such as a magazine article, a newspaper article on Turkish politics, and put it down on their notebook or post it on their blog.

However, he adds that it is difficult for students to do so because they have too many courses which require them to do too much reading; therefore, they do not have enough time to develop their interests.

As a means to study the literary text better, students also need to know how to benefit from secondary resources. Being skilled at finding and using these resources is another issue that was addressed during the interviews with the ELIT faculty members.

When questioned about whether they tell students which or how many secondary resources to use when analyzing a text, faculty members had different opinions. To illustrate, Dr. Çelik said that she does not do so due to students' tendency to do what their instructor says instead of using their own initiative. According to Dr. Çelik graduate students have the ability to expand their research even when their instructors lead them to certain secondary resources. However, undergraduate students lack this ability. For Dr. Collin, students always feel obliged to use secondary resources because most of the time their instructors add it to their course requirements. However, according to Dr. Collins, what undergraduate students should be doing is using their own initiative to decide whether they really need to benefit from a secondary resource:

> The first thing that many of our students ask is how many secondary sources that they have to use. The proper answer to this is that it completely depends.

> If they have a really good insight into the text, they can write a fantastic essay without any secondary resources. They think that they have to tick the box. They may say: 'Well, Professor X tells us to use two secondary sources' and then I say 'Okay! I understand why he is doing it but the idea of that should come organically'.

Dr. Collins also added that when students really need to use secondary resources, they need to be guided in a realistic way by taking their skills into consideration:

> We need to move our students to the way where they are looking for something more sophisticated but it is about being realistic about our students. If you pretend that they are Oxford doctoral students, you are not helping them.

When the researcher asked what challenges students usually face while they are trying to make sense of secondary resources, Dr. Collins pointed at their low level of language proficiency, heavy course load and lack of experience in looking for different perspectives to develop their own view points. Therefore, to his mind, it is not realistic to guide them solely to highly academic and sophisticated resources. Unlike Dr. Çelik, Dr. Collins pointed out that if he would run the Critical Reading course again, he would give students specific, brief secondary reading which would provide them with the critical debates about a text they are reading.

Having obtained a Bachelor's degree in literature herself and from the interviews she conducted with the undergraduate ELIT students, which will be mentioned in details under the title of ELIT students' perceptions in this chapter, the researcher knew that students frequently benefit from websites such as Wikipedia, which is an online and a free of charge encyclopedia designed and edited constantly

by volunteers around the world, and Sparknotes, Schmoop and Enotes, which contain brief and easy-to-understand summaries and critical analyses of the literary texts of English and world literature. The researcher also asked Dr. Collins what he thinks about using the afore-mentioned resources and he said that it is wrong to tell students not to benefit from these resources.

He asserted that he understands many professors do not want their students to use these websites because they think that such websites give students an interpretation of the text and prevent them from engaging with it in a more academic way. Nonetheless, he thinks such websites can be really useful for students, especially the ones in Turkey, who struggle with the cultural and historical context or with the language. He claimed that undergraduate students can use these websites as a starting point, and then look for other 'more sophisticated' resources to improve their literary analysis skills.

He also added that using these resources are not free of problems:

> The first problem is that a lot of students take what they get out of Sparknotes or Enotes and they just write that in their essays. The professors know immediately what they did. Some students just plagiarize, which is depressing. The other problem for me is that some of those websites such as Schmoop is written in an informal style in general. The danger is that students read that kind of material and pick up that style and I do see it sometimes.

Dr. Jones, correspondingly, remarked that providing students with secondary resources such as dictionaries which give the meaning of a word together with its history and guides that present information about writers, topics, periods etc. is beneficial for undergraduate students. She suggested that students who start from

‘easy’ secondary resources can then look for ‘more specific critical texts for second reading’.

All three ELIT faculty members also emphasized the importance of collaboration between peers. According to them, when undergraduate ELIT students work collaboratively with their peers, their socialization process into ELIT academic discourse community becomes easier.

Dr. Çelik told that it is always encouraging for students to “listen to their peers who have similar experiences or who have perhaps better insights in the subject and who can express themselves better.” In the same way, in the opinion of Dr. Jones, literature creates conversation and peers are the “immediate thoughtful community” in which students can talk about their likes and dislikes in literature, and ask questions to each other. Dr. Jones also emphasized that this conversation between peers do not have to take place in the classroom but outside of it as well.

When the researcher asked her whether she puts an effort to encourage students to work in groups, she said that designs group projects to “create a platform by which students cannot only do their own individual research and have confidence in that but have this active literary community.” She explained how teaching often works in literary studies as it follows:

> Students prepare for the seminar on their own with close attention and come in to the seminar. They give some of their ideas, and they have other students with other ideas. They debate these ideas. They ask questions and then they go back to reading the text with close attention but influenced by multiple different perspectives.

By referring to literature circles in which students discussed a text in groups, Dr. Collins pointed out that working in pairs and groups is the first step for students to participate in the ELIT academic discourse community:

> They need to enter this community of discussion, which is actually what the literature circle is about. The students have the circle of five or six students in the group but we are trying to get them into is the biggest circle of the department, scholarly community both now and over the time.

However, thanks to his experience, he is well aware of the fact that group work does not always work:

> Sometimes I think to choose five strong, committed and mature students, put them in one group. They will have a good discussion. The way they are doing it can then become a model. Students who are not so mature or interested will see say 'Okay! We can do it more like that'. In Critical Reading course, there were two students who really wanted to do it but if you have three or four who are not really committed, then those two students who were having a really good day, get depressed and the whole group discussion dies.

In conclusion, in order to study literary texts, undergraduate ELIT students are required to develop various strategies. First, they need to improve their English language skills in a way that they can understand the literary texts. Secondly, they need to familiarize themselves with British history and culture so that they can better understand the references in a text. In addition, students ought to create individual study periods to develop their skills, constantly take notes of the things they find interesting, crucial or confusing, benefit from secondary resources and collaborate with their peers.

Students' Perceptions before Their Participation in Literature Circles

Undergraduate ELIT students' perceptions in regards to their academic discourse socialization before their participation in literature circles were investigated through semi-structured focus group interviews which were held at the beginning of the spring term of 2016-2017 academic year. When the interview was conducted, students were at the second semester of their course of study at the ELIT department. Therefore, the questions were designed accordingly. In that sense the researcher paid close attention not to use any terminology and asked questions mainly about students' educational background such as their experiences of studying literature and group work in high school and the challenges they face while they were studying at the ELIT department. Table 9 presents the themes and codes that emerged from the first interview with the students.

Table 9

Themes and Codes for Students' Perceptions on Studying Literary Texts before Literature Circles

Themes	Codes
Students' experiences of studying literature before they started studying in the ELIT department	- The way they were studying literary texts at high school - Experiences of working in groups
The problems students encountered while studying literature in the ELIT department	- Challenges in comprehending literary texts and the lecturers - Lack of familiarity with the British historical context - Heavy course loading

Students' experiences of studying literature before they started studying at the ELIT department. The first theme that emerged from the first semi-structured focus group interviews with the ELIT undergraduate students was their experiences of studying literature before they started to study at the ELIT department. How students were studying literary texts at high school and their experiences of working in groups are the codes that constitute this theme.

The way they were studying literary texts at high school. During the first-interview with the students, the researcher asked students questions about their experiences in studying literary texts before they started to study at the ELIT department. Their answers pointed out that most of them had never analyzed a literary text even in their Turkish literature classes. One of the students stated that they "rarely discussed something in context like the purpose of the writer, the purpose of the text, its meaning, and so on" but they just "memorized the names of the writers and their works and the traditions of each literary movement in Turkish literature."

Upon receiving these answers, the researcher asked questions to gain better understanding of the students' engagement with literary texts from English literature in their English classes. Majority of them revealed that in their English language classes they just read short, abridged stories and never analyzed literary texts or the language in literature.

Although there were few students who stated that they did focus on literature instead of studying grammar and vocabulary in their English classes, the rest of the students pointed out that they did not have such an experience. One student told that they read a novel every week and discussed about it in her English classes at high school. However, she emphasized that it was so not because the national curriculum

required it but because of their teacher's appreciation of literature thanks to her educational background:

Interview #1

Student #2

We read the novel every week and I loved my teacher and I am a good learner so we got along really well. She had studied English language and literature at university. She was not from the English language teaching department. She knew a lot about literature. We were not like normal Turkish high schools. We were reading a novel every week and had a discussion on it.

Another student also stated that their teachers were conducting in-class discussions and then written exams. However, she said that these discussions and exams, which were consisted of short questions, were not held with the aim of improving their abilities to analyze a literary text but basically testing their comprehension of it.

Experiences of working in groups. During the interviews with the students, the researcher asked students their ideas about working in pairs and groups to gain further insights into their perceptions in conducting a joint work since the main aim of the researcher in this study was to understand to what extent literature circles, which can be regarded as a group work, contributed to students' academic discourse socialization.

One of the students very clearly explained that pair work or group work works well depending on the participants. She told that if all the all the group members are willing to work, take responsibility, and, most important of all, know what they are supposed to do, the group work goes well. Conversely, if no one knows what to do or if just one person does all the job, then it fails:

Interview #1

Student #3

I worked in groups in art projects in my personal life. I think I observed a lot. There are four types of group work. The first one is, I call it the miracle, everyone is interested in the work and everyone is willing to work. Everyone does equal work and they will get a good grade. This rarely happens. The second one is, I think that is very often, everyone feels awkward, they do not know what to do and in the end no one does anything or a little work that does not mean anything and the group fails. The third one is only one person does the work in the group. When the group presentation comes only that person who does the work presents the presentation and even though she does all the work, everyone gets good grades. That is unfair. The fourth one is no one is interested in the work and they try their best but it fails because they do not know what they are expected to do. These are my experiences in group work.

Some students said that they do not like working in groups. They gave various reasons for their dislike which could be listed as follows; feeling obliged to censor thoughts, spending so much time to persuade others, and the feeling that their ideas are not appreciated and put in a presentation just because some other group members do not like it. On the other hand, one student also stated that she had a really nice group work experience when her instructor allowed them to form their groups themselves.

To conclude, the interviews with the undergraduate ELIT students clearly showed that many of them were not equipped with the basic skills to analyze a literary text when they started to study at the ELIT department. It was also observed

that students were familiar with conducting joint work yet most of them did not like the idea of working in groups.

The problems students encounter while studying literature in the ELIT department. Another theme that emerged from the first semi-structured interviews with the undergraduate ELIT students was the problems they encounter while studying literature in the ELIT department. Challenges in comprehending literary texts, lack of familiarity with the British historical context, and heavy course loading were the three main issues that students pointed out throughout the interview.

Challenges in comprehending literary texts and the lecturers. When the researcher asked questions to students about what challenges they face while they are studying at the ELIT department, the first thing they mentioned was the difficulties they experience while they are trying to understand the literary texts and their lecturers. For instance, one of the students said that her vocabulary is not broad enough for her to make sense of the literary texts she reads. She added that she needs to look up for the meanings of the words frequently.

Another student mentioned that she learnt English as a foreign language from Turkish teachers. However, when she started to study at university, she found it difficult to understand native lecturers at the beginning:

Interview #1

Student #4

I went to English courses to learn English in elementary school and also in middle school. My teachers were speaking English, of course, but they were Turkish so they were speaking clearly but when I came here, my teachers became foreign teachers from other countries so at the beginning, like for two

> or three months maybe, I had difficulty to understand them. Every sentence they say was so hard for me to understand but I think I got used to it.

Lack of familiarity with the British historical context. Another problem that students mentioned during the interviews was their lack of familiarity with the British historical context. One of the students said that their lack of familiarity with the historical and cultural references discourage them from taking part in class discussions:

Another student also told that she was disappointed when they were not offered British history classes which, she thinks, were closely related to ELIT department:

> *Interview #1*
>
> *Student #6*
>
> Before I decided to come to this department, I looked at the classes but when I came here I saw that we were doing Maths and Computer Science. That is not us. That is not why I came here for. When I learnt that Mythology and English History were removed from the curriculum, I was kind of disappointed but also I still love the department becuase, like my friend says, it teaches us to think analytically and it increases our intellectual level so there are pros and cons.

Heavy course loading. When being interviewed, students emphasized that in addition to their language proficiency problems in making sense of literary texts and their lecturers and their lack of familiarity with the British historical context, they struggle in meeting the requirements of all the courses in their department. One of the students who had studied at the preparatory class the previous year pointed out this problem by saying:

Interview #1

Student #7

The difficulty for me was there are a lot of requirements for every course. For example, I passed the Certificate of Proficiency in English exam and I was thinking that I am not going to have any difficulty in English but, for example, we had to write 800 words essays and it was difficult for me. Also every week we have to submit some homework so arranging time was difficult for me in the first semester.

In summary, the first semi-structured focus group interviews with the undergraduate ELIT students pointed out that at that stage of their academic discourse socialization, students had difficulty in comprehending literary texts due to their low level of English language proficiency and their lack of familiarity with the historical and cultural references in the texts. Furthermore, students found it challenging to meet the requirements of all their courses; therefore, they felt overwhelmed. The afore-mentioned three factors could be regarded as problems that need to be addressed to facilitate students' legitimate peripheral participation in ELIT academic discourse community.

How Students' Ongoing Academic Discourse Socialization is Reflected in Literature Circles

In this study, in addition to the interviews with ELIT faculty members and undergraduate students, the process of students' academic discourse socialization was also investigated through literature circles which were held during a first-year course called Critical Reading in the spring term of 2016-2017 academic year. To this end, the researcher audio recorded and then transcribed students' literature circle

discussions for ten weeks and collected students' reflective journals. Table 10 presents the themes and codes that emerged from the analyses of the transcriptions of the discussions of two literature circle groups and reflective journals.

Table 10

The Themes and Codes for how students' Ongoing Academic Discourse Socialization is Reflected in Literature Circles

Themes	Codes
How students' lack of experience in having discussions about literary texts is reflected in literature circles	- Not commenting on each other's ideas - Problems in developing an argument - Difficulty in understanding language in literature
Resources students benefitted from in literature circles	- The secondary resources they referred to - Lectures on critical reading - Their peers - Their lecturer

How students' inexperience in having discussions about literary texts is reflected in literature circles. During the analysis of students' literature circle discussions and their reflective journals, it was clearly seen that students lacked the experience of discussing literary texts with others. Therefore, the first theme that emerged from the transcriptions of the literature circle discussions and students' reflective journals was how their inexperience in discussing literary texts with others was reflected in their literature circle discussions. Not commenting on each other's

ideas, problems in developing an argument, and difficulty in understanding language in literature are the codes that constitute this theme.

***Not commenting on each other's ideas*.** During the literature circle discussions, it was observed that students rarely commented on each other's ideas. Although literature circle discussions were designed to promote the idea of gaining new perspectives through discussing a text with peers, it was clearly seen that students hardly ever built on each other's ideas; therefore, most of the time they failed to have sustained discussions.

At almost every discussion, students shared their ideas that they took note of in their role sheets with their peers. However, they mostly just shared it and did not ask group members' their ideas about what they thought of it. Similarly, the group members usually preferred to move on with the next task when one was over. To illustrate, when students became a word watcher, they usually just read the definitions of the words from their role sheets and did not discuss the significance of them or why the writer used that specific word. It was also seen that students tended to choose words of which they did not know the meaning:

Excerpt 1

Discussion Group: Pokol

Book: Dracula

Aynur (director): Do we have a word watcher today?

Melda (word watcher): Yes. It is me.

Aynur: OK! Let's move on with the important words.

Melda: I did not choose the important words. I chose the alien ones actually.

Aynur: OK!

Melda (*says each word one after another simply by reading them from her role sheet, without discussing them with group members*): You know there is an old man who speaks really weirdly. All of these words are the ones that he used in chapters six and seven. The first one is 'scuppers' which means opening in the side of a ship on a level with the deck designed to allow water to escape. And then 'Yablins!' It means possibly. Then there is 'keckle' which means chuckling. Then there is a phrase 'lock, stock and barrel' which means including everything, completely. 'Feet folks', derogatory slang for tourists who travel by foot rather than by carriage as the wealthy passengers do. And, there is 'belly timber' which means food. That is all.

Aynur: OK! Thanks for sharing. So, now we know the unknown words. Does anyone of you want to continue with the other role or should I choose one? (Discussion 4, 16/03/2017).

From time to time it was seen that students also picked up the words that have some cultural references; however, usually they did not discuss them in details or elaborate on their peer's findings but continued with the next role.

It was also observed that students rarely made connections with the story when they were talking about the words they had taken note of in their role sheets. The researcher noted that students sustained the discussions a little bit more, when the word watcher made connections to the story and added his/her comments instead of just reading the definitions of them.

Problems in developing an argument. Students' lack of experience in having discussions about literary texts was also seen through their problems in developing an argument.

As it was mentioned above, in the literature circle discussions, students mostly just read what they took notes of their role sheets and did not ask their peers' ideas or commented on them. In other words, after completing their tasks, they gave the floor to another person and expected him/her to do the same instead of discussing their ideas in details.

During the discussions and in their reflective journals, it was also seen that students often talked about what happened in a story. In other words, instead of reflecting on the literary texts, coming up with questions or developing arguments about the background of the study, writer's intention, or literary devices that he/she used, they simply described the plot-line. The researcher realized that after all group members shared what they had written in their role sheets, they started to talk about the events in a story. In addition to that, they found the book either boring or interesting depending on the flow of the events:

Excerpt 4

Journal Entry

> The events also moved very fast. They were like TV series in the sense that while many events were going on, the main character did not do anything and this makes the reader feel more excited. This excitement makes the reader want to read more and more so that the mysteries can be solved. It is a great tactic that Thomas Hardy applied. It is a good way to strike the audience in every chapter they read. I look forward to read more of his novels during the summer holiday. (Nurşel's Journal, 03/05/2017)

Another pattern that the researcher realized while she was analyzing the discussions and journal entries was that students usually speculated about what would happen next in a story:

Excerpt 5

Discussion Group: The Britts

Book: The Mayor of Casterbridge

Nurşel: If you were Michael and woke up after the incident what would you think?

Ceyda: I would regret what I have done also because of the alcohol I drank the other night. I sold my wife and child so I think it is just something that I should be ashamed of. I would do everything to get back things.

(Discussion 2, 02/03/2017)

It was also apparent that students had an inclination to approach the literary text with a moralistic point of view while they were discussing it with their peers or writing an entry about it in their reflective journals. Most of the time they were concerned about the *good* or *bad* behaviors of the characters rather than the literary elements or historical or sociological aspects of it. Furthermore, compared to in-class literature circle discussions, it was observed that students mentioned their emotional reactions to the events and characters more in their entries in their reading journals:

Excerpt 6

Journal Entry

I think Renfield's death is somewhat tragic. Dracula is not only demon due his vampire features but also he is a bad person from the beginning. He was not being fair when he killed Renfield. He respected Dracula all the time but Dracula just broke his neck. It was sad. (Melda's Journal, 12/04/2017)

Last but not least, it was observed that students sometimes put themselves in the place of the characters and talked about what they would do if they had been that character:

Excerpt 7

Discussion Group: Pokol

Book: Dracula

Ahmet: Can you sympathize yourself with Count Dracula? What makes you think he is wretched and miserable?

Zeliha: He was so lonely before Jonathan arrived so he wanted a company with him. He cannot always talk to walls or wolves. Maybe, he just wanted a friend and a friend turned into a prisoner.

Nurşel: I do not relate myself to him. He has two faces. At the beginning of the book, he was so nice and kind. He liked people who come into castle but in the later chapters, he starts to act like an animal.

(Discussion 3, 09/03/2017)

Difficulty in understanding language in literature. During the discussions and in their reading journals, students said that sometimes it is really hard for them to understand the literary texts because the language used in these texts is different from what they are used to. Especially, they expressed that there are many words of which they do not know the meaning; therefore, they need to check the dictionary frequently.

Excerpt 9

Discussion Group: The Britts

Book: The Mayor of Casterbridge

Ceyda: I have questions for you. Are the sentences in chapters you read are complex? Does the complexity level of the text created an obstacle while you are reading it?

Derya: In Chapter 2, the descriptions were made by using advanced vocabulary, by old words. It was the hardest one, I think.

Nurşel: The sentences were kind of easy to understand but there were a lot of unknown words. For example, I personally had to look up what the word 'meek' because I did not know its meaning. After you look them up, it becomes clear.

Similarly, in their reading journals, students mentioned that they had difficulty in understanding the literary texts because of the language used in literature:

Excerpt 10

Journal Entry

I want to write a bit about Thomas Hardy's writing style. He uses many words that I do not know. This exhausts me because I have to look up every word to help me understand the context. Also, he structures his sentences in such a way that even the easiest statement seems or is vague. Although I sometimes struggle with understanding what Hardy says, I often understand the conversations among the characters with ease although they sometimes talk differently. They use words and phrases that we do not usually hear in our daily dialogues. Some of the expressions also have to do with their culture. Therefore, it is hard to understand something that is in a culture you are not included in. For instance, in Chapter 13, the very last sentence is "I am as clammy as a cockle snail." I had a hard time figuring out what this meant as it was not on the internet but when my teacher explained it to me, I understood it well. (Nurşel's journal, 15/04/2017)

In summary, the audio recordings of the literature circles and students'

journal entries showed that students' lack of experience in having discussions about literary texts caused them not to comment on each other's ideas, and therefore it was hard for them to develop arguments throughout their discussions. The majority of the students mentioned that they had difficulties in understanding the language used in literary texts. Based on what they said, it is clear that at this stage of their academic discourse socialization, students focus more on making sense of the language used in literary texts than on the ideas or developing arguments.

Resources students benefitted from in literature circles. Another theme that emerged from the analysis of students' literature circle discussions and reading journals was the resources they benefitted from in literature circles. These resources, which are also regarded as the codes of this theme, could be listed as follows; secondary resources, lectures on critical reading, their peers and their lecturer.

The secondary resources they referred to. The analysis of the literature circle discussions revealed that at that phase of their course of study, undergraduate ELIT students did not refer to any serious academic texts or used the ideas of other literary critics to develop arguments. What students actually referred to frequently when they wanted to make connections between the literary text they were analyzing and other resources during literature circles were; contemporary, best-seller books, films, TV series, animes, and fairy tales. When students were referring to secondary resources mentioned above, it was observed that they mostly compared the characters with others in different stories:

Excerpt 13

Online Discussion Entry

Warning! There is going to be a spoiler about Jane Eyre. I cannot say I know about Victorian men really well but what happened to Van Helsing's wife and

> his mysterious behavior made me remember Mr. Rochester (Jane Eyre) who is also a Victorian man (even if not a typical one). I can just say that Van Helsing is a Victorian man as much as Mr. Rochester is. Maybe even more cruel. As I remember or I am just thinking like that Van Helsing sent his wife to asylum. As I remember from my searches of Jane Eyre, asylums in Victorian era were so cruel so Mt. Rochester did not do that and kept his wife Bertha at home. However, I do not think we know Van Helsing enough to talk about him as a Victorian man. I hope in the next chapters we can learn more about him. (26/03/2017, Lale's comment).

The effect of lectures on critical reading. As it was mentioned in Chapter 3 of this study, during the first two hours of the Critical Reading course, Dr. Collins introduced a particular topic, element, focus or approach to critical reading. As students started to learn more about the literary elements, they began to talk about them yet usually not in the form of an argumentation but description. Nonetheless, it was seen that learning about the literary elements helped them have longer and more detailed discussions and journal entries; therefore, affected their participation in literature circles.

Among the literary elements that students mentioned during the discussions and in their reading journals were; genre, climax, narration, and themes. In addition to these, students also mentioned character development, allusion and symbolism. The researcher realized that students put a lot of emphasis on figuring out the symbolism used in a literary text. For example, Melda thinks that she can become a better literature student if she can make sense of the symbolism in a text she was reading.

Excerpt 14

Journal Entry

I am so excited about the novel right now. Finally, some action! Dracula is like a Stephen King novel in Victorian times but it is much better because it has all the symbolism. I am trying hard to understand because I want to be a better literature student. (Melda's Journal, 05/04/2017)

Another thing that was mentioned by Dr. Collins during the lectures on critical reading was Vladimir Propp's character types. Vladimir Propp is a Russian formalist critic who identified seven character functions (i.e., villain, donor, helper, princess, dispatcher, hero, false hero) in Russian folk tales. In his book, Morhopology of the Folk Tale (1968), Propp states that the roles could sometimes be distributed among various characters or one character could fulfill more than one role. Upon lecturing about Propp's character types in week ten, Dr. Collins asked students to describe the characters in their reading texts in Proppian terms and give examples from other stories as well. Compared to the discussions in previous weeks, it was observed that students had more sustained discussion. In other words, they asked more questions, commented on each other's findings and tried to develop arguments.

Dr. Collins also lectured about the classic discussion of Greek tragedy in Aristotle's *Poetics*. In this lecture, Dr. Collins mentioned some basic characteristics of a tragic hero; harmartia (i.e., a tragic flaw), peripeteia (i.e, the reversal of fate), and anagnorisis (i.e., a moment of a discovery). It was seen that when students were trying to find examples to Propp's character types and Aristotle's ideas on tragedy, they realized that there may be more than one answer:

Excerpt 16

Discussion Group: Pokol

Book: Dracula

Nurşel: We can talk about anagnorisis or the moments of realization in the book. Does anyone have an idea about which event can be realization?

Aynur: We talked about the mirror scene but I think right after the mirror when Dracula attacked him was the actual realization because he realized that he was in danger. And, that moment when the cross hurt Dracula, they realized about religion also.

Zeliha: There was a time when he saw three women and he realized they were going to hurt him.

Aynur: Yes! But he always thought that he was dreaming. It is kind of complicated at the beginning.

Nurşel: When they found Lucy's tomb empty, they realized that there is a vampire that needs to be stopped so they put crucifix and they stopped her. This is another realization example.

Their peers. The observation and the analysis of the transcriptions of literature circle discussions displayed that students helped each other gain new perspectives about the text they were discussing, and make sense of the course requirements.

Although most of the time students did not comment on each other's ideas, from time to time they helped one another gain new perspectives about the text they were reading. Due to students' inexperience in discussing a literary text with a critical methodology in a scholarly manner, they mostly focused on the flow of events:

Excerpt 17

Discussion Group: Pokol

Book: Dracula

Aynur: You remember Lucy's sleepwalking, right? Why do you think she sleepwalks? What do you think about her psychology? What do you think happened to her? Why do you think her psychology kind of has fallen apart?

Zeliha: At the chapters, she seems so happy because she has chosen the right husband, Arthur, among her three options. Maybe her inner mind, her psychology, does not think Arthur is the right choice.

Aynur: Your ideas are realistic but I thought something supernatural is going around. Do you remember the flames in the first chapters? There are supernatural things out of the castle. Maybe this is one of them. Maybe something supernatural is affecting her.

Zeliha: Maybe, she is just turning into a vampire. (Discussion 4, 16/03/2017)

Secondly, in weeks nine and ten, the lecturer of the Critical Reading course asked students to identify themes and then possible questions for their final exam paper. This was something puzzling for the students at the beginning because, as it was mentioned before, undergraduate ELIT students tend to find answers instead of coming up with questions due to their educational background. When students were discussing what they actually needed to do, they got help from their peers. It was also seen that when students were trying to understand the course requirements, they started to use their native language, Turkish, although they were speaking fluently in English when they were discussing a literary text in literature circles. It was also observed that they code-switched a lot:

Excerpt 18

Discussion Group: Pokol

Book: Dracula

Ayşe: Ne belirleyelim? (*What should we identify as questions now?*)

Zehra: Karakterler üzerinden mi yola çıkabiliriz? Bilmiyorum. (*I do not know if we should start by talking about the characters.*)

Ayşe: Kaç kelime olmalı? (*What is the word limit?*)

Zehra: Kelime sınırı koymamış. (*There is no word limit.*)

Ayşe: 200 falan olur bence. (*I think it is 200 or something*)

Zehra: Şimdi ilk önce soruları mı yazacağız? 10 tane? (*Are we supposed to write the questions first? 10 questions?*)

Ayşe: Essay'e yazacağın bir tane konu belirleyeceksin. Karakterler hakkında mı yazacaksın; setting hakkında mı, hotspotlar hakkında mı… Bunlardan (*probably by showing the paper*) seçeceksin mesela. Bunlardan olmak zorunda da değil. Bunlar sadece örnek olsun diye verilmiş. (*You are supposed to identify a topic that you are going to focus upon in your essay. You have to decide if it is going to be about the characters, setting, hotspots and so on. It may be something among those. It does not have to be, though. These were given as examples*.)

Nihan: Ama herkes farklı farklı seçebiliyor değil mi? Yoksa tek bir konu seçip beraber aynı şekilde mi yazacağız? (*But everbody can choose a different topic, right? Or are we supposed to choose only one topic together and write the same things?*)

Ayşe: Burada 'as a group try to identify ten topics' diyor. (*Here it says 'as a group try to identify ten topics'.*)

Zehra: Yani on tane topic bulmamız gerekiyor. Onlardan bir tanesini seçip onun hakkında essay yazacağız galiba. (*That means we have to identify ten topics and choose one of them and write an essay about it.*)

Nihan: Yedi tanesi burda var. Geri kalanı biz bulacağız. (*There are seven here. We are going to find the rest.*)

Ayşe: On tane buluruz. Niye bulamayalım? (*It is easy to find ten.*)

Zeynep: Haftaya mı başlayacağız? (*Are we going to start next week?*)

Selin: Bence take-home seçelim. (*I think we should prefer take-home.*)

Ahmet: Bence de. (*I think so*)

Nihan: Deadline'ı ne zaman? (*What is the deadline?*)

Ayşe: Deadline'ı yok galiba. Üç haftaya yayılıyor. Ben öyle anladım ama yanlış anlamış olabilirim. (*I think there is no deadline. We can do it in three weeks. That is what I have understood but I may be mistaken*)

Zehra: Peki burada 7 tane konu var. Geriye kalanı ne olabilir mesela? Narrating ile mi ilgili mesela? (*OK! There are 7 topics here. What might be the rest? Narrating, for instance?*)

Ayşe: Evet. Narrating'in nasıl etkilediğini yazabiliriz. (*Yes. We can write about the effect of narratting*)

Selin: Bence en mantıklısı karakter. (*To my mind, the most logical thing to write about is the characters*)

Nihan: Bence de. (*I think so*) (Discussion 8, 20/04/2017)

In addition to helping each other with making sense of the course requirements, students also helped one another to find secondary resources: ***Their lecturer***. Throughout the literature circles, the course lecturer, Dr. Collins, helped students in many ways. He assisted students with their discussions,

course requirements, and helped them learn more about the practices and values of ELIT academic discourse community.

Firstly, as it was pointed out before, students need modelling throughout their studies. He provided the students with that modelling in literature circle discussions. When he was doing this, it was observed that he tried to help students with questions instead of providing them with direct answers:

Excerpt 20

Discussion Group: Pokol

Book: Dracula

Dr. Collins: Did you notice what religion is for Jonathan Harker?

Aynur: Christian.

Dr. Collins: Christian but I think it is worth starting to distinguish different types of Christianity in Dracula. I think this is important partly because of Bram Stroker. What was his nationality?

Melda: British?

Dr. Collins: Well, that is a very controversial question. Why might it be controversial then in 1890s?

Aynur: I am not sure.

Dr. Collins: Well, he is Irish.

Students: Aha!

Dr. Collins: Yes. In that sense, he is living within the British state in the late Victorian period but, of course, many Irish were not happy about that. Secondly, what religion did most of Ireland follow?

Aynur: Is it Christianity?

Dr. Collins: Yes. What branch of Christianity?

Aynur: Is it Catholic?

Dr. Collins: Yes. Catholic and still today Ireland is predominantly Catholic. What about Jonathan Harker?

Aynur: He is not really into religion.

Dr. Collins: Yes. In a certain sense he declares his own faith. He is an English clerk. What would you guess he would be?

Ahmet: He is a lawyer.

Dr. Collins: He is a lawyer so we would expect him to believe in law logic, science. He is also Protestant.

Aynur: Oh! Protestant.

Dr. Collins: Yes. Most of England is Protestant. One thing to be aware of when reading Dracula, there are many different ways you can approach it, but there is a sense that Jonathan Harker, and many of the English characters in the novel, are Protestant. For Protestants the idea that a crucifix, an image, can have power is anti-Protestant. In the Reformation, in the 16th century, the Protestants would go to churches that had been Catholic and claimed over the paintings. They would paint the walls white because then the idea of worshipping images was somehow dangerous. So, if you see somebody wearing a crucifix, you can be sure that there are different forms of Protestantism. Some accept the crucifix but they are more likely to be Catholic than Protestant. Dracula, of course, is from Eastern Europe, an area that is still Orthodox or Catholic, which could be regarded as the old Christianity. Jonathan Harker comes from the new Christianity. He is resistant. When the woman tries to push the crucifix on him, he does not want to take it first. There might be many reasons for that but one reason is the idea

that this is the old faith. This is the worship of images. Yes! That turns out to have power against the evil. I think there are many levels on which to read Dracula. One you might not be so alert to is the tension between Protestant and Catholic. (Discussion 2, 02/03/2017)

In addition to helping students throughout the discussion by providing them with useful information, Dr. Collins also helped students learn more about the practices and values of ELIT academic discourse. As it was stated before, what undergraduate ELIT students are supposed to do is to learn ways to develop sound arguments by taking other people's ideas into consideration. During the literature circles, this was emphasized many times by Dr. Collins:

Excerpt 21

Announcement by the course lecturer

Dr. Collins (*addressing the whole class*): Think like a lawyer. What are you going to argue? What might be some of the arguments against you, which try to challenge you? What kind of evidence can you produce to support your argument? I would like you to start a plan. I am going to give you 20 minutes to work on some kind of a plan. This is not going to be your final plan. Please, make it legible. I also ask you to share your work with other members of your group so you can help each other build as a good plan as possible, as much evidence as possible, and as much argument. Make you sure that arguments are strong. (Week 13, 04/05/2017)

Last but not least, Dr. Collins also helped students to understand the course requirements. At the beginning of the semester, he gave the students a very detailed syllabus of the course which provides information about required and further reading, the structure of the course, assessment, plagiarism and academic dishonesty.

In addition to that, throughout the semester, he also gave several hand-outs which inform students about what they supposed to do in their midterm and final exams. Furthermore, either at the beginning or at the end of the class, he made announcements to inform students about the course requirements.

In conclusion, students' literature circle discussions and their entries in their reading journals indicated that undergraduate ELIT students did not mention any serious academic texts or the ideas of literary critics but instead referenced contemporary best sellers or visual media when asked to refer to secondary resources. However, as they learnt more about literary techniques and terms, it was observed that they started to incorporate them into their discussions. It was also seen that students got help from their peers in gaining new perspectives and understanding the course requirements. Moreover, students' lecturer, Dr. Collins, also played a key role in the students' socialization process by aiding them in understanding cultural and historical references and course requirements. It was also observed that Dr. Collins frequently mentioned the valued practices of the ELIT academic discourse community during his classes. Hence, it can be said that both students' peers and their lecturer acted as socializing agents during literature circles discussions.

How students' perceptions on studying literature changed after literature circle discussions

In this study, the extent to which students' perceptions on studying literature changed after literature circle discussions was investigated through semi-structured focus group interviews with the students in Section 1 and Section 2 at the end of the semester. Table 11 below displays the themes and codes that emerged from the second semi-structured interviews with the undergraduate ELIT students.

Table 11

Themes and Codes for How Students' Perceptions on Studying Literature Changed After Literature Circle Discussions

Themes	Codes
Perceptions on strategies to study literary texts	- Asking questions - Taking notes - Using secondary resources
Perceptions on discussing a literary text with others	- Conducting a joint work in literature circles - Discussing a literary text online

Perceptions on strategies to study literary texts. The first theme that emerged from the second semi-structured focus group interview with the undergraduate ELIT students was their perceptions on strategies to study literary texts. Asking questions, taking notes, and using secondary resources are the codes that make up of this theme.

Asking questions. Instead of asking a question and expecting students to answer it properly, Critical Reading course lecturer, Dr. Collins, asked students to collaborate with their peers and identify ten varied topics, themes or subjects that their essay could focus upon towards the end of the semester. He suggested some points such as characters, setting, themes and problems but reminded students that they could come up with some other theme as well. He later asked students to choose one of these themes and think about five or six focused, clear, interesting questions about their reading group text and then discuss with their group members and choose one of them. He required students to a) include their interpretations rather than solely

talking about facts, b) develop arguments and support these arguments with evidences and c) try not to look for a single correct answer while they were writing about the final question in their exam paper. As the researcher knew from the interviews she conducted with the ELIT faculty members that asking questions is important for the socialization into ELIT academic discourse, she enquired students whether finding a question was easy or difficult for them. Students pointed out that they had difficulty in coming up with questions during the interview which was held at the end of the semester.

As it was mentioned in Chapter 3, students studied Ways of Reading: Advanced Reading Skills for Students of English Literature (Montgomery et al., 2012) at the first two hours of the Critical Reading course. The first chapter of the book introduces asking questions as a way into reading and this chapter was addressed by the lecturer at the second week of the class. In other words, students knew that they need to ask questions to comprehend a literary text. However, they still found it challenging to come up with a question:

Interview #2

Student #1

I remember in our first lecture we talked about asking questions about the text before we read it so I think in Critical Reading course, it is necessary to ask questions about the text. I think it is challenging but we need to learn about it. I think it is good for us.

One of the student who was majoring in psychology and chose ELIT as her minor department, claimed that she was more experienced than her peers in the ELIT department because it was her third year at school. Based on her experiences, she remarked she ‘naturally’ starts to think about the questions that could be asked when

she is asked to write a paper about the text she is reading. When the researcher asked her if she had any suggestions for her friends, she recommended:

Interview #2

Student #3

Focus! As Dr. Collins always says this is the great one. You have to focus. You have to pick one specific thing. You cannot say 'What is love in Persuasion?'. Ask different questions. You know people are inclined to ask questions like 'What is marriage in Persuasion?'. Poor teacher! He has to grade all the paper. You know, 500 words! It is not fine. And, wording is also important. When you have a good idea but different wording, it might make a good research question a very bad research question. Ask questions like 'To what extent...?', 'What implications...' That sort of questions. Not like 'Is it this?' or yes/no questions. I mean that is not a good question as he always says.

When talking about their ideas on finding a question for the final exam paper, other students said that it was very ‘difficult’ and they ‘did not like the idea’. However, they also told that sharing ideas with their reading group members and Dr. Collins’s feedback really helped them find a question. One of the students also stated that it was hard for her to find a question through which she could develop an argument. She admitted that all the questions that she could think of were focusing on the plotline.

Last but not least, students emphasized that they had never experienced finding their own questions for a literary essay. Furthermore, one student also stated that they had not written a literary essay before, either:

> I am a first year ELIT student and I had never written a literary essay. We all wrote something for our ENG101 course but when it is something literary, it is harder to ask questions. I am afraid! In ENG101 course, they did not want us to ask a question. They just wanted us to choose an argument and support it.

Taking notes. In order to encourage students to take notes while studying literary texts, the lecturer of the Critical Reading course, Dr. Collins, required students to fill in a role sheet and keep a reflective journal during literature circles. At the end of the semester, to learn what students think about the role sheets and keeping a reflective journal, the researcher asked them questions about these two techniques.

At first the researcher asked questions about filling in a role sheet while students were preparing for the discussions. As it was mentioned in Chapter 3, there were six different roles which rotated among students every week (see Appendix D). On these role sheets there were directions and questions which guided students. Majority of the students found role sheets very helpful. For one of the students, the directions on the role sheets encouraged them to "think innovatively and think more about the text." Similarly, other students stated that while they were filling in those role sheets, they wrote sentences, drew something or took notes of the questions that arouse in their mind. Students also told that role sheets made them read the book and contributed a lot to their critical reading because it guided them in asking questions. Moreover, one of the students stated that she would keep using the role sheets in her other courses as well.

Keeping a reflective journal was another technique deployed by Dr. Collins, who wanted to encourage students to take notes while studying literary texts. For

some students taking notes of their responses to the text they were reading on their reflective journal was beneficial. To illustrate, one of the students said that she got really excited when she heard about the idea because she generally likes writing down her opinions. While taking notes on her reflective journal, she stated that she "paid attention to themes, details and minor characters." Another student told that she loved the idea of keeping a journal because it gave her space where she could be creative. However, students also pointed out that although they liked the idea of keeping a journal, it was difficult for them to do so from time to time due to heavy course loading:

Another thing that students mentioned was that they did not find the idea of keeping a journal 'enjoyable' when it becomes a course requirement or when they were graded on it: "I love writing but it was not good to be marked because then it becomes a burden. I do not like doing stuff for marks because then it becomes boring." On the other hand, although being graded on their reflective journal was not something good, students told that it helped them develop their writing skills.

Using secondary resources. In order to understand literary texts better and develop arguments, ELIT students need to know how to benefit from secondary resources. To gain insights into the ways students benefitted from secondary resources, the researcher asked students what kind of secondary resources they used while reading their assigned text for literature circle discussions.

During the interview, majority of the students stated that they mostly benefitted from websites such as Wikipedia, Sparknotes, Schmoop and Enotes although they did not mention the names of these websites during their literature circle discussions. One of the students admitted that when she found the text they were reading difficult to understand, she used the above-mentioned websites:

Interview #2

Student #5

I did use Schmoop a lot. I first read the summary in Schmoop then I read my chapter because it helped me a lot to understand everything clearly. Schmoop has the everyday language so that is more helpful. The Mayor of Casterbridge uses a lot of different words.

Besides reading the summaries, students admitted that they also read the character and chapter analyses provided by these websites:

Interview #2

Student #6

I actually used Sparknotes a lot because they have analyses for each chapter so it is easier to understand. At first, the author's language was a bit difficult for me but then I got used to it. Until I got used to it, analyses were actually very good for me. They also have character analyses which is also nice because you can have an idea about that character before you read it so Sparknotes was good for me.

According to one of the students, reading about the writer first and then reading the chapter analyses on Sparknotes helped her a lot order her opinions and express them in their literature circle discussions. Similarly, another student told that she initially read the original text, then checked a website that gives information about Biblical symbols, and finally read the summaries on websites like Schmoop to see if she had missed something.

On the other hand, one of the students claimed that she did not use the websites such as Sparknotes, Schmoop, Enotes but she got help from other essays that provided the analysis of the text that she was working on upon reading the

original text. When the researcher asked her how she found these essays she said that she just typed in Google the word ‘analysis of’ and the title of the text.

Dr. Collins held one of the sessions of the Critical Reading Course at the computer laboratory with the aim of giving information about the websites students can benefit from during their studies at the ELIT department. At the beginning of the session, after telling about the websites the lecturer told students:

Excerpt #21

Critical Reading Course Session

Dr. Collins: To use some of these resources like Literature Online, Oxford Reference, Oxford Dictionary of National Biography, you need to be logged in Bilkent to access. You may need your library card number to access this. Some of them you can access anywhere Collins Dictionary, for example, and the Key Words website. If you are not sure where to begin with your studies, if your professor gives you an essay to write about a sonnet or Renaissance poetry or James Joyce's short stories, this is an excellent place to begin. Most of us use Wikipedia. It has many good qualities but what you have found there, you need to check. It is not a reliable source. Explore these a little by yourself, when you are at home or when you are on the computer system. (Week 3, 24/02/2017)

When the researcher asked students whether they had used any of the websites that Dr. Collins mentioned during that session, students said that they used online dictionaries like Oxford English Dictionary to look up the meanings of the unknown words, Project Gutenberg to find the words and quotes easily, Literature Online, Oxford References and Oxford Dictionary of National Biography.

Some students also added that they got help from the audio books when they had hard time in understanding the literary texts they were reading:

Interview #2

Student #2

I have a weird one actually. Whenever I do not understand the chapter, I actually open the audio book in YouTube and then listen to it while I am reading. I follow what they are saying on the audio book. By this way I understand better. I do not have to read Sparknotes anymore. When I listen, it is different. It helps me to understand better.

In addition to various websites and audio books students say that they also benefitted from the films:

Interview #2

Student #7

I watched a film about Persuasion and interestingly enough, after watching it, my interest in the book increased because the movie was better than the book. The book is very boring. After watching the movie, you want to learn the details.

To conclude, the second semi-structured focus group interviews with the undergraduate ELIT students pointed out that literature circle discussions raised students' awareness on the significance of asking questions and taking notes, which were highly expected by their faculty members in order to socialize into ELIT academic discourse community. In addition to these, thanks to the guidance of their lecturer students also learnt about more serious, academic secondary resources and benefitted from them from time to time although they did not mention them during their literature circle discussions.

Perceptions on discussing a literary text with others. The second theme that emerged from the second semi-structured focus group interview with the undergraduate ELIT students was perceptions on discussing a literary text with others. Conducting a joint work in literature circles and discussing a literary text online are the codes of this theme.

Conducting a joint work in literature circles. When the researcher asked students about their experience in discussing a text in in-class literature circles, majority of them claimed that they found it very beneficial for several reasons. The first thing that students pointed out was that discussing a literary text in small groups made them gain new perspectives:

Interview #2

Researcher: How did discussing a text in literature circles contribute to your interpretation of the book?

Student #8: It definitely adds more angle. I can definitely see the things from different perspectives. It enriches my journal writing. When I am contemplating on the text or specific words or scenes, I can see more diverse version of that single thing.

Student #9: I think it was fun, too. We had different ideas and it was nice to listen to others. We discussed different things, we had different approaches to texts. It was nice to see others' perspectives.

Student #10: In our group five of us thought that Lady Russell was not a good character but one of our friends said that she has to be considered in her time and conditions. After the lesson I told her that I had never thought of it that way. Although we know that there are different perspectives, experiencing them is another thing.

Secondly, one of the students expressed that discussing a text in small groups was better than discussing with twenty other students and the weekly discussions made her more disciplined:

Interview #2

Student #10

I was so relaxed to express my ideas when the lecturer and twenty people were not listening to me. Thanks to these small group discussions, I read the scenes regularly so it was kind of a discipline for me.

Students did not gather in literature circles to solely discuss the novel they were reading. In weeks nine and ten, the lecturer asked students to come up with themes and questions for their final exam paper. While doing this he required students to share their ideas with their peers and comment on each other's questions. During the interview with the students that was held at the end of the semester, the researcher asked students whether collaborating with their peers helped them find a well-thought question.

Many students said that it was very helpful for them to work with their peers at that point:

Interview #2

Student #5

My friends really helped me find a topic for my essay as I did with theirs. Actually what we were discussing was just like a little outline. I wrote down what they said. Receiving genuine questions from my friends led to me a better question.

Although majority of the students enjoyed literature circle discussions and found them beneficial, some students argued that sometimes they had difficulties

because they got stuck and could not find anything to talk about; therefore, they needed help. According to the students, at those moments, their lecturer's guidance, having a more experienced person in a group and changing roles every week were very helpful to sustain their discussions.

Discussing a literary text online. After getting students' ideas on in-class literature circles, the researcher asked them what they thought about having an online discussion. As it was stated in Chapter 3, one of the literature circle discussions was held online learning management system called Moodle. Although some students found online literature circle discussions beneficial, some others did not think that they were helpful.

Those students who found online literature circle discussion favorable claimed that online discussion allowed them "more time to think and put their thoughts in order." Furthermore, it gave them a chance to "correct their mistakes" and "support their ideas with images."

Nonetheless, majority of the students argued that online discussion was not effective:

Interview #2

Student #11

In online discussion I lost my interest. I did not feel like I was doing something. It was just reading and writing I really like talking at face to face because you can understand what he or she meant. In online discussion it is very hard.

In online discussion, the lecturer asked students not only post their role sheets together with their comments but also read their peers' posts and comment on them.

However, most of the students admitted that they just posted their assignments and did not read their peers' comments during the online discussion.

To sum up, literature circle discussions raised students' awareness on the importance of collaborating with peers while analyzing literary texts. Many students told that discussing a literary text in literature circles was beneficial not only because it made them gain new viewpoints but also they felt more comfortable in working in small groups when compared to discussing a literary text as a class. However, students did not really like the idea of conducting their discussions online.

Conclusion

With this study, the researcher aimed to investigate academic discourse socialization of undergraduate ELIT students. To this end, she focused on ELIT faculty members' expectations, students' perceptions before and after literature circle discussions and how participation in literature circle discussions reflect students' ongoing academic discourse socialization. This chapter presented the findings based on the semi-structured interviews with the ELIT faculty members and undergraduate ELIT students who took a first year course called Critical Reading and students' literature circle discussions. The next chapter will present the findings and discussions, pedagogical implications, limitations of the study, and suggestions for further research.

CHAPTER 5: CONCLUSION

Introduction

This study was conducted with the aim of investigating the academic discourse socialization of undergraduate ELIT students through their participation in literature circles. In this section, the researcher will discuss the findings in relation to a) faculty members' expectations of students regarding their socialization into ELIT academic discourse community and how these expectations match and mismatch with students' perceptions and experiences, and b) the extent to which literature circles contributed to students' academic discourse socialization.

The Alignments and Discrepancies between Faculty Members' Expectations and Students' Perceptions of Academic Discourse Socialization

In order for newcomers to fully participate in their community of practice, they need to acquire not only the linguistic knowledge but also the sociocultural knowledge of that community, and with the aim of gaining that knowledge newcomers need to interact with competent others (Lave & Wenger, 1991; Schieffelin & Ochs, 1986; Vygotsky, 1978). In ELIT academic discourse community, ELIT faculty members could be regarded as one of the mediators from whom undergraduate ELIT students can learn how to negotiate with institutional and disciplinary ideologies. Therefore, in this study, the researcher conducted interviews with ELIT faculty members to gain insights into their expectations of undergraduate ELIT students regarding their academic discourse socialization. And, to understand how these expectations correspond to students' perceptions of their academic discourse socialization process, the researcher conducted interviews with the students

both at the beginning and at the end of the semester and observed students' work in literature circles. Table 12 below presents the discrepancies between faculty members' expectations and students' perceptions. The details of these conclusions were discussed in the following paragraphs.

Table 12

Discrepancies between Faculty Members' Expectations and Students' Perceptions

Faculty Members' Expectations	Students' Perceptions
Read other literary texts not only for the sake of their courses but for the development of their thoughtful learning and cultural life	Rarely referred to other literary texts than the one they read for their classes
Ask questions, take other people's ideas into consideration, filter them from their own understanding and develop arguments	Find single correct answers to the questions and give floor to others instead of coming up with questions and building up on each other's ideas
Do not simply describe what happens in a literary text but make observations to develop and extend the arguments about it	Simply describe the events in a story

According to the lecturer of the Critical Reading course, Dr. Collins, undergraduate ELIT students need to regard their cultural life as something to be developed and shared with others. In other words, they should think of themselves as cultural beings and make an effort to develop their cultural identity and one way to achieve that is to read extensively. Although self-fashioning (i.e., how we create

ourselves and how we show ourselves to the outside world) was only mentioned by Dr. Collins, the other faculty members, Dr. Çelik and Dr. Jones also pointed out the importance of extensive reading. What all three faculty members agreed on was that undergraduate ELIT students should not read literary texts for the sake of their courses but for the development of their thoughtful learning and cultural life. Faculty members also admitted that ELIT students have heavy course loading which does not allow them enough spare time to read the texts that interest them. On the other hand, although students' literature circles were observed for ten weeks during the spring semester, students rarely referred to literary texts other than the one they were analyzing in their literature circles. What they constantly referred to were contemporary, best-seller books, films, TV series, animes, and fairy tales.

As was emphasized by Duff (2007, 2010), academic discourse socialization should be seen as social construction by individuals in accordance with their background, relations with their learning communities, their audience and aims. The interviews with the undergraduate ELIT students indicated that Turkish students come from an educational background where they do not have a lot of control over their own learning. Instead of asking questions, they are always required to find the single correct answer to the questions that were asked to them. However, for the ELIT faculty members, students need to take active part in their own learning, and to do that they are required to ask questions, take other people's ideas into consideration, filter them from their own understanding and develop arguments. Nevertheless, during the literature circle discussions, it was observed that students mostly just read what they took notes of on their role sheets and did not ask their peers' ideas or comment on each other's findings. In other words, after completing their tasks, they gave the floor to another person and expected him/her to do the same

instead of discussing their ideas in detail. Furthermore, students themselves also admitted during the second interviews that it was very challenging when their lecturer, Dr. Collins, asked them to come up with a question for their final paper because what had been expected from them until then was to answer the question that some other person asked. They explained that the questions they could think of were mainly about the plotline and it was hard for them to come up with focused, argumentative questions.

ELIT faculty members also emphasized the fact that there might not always be a single correct answer to their questions while studying literature. For Dr. Collins, for example, finding answers to the questions should not be the ultimate goal of the students but a way to get a deeper understanding of the text and to generate more questions. However, the observation of the literature circles revealed that the majority of the students thought of questions asked by their lecturer either in literature circle discussions or in their role sheets as a task that needs to be completed by finding a single correct answer.

Students' inexperience in asking questions and their tendency to look for a single correct answer also resulted in their inability to have sustained discussions. It was observed that instead of developing arguments by asking questions, taking other critics' or their peers' ideas into consideration and creating their own interpretation, students tended to simply describe the events in a story by adopting a moralistic approach and putting themselves in the place of the characters. However, for ELIT faculty members, simply describing what happens in the literary text is not enough for students to be legitimate members of the ELIT academic discourse community. As stated above, what needs to be done is to make observations of the literary elements and historical and social aspects to develop and extend the arguments about

a literary text. This finding is in line with Guttierez's (1995) study which focused on the development of academic literacy of elementary school-aged Latino children. In that study, she concluded that in teacher-dominated classrooms where students' participation was limited to one word or short responses to teacher's questions, students were not able to generate sustained oral and written discourse although they answered their teacher's questions accurately.

In addition to their teacher-centered educational background which frequently demands students find answers to questions instead of asking them, the interviews with the faculty members and students revealed other reasons for students' inability to ask questions, develop arguments and have sustained discussions about literary texts. It was seen that both faculty members and undergraduate ELIT students agree on these reasons. These reasons are presented in Table 13 below and will be explained in detail in the following paragraphs.

Table 13

Alignments between Faculty Member's Ideas and Students' Perceptions

Alignments between Faculty Members' Ideas and Students' Perceptions
The challenge of students' low levels of English language proficiency
The challenge of students' lack of familiarity with the historical and cultural references in literary texts
The challenge of students' heavy course loading

Firstly, to engage meaningfully with literary texts, students need to have high levels of English language proficiency. Nonetheless, as was stated by Dr. Collins, the majority of undergraduate ELIT students are not at a level where they feel comfortable engaging with literary texts. Moreover, according to Dr. Jones, to

comprehend literary texts better, students not only need to have high levels of language proficiency but also be aware of the fact that language works differently in literature, and it is usually very ambiguous and has multiple meanings. Therefore, students have to make special efforts to read between the lines by paying close attention to the words that were chosen by writers. Similarly, during the focus group interviews and literature circle discussions and in their reading journals students themselves also admitted that they experience difficulty in understanding the language used in literary texts and the language used by their lecturers. Especially, being unfamiliar with most of the words in a literary text forces them to constantly check the dictionary, which they find too demanding. Furthermore, they also stated that it is sometimes difficult for them to understand what their lecturers who are native speakers of English were saying. In Turkey, whether a student is eligible to study English literature is tested via a multiple choice exam which does not include listening, speaking and writing sections. The test includes a reading section, but this consists of short paragraphs from various genres which require students to find a single correct answer. Furthermore, as it was stated by the students themselves, they do not have enough experience in analyzing and having discussions about literary texts even in their native language. Thus, it is not surprising that Turkish undergraduate ELIT students have difficulty in understanding the language used in literature.

Secondly, students' lack of familiarity with the historical and cultural references, which was mentioned both by the ELIT faculty members and the students, also makes it more challenging for students to make sense of and analyze English literary texts. However, the faculty members admitted that incorporating historical thinking into their literary studies is not difficult only for Turkish students

but for many British and American students as well. According to Dr. Collins, just like Turkish students, many British students do not have detailed knowledge of the Bible, to which the majority of British literary texts make frequent reference. This finding supports the idea that both native speakers and non-native speakers should be regarded as novices, and being at the periphery of community, both of them need to find ways to negotiate with its practices and values. As was stated above, during the interviews, Turkish students also emphasized that they are not familiar with the relevant historical contexts. One of the students even said that she had checked the curriculum before she decided to study at the ELIT department but then she was disappointed when she learnt that British History and Mythology courses had been removed from the curriculum. When the researcher asked Dr. Collins about this issue, he said that they opted for a change in the curriculum and removed the British History course and offered a course called Literature in Contexts because they thought it was better for students to study literature in its contexts instead of attempting to survey one thousand years of British history very shallowly in one semester. Dr. Collins also added that the department had intended to make available to ELIT students an elective course in British History from the History Department, but due to the changes in rules by the university administration, students were not allowed to take that elective course. However, he admitted that they should offer some version of the British History course again to make it easier for students to make sense of and comment on British literary texts. This finding reinforces Duff's (2007) idea that from time to time, institutional factors might influence instructors' decisions and socialization should not be regarded as uni-directional. Not only novices but also the mentors gain new insights and abilities while mediating others to the practices and values of the community.

Another reason for students' inability to ask questions, develop arguments and have sustained discussions about literary texts was their heavy course loading. According to the interviews with the faculty members, students should read extensively yet they do not have enough time to read texts other than those required by their lecturers. In other words, they cannot spare time to read the texts that interest them, and thereby develop their thoughtful learning and study skills in accordance with the topics and literary texts that engage them. Furthermore, students stated that they have problems in meeting all the course requirements due to problems related to their low level of English language proficiency.

As can be understood from the above, students have problems in meeting faculty members' expectations due to their a) educational background; b) low level of English language proficiency; c) lack of familiarity with historical and cultural references; and d) heavy course loading. To overcome these challenges, according to one of the ELIT faculty members, students ought to create individual study periods for themselves during which they read the texts that interest them and explore the ideas about the topics that are mentioned in those texts, and all three of the ELIT faculty members agree that students need to take notes of what they think is significant, and collaborate with their peers.

To begin with, being skilled at finding and using secondary resources is a significant skill students need to develop to improve their study skills, as it was pointed out by ELIT faculty members. These resources, on the other hand, do not necessarily have to be literary texts but everything they find interesting and think will contribute to their understanding of and ability to develop arguments about a particular topic. Although two of the ELIT faculty members were in favour of the

idea of providing students with ‘easy’ resources first and then asking them to look for more sophisticated ones, one of them stated that instructors should leave students a free hand when they are searching for secondary resources. During the interviews, when the students were questioned about what type of secondary resources they benefitted from when they were preparing for the literature circle discussions, it was seen that majority of them used websites such as Sparknotes, E-notes, Gradesaver and so on to read summaries and analyses of the text they were focusing on although they did not mention their names during literature circle discussions. Students admitted that they resorted to these websites when they could not understand the text or when they did not have enough time to do all the assigned readings. In addition to these websites, some students also claimed that they benefitted from online dictionaries, reference websites, e-books and audio books while they were preparing for the literature circle discussions. As it can clearly be seen, students get help from secondary resources solely to ensure basic comprehension of literary texts, not to explore the topics that interest them or improve their ability to develop arguments. According to Dr. Collins this tendency may stem from students’ low level of English proficiency, lack of familiarity with the historical and cultural references, and time restrictions due to their heavy course loading.

In order to benefit fully from secondary resources, students should also take notes of their ideas while reading them. When taking notes of what they think is interesting, ELIT faculty members do not expect students to write full, elaborate sentences at all times. They stated that students can start with a sign and or just scribble in the margins. Here, taking notes should be regarded as a way to have a conversation with the text. The idea of having a conversation with a text is also related to reader response theory (Rosenblatt, 1978) which suggests that meaning

cannot be found solely in a text but rather in the transaction between the reader and the text. On the other hand, the observation of the literature circle discussions revealed that students had not been made properly aware of the benefits of note-taking until their lecturer, Dr. Collins, required them to fill in the role sheets and keep a reflective journal. How this requirement contributed to students' perceptions of taking notes and in general their socialization into the ELIT academic discourse community will be discussed in detail in the following paragraphs. However, during the first interviews with the undergraduate ELIT students, it was evident that instead of taking notes on what a text makes them think and how it makes them feel, students thought that they ought to take notes on unknown vocabulary. Nevertheless, their ideas changed after their work with role sheets and reflective journals in literature circles.

Last but not least, according to ELIT faculty members, another strategy that will help undergraduate ELIT students ease their academic discourse socialization is collaborating with their peers. Here, it is important to note that undergraduate ELIT students should collaborate with their peers not only in the classroom but outside the classroom as well. By conducting joint work in groups, students can gain different perspectives and start to enter the academic discourse community. This idea is in line with Duff and Anderson's (2015) argument that peers also play a complementary role in each other's socialization. During the interviews with the students before their participation in the literature circles at the beginning of the semester, it was seen that they had varying ideas about group work. While some of them said they like it, some said they do not. What they mentioned when the researcher asked them about their experiences in group work was mostly about the difficulty of sharing responsibility. However, after their participation in literature circle discussions it was observed that

students' ideas about working in groups changed. This finding will be discussed in detail in the section about the contribution of literature circles to students' academic discourse socialization.

The Extent to Which Literature Circles Contributed to Undergraduate ELIT Students' Academic Discourse Socialization

In order to understand the extent to which participation in literature circles contributed to the academic discourse socialization of undergraduate ELIT students, the researcher observed and audio-recorded students' literature circle discussions and conducted another semi-structured focus group interview with the students at the end of the semester. The findings of the analysis of the literature circle discussions and interviews indicated that literature circles contributed to students' academic discourse socialization by raising their awareness of the significance of a) conducting joint work when studying literature, and b) taking notes while reading literary texts. However, it was found that literature circles did not contribute much to students' ability to develop arguments by taking other people's ideas into consideration, filtering it from their own perspective and creating their own interpretation.

To begin with, as was suggested by ELIT faculty members, working in groups and pairs is a crucial step for students to participate in their academic discourse community. Literature circles can be thought of as small groups that provide students with an immediate community of thought. Although students have various ideas about working in groups and pairs, the majority stated that they liked in-class literature circle discussions mainly because discussing a literary text in small groups made them gain new perspectives. In addition to that, in literature circles students also helped one another understand the course requirements. Furthermore, one of the students also stated that it was easier for her to express her ideas in a

group compared to whole class discussions. However, literature circles were not free of problems. Some students also stated that from time to time they got stuck during the discussions because they could not find anything to talk about. At those times, their lecturer's guidance, having a more experienced person in a group and rotating role sheets every week helped them sustain their discussions. In that sense, it can be said that the course lecturer and peers can be regarded as socializing agents and students realized that they can learn about the practices and values of their target academic discourse community not only from their lecturers but from their peers as well. The roles of the socializing agents in literature circles, which could also be regarded as micro communities of practice (Lave & Wenger, 1991), will be discussed in detail below, under the heading 'Overall Findings'.

When asked about their perceptions of online literature circle discussions, students revealed contrasting ideas. While some of the students liked it because it gave them more time to think, put their ideas in order, correct their mistakes, and support their ideas with images, most of the students were of the opinion that they lost their interest because it was not as effective as face-to-face communication. When the researcher checked students' online discussion entries it was seen that students just posted their role sheets on Moodle or simply answered the director's questions. They did not comment on each other's' ideas or develop their arguments based on what their peers said. However, they still conducted a joint work with their peers.

Another contribution of literature circles to students' academic discourse socialization was that it raised students' awareness of the nature and importance of taking notes while studying a literary text. As Dr. Collins indicated, students should have a conversation with a text and take notes of what it makes them think or feel.

To promote this idea, during the literature circles, he required students to work with role sheets, which include various thought-provoking questions. When the researcher asked students what they thought about working with role sheets, they said that it was very beneficial because it made them think innovatively and the questions provided by their lecturer served as guidelines and made them read the text more enthusiastically and critically. Likewise, some students also said that they liked the idea of keeping a reflective journal and would continue doing so because it allowed them to be more creative while they were reading the text and improved their writing skills. They also added that journals helped them during the discussions. This finding corresponds to Campbell-Hill's (2007) study which reached the conclusion that keeping a reflective journal helps students comprehend the text better and start a discussion. Based on what students said, it can be concluded that texts also serve as socializing agents for undergraduate students.

The journals also allow the teacher to gain insights about students' ideas and understanding of the text. The teacher can provide students with some prompts to guide them. In addition to asking questions that students can relate to their own lives, it is also possible for the instructor to form questions that lead students to develop their discourse competence.

On the other hand, based on the data collected from the interviews with the students and in-class and online literature circle discussions, it can be concluded that literature circles did not improve students' skills to develop arguments, which was highly desired by their faculty members. Actually, when students' educational backgrounds, their language proficiency problems, their lack of familiarity with the historical and cultural references, and heavy course loading are all taken into account, it would be very naïve to expect them to develop this skill thanks to a single

instructional technique. Nevertheless, as was stated above, this technique contributed a lot to students' understanding of the importance of conducting joint work to better understand and develop arguments about a literary text, and allowed them opportunities to have a conversation with the text and then share their ideas with others.

Overall Findings: Academic Discourse Socialization of Undergraduate Students through Literature Circles

This study is in line with the existing literature in reaching the following conclusions: a) the biggest challenge that ELIT undergraduate students face during their academic discourse socialization process is making sense of the language used in literary texts; and b) texts, peers and ELIT faculty members, who could also be regarded as competent others, played key roles as socializing agents in undergraduate students' academic discourse socialization into ELIT academic discourse community.

Firstly, the data collected from the interviews and the literature circles revealed that in the first year of their course of study, ELIT undergraduate students expend their greatest efforts to make basic sense of the language that is used in the written and spoken discourse of their community of practice. However, it is hard for them to do so because the majority of them do not start to study at the ELIT department with a high level of English language proficiency, and they are not familiar with the historical and cultural references used in literary texts. In addition, it is also challenging for students to develop arguments, due to the fact that they come from an educational background which usually asks them to find single correct answers to questions asked of them. To be able to develop arguments students should not only read the texts that were assigned to them in their courses but other texts that

interest them as well. Nonetheless, their heavy course load prevents them from doing so. This finding supports Garrett and Baquendo-Lopez's (2002) argument that one should not expect all novices to simply internalize linguistic and ideological resources in a short time. It also aligns with other socialization studies (e.g., Mahfood, 2014; Yang, 2010) which conclude that students face difficulties due to their inadequate linguistic knowledge, inexperience in participatory communication modes and content-related problems.

Secondly, the interviews with the ELIT faculty members revealed that ELIT faculty members expect students to be more active in their learning process and benefit from a way of critical thinking in order to develop as a whole person during their course of study at the ELIT department. To be more specific, faculty members expect students to be able to develop arguments by coming up with questions, search for what others have said about an argument or text, filter what they have found from their own understanding and create their own response. In order to gain insights into students' ideas and experiences, the researcher conducted interviews with the students and observed their literature circles for ten weeks. The first interviews with the undergraduate ELIT students revealed that students were aware of the fact that they need to develop their language skills but they were not aware that they needed to develop arguments through having a conversation with the text and conducting joint work with their peers. In that sense literature circles afforded students the opportunity to realize that by taking notes of their ideas in order to converse with the text and working with their peers they could improve their skills to develop arguments. In other words, texts and peers played a role in undergraduate ELIT students' academic discourse socialization, alongside the students' lecturers.

As Duff (2010) argues, texts play a socializing role in students' peripheral participation, which is described as "a way of gaining access to sources for understanding through growing involvement" (Lave & Wenger, 1991, p. 37) in academic discourse. Parallel to this, in this study it was observed that the questions on the role sheets provided helpful guidance for undergraduate ELIT students. It should be noted here that most of the undergraduate ELIT students who participated in this study revealed that they had never analyzed a literary text, even in their native language. Therefore, the guidance provided by these questions was of great importance for them. Although students read their answers from the role sheets most of the time, as Bowers-Campbell (2011) conclude, the questions nevertheless guided them and allowed them to read with a specific purpose. Similarly, keeping a reflective journal also helped students have a conversation with a text by recording their insights about it. The students were supposed to benefit from what they learnt in the course to help them develop these insights, but they were also free to explore what most fascinated and bothered them about the text they were reading. When their reflective journals were analyzed, it became clear that the journals promoted transactional reading by taking both efferent stance and aesthetic stance, which according to Richards (2008) is the ideal to experience literature. Students also stated that keeping a reflective journal helped them with their discussions, a finding also reported by Campbell-Hill (2007).

In addition to role sheets and reflective journals, peers also played a great role in undergraduate students' academic discourse socialization through literature circles. This finding also matches with the findings of other socialization studies (e.g., Ahmadi & Samad, 2015; Cho, 2013: Ho, 2011; Morales & Carroll, 2015) which concluded that peers assist each other in their peripheral participation in

communities of practice. Similarly, in this study, the transcriptions of the literature circles and the second interviews with the students indicated that peers scaffolded each other to understand the literary text, gain new perspectives and make sense of the course requirements. However, students were still unable to develop arguments and have sustained discussions. Instead of building upon their ideas, they preferred to give the floor to others when they were done with their tasks.

Here, it should also be noted that the role that the course lecturer played in students' acquisition of academic discourse was of great importance because he provided modelling and feedback for the students. Students learnt a lot from him, his lectures on British literature, and his occasional contributions to their literature circle discussions. During his brief participations in students' literature circle discussions, he listened to the students carefully and tried to help them with their questions. However, when he was doing this, he also asked questions to the students to guide them to the answer instead of giving them the direct answers. It is also significant to note that the course lecturer, Dr. Collins, who is British, helped students especially with the cultural and historical references. In addition to that, when he was giving instructions about the final exam, for which he required students to come up with their own themes and questions, he frequently reminded them to find argumentative questions. That is to say, he made his expectations clear. In that sense it can be said that Dr. Collins was an effective socializing agent who not only displayed the values and practices of the ELIT academic community but also made them explicit, and provided these newcomers to the community with language, training and support continuously, which is highly recommended by Duff (2007).

To conclude, it can be said that just providing the students with the conventions of academic discourse associated with specific discipline, and expecting

them to acquire it in a short time is not enough for them to socialize into discourse community and become a legitimate member of it. What students need to acquire is discourse competence and this consists not only of linguistic knowledge but also the sociocultural knowledge of that community. In this study it was clearly seen that undergraduate ELIT students encounter difficulties in understanding literary texts due to their low level of English language proficiency; however, improving their linguistic abilities was not the only thing that is expected from them. The interviews with the ELIT faculty members revealed other values and practices which will ease students' socialization into ELIT academic discourse community. In that sense, it can be said that literature circles provided the students with the opportunities to become aware of these values and practices to a certain extent, with the help of texts, their peers and their lecturer as socializing agents. Although these three elements helped students realize that they need to have a conversation with a text by taking notes and collaborating with their peers, the technique did not contribute much to students' abilities to develop arguments and have sustained discussions. All these findings support Duff's (2007) argument that the socialization process should not be seen as a mindless passive conditioning; just being exposed to the discourse of the particular community might not produce the desired responses or competencies.

Pedagogical Implications of the Study

The findings of the current study have significant pedagogical implications. To begin with, undergraduate ELIT students clearly stated that they benefitted from literature circles because they made them become more aware of the importance of a) having a conversation with the text, and b) collaborating with their peers to share their ideas and gain new perspectives. Hence, a similar technique that promotes the values and practices of the ELIT academic discourse community can be used in their

other classes. In order to benefit from the literature circles more, students can be provided with opportunities to choose the books that they would like to analyze with their peers themselves. Just as Dr. Collins did, giving them a list of texts and asking them to rank them and then assigning them to groups in accordance with their preferences is a good idea because it allows the students to read something that they are interested in. As was discussed in the previous section, students cannot find enough time to read the texts that they are interested in during their course of study due to their heavy course loads. Therefore, allowing them to choose their texts can contribute to their academic discourse socialization.

Secondly, the majority of the undergraduate ELIT students who participated in this study had never experienced analyzing a literary text even in their native language. Therefore, they need guidance in analyzing literary texts. In that sense providing them with questions in the role sheets made them read the text with a focus. All the questions in the role sheets were designed so as not to be answerable with a single correct response. On the contrary, they were designed to promote the idea of developing arguments and discovering how language works in literature. Instead of reading the text without a guide, it was more beneficial for students to have these questions to hand. The questions in the role sheets also afforded the students the opportunity to be creative by writing letters to the characters, a poem or drawing pictures. In addition, rotating role sheets was also very helpful, as students were exposed to different ways of reflecting on the text and making better contributions to their group discussions. Furthermore, keeping a reflective journal was also beneficial because it allowed the students to see that they can apply this technique to other texts they read outside the classroom as well. Hence, both role

sheets and reading journals can be used to ease undergraduate literature students' socialization into ELIT academic discourse community.

Finally, the majority of the undergraduate students who participated in this study stated that it is hard for them to understand the cultural and historical references in the literary texts they were reading. Although incorporating historical thinking to their studies is highly expected from the students as it was stated by Dr. Jones, they are unable to take a course in British History either as a required course or an elective. Thus, the ELIT department or university administration should find ways to offer students a course in British History

Last but not least, during the departmental orientation program at the beginning of the first semester, students should be informed of the expectations of their faculty members very clearly. When doing this the competent others such as ELIT faculty members and junior or senior students can collaborate and brief students about the a) socialization process, b) valued practices of the department, and c) how they can gain access to sources of understanding.

Limitations of the Study

The research for this study was conducted from October 2017 to May 2017 (7 months). Therefore, the researcher had limited time to observe students' academic discourse socialization process. It would have been more in-depth and complete study if the researcher had a chance to observe undergraduate students' experiences of academic discourse socialization for a longer time – over several semesters or, ideally, the whole course of their degree program.

Another limitation of the study regards the sample size. Since he Critical Reading course was a crowded course with sixty-five students divided into two sections, the researcher could only record the literature circle discussions of the

groups in the first section, although she conducted interviews with all the students. And, due to technical problems with voice recording and time restrictions, she could only transcribe the discussions of two groups (i.e., Pokol and The Britts). In that sense, it can be said that the transcriptions of the discussions of all groups in section one may have offered different perspectives and insights into the participants' academic discourse socialization.

Suggestions for Further Research

Researchers interested in the academic discourse socialization of undergraduate students through small group discussions might extend their studies to survey a longer time period. It might be a better idea to follow three to four of students from their first year to their senior year to gain better insights into the process of their academic discourse socialization. While doing this, it would also be important to keep in mind that it might be more helpful to conduct monthly interviews with the students and their lecturers, to trace their socialization process into their target academic discourse community. In this way, future researchers could allow students to reflect on their experiences more regularly.

Finally, future researchers might also focus on the role of feedback in literature circles. The lecturer of the Critical Reading course in this study occasionally joined the discussions of the students in literature circles, listened to them carefully and provided feedback on their ideas. In addition, he also provided written feedback to students on their reading journals and their questions for their final exam paper. Focusing on the language used by the lecturer as a socializing agent in small group discussions might prove enlightening for further research on academic discourse socialization.

Conclusion

This study was conducted with the aim of investigating the academic discourse socialization of undergraduate ELIT students through literature circles. The findings pointed out that ELIT faculty members expect students to develop a culture of reading involving developing arguments about literary texts by asking questions, taking other people's ideas into consideration, filtering them from their own understanding and creating their own responses. To attain this aim, students need to have a conversation with the text and collaborate with their peers to share their ideas and gain new perspectives. However, the interviews with the students and the observation of their literature circle discussions indicated that students faced challenges in meeting these expectations due to their educational background, low level of English language proficiency, lack of familiarity with the historical and cultural references, and heavy course loads. In that sense, using literature circles helped facilitate students' socialization into the ELIT academic discourse community to a certain extent. By requiring students to work with role sheets, keep a reflective journal and conduct joint work with their peers in small groups, this technique raised their awareness of the importance of having a conversation with a text and cooperating with their peers. Nonetheless, it was observed that students still need to gain more experience in developing sound arguments and having more sustained discussions.

REFERENCES

Agustiani, M. (2016). The effects of DRTA and LC strategies on students' reading comprehension achievement of narrative texts based on English score levels. *Journal of English Literacy Education, 3*(2), 111-124.

Ahmadi, P., & Samad, A. (2015). Oral academic discourse socialization of in-service teachers in a TEFL program. *English Language Teaching, 8*(4), 97-105.

Almasi, J. (1996). A new view of discussion. In L. Gambrell & J. Almasi (Eds.), *Lively discussions! Fostering engaged reading* (pp. 2-24). Newark, DE: IRA.

Andresen, M.A. (2009). Asynchronous discussion forums: Success factors, outcomes, assessments, and limitations. *Educational Technology & Society, 12*(1), 249–257.

Beckett, G. H., Amaro-Jiménez, C., & Beckett, K. S. (2010). Students' use of asynchronous discussions for academic discourse socialization. *Distance Education, 31*(3), 315-335.

Biber, D. (2006). *University language: A corpus-based study of spoken and written registers*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Blum, T., Lipsett, L., & Yocom, D.J. (2002). Literature circles: A tool for self-determination in one middle school inclusive classroom. *Remedial and Special Education, 23*(2), 99-108.

Bowers-Campbell, J. (2011). Take it out of class: Exploring virtual literature circles. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy, 54*(8), 557-567.

Boyatzis, R. (1998). *Transforming qualitative information: Thematic analysis and code development*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology, 3*(2), 77–101. doi:10.1191/1478088706qp063oa

British Council & Economics Policy Research Foundation of Turkey (TEPAV). (2015). *The state of English in higher education in Turkey*. Ankara.

Campbell-Hill, B. (2007, April 1). *Literature circles and response*. Paper presented at the NESA Conference, Athens, Greece. Retrieved from http://bonniecampbellhill.com/Handouts/Handouts/NESALitCircleHandoutAthens07.pdf

Casanave, C., & Hubbard, P. (1992). The writing assignments and writing problems of doctoral students: Faculty perceptions, pedagogical issues and needed research. *English for Specific Purposes*, *11*(1), 33–49.

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

Clarke, L.W., & Holwadel, J. (2007). Help! What is wrong with these literature circles and how can we fix them? *The Reading Teacher, 61*(1), 20–29.

Connor, U., & Upton, T. (Eds.). (2004). *Discourse in the professions: Perspectives from corpus linguistics*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Creswell, J. (2007). Data analysis and representation. In J. Creswell (Ed.), *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches* (2nd ed., pp. 179–212). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Daniels, H. (2002). *Literature circles: Voice and choice in book clubs and reading groups.* Portland, Maine: Stenhouse Publishers.

De Brún, C. (2016). *Teaching for thinking: An action research inquiry into the pedagogical potential of modern literature to foster critical thinking and facilitate critical consciousness in third level students* (Doctoral dissertation) Retrieved from http://eprints.maynoothuniversity.ie/7558/

Duff, P. (2007). Second language socialization as sociocultural theory: Insights and issues. *Language Teaching, 40*(4), 309-319.

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

Duff, P., & 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). UK: John Wiley and Sons.

Fujieda, Y. (2015). *Academic literacy and discourse socialization of seven multilinguals in a research seminar course in a Japanese university* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from https://knowledge.library.iup.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?referer=https://www.google.com/&httpsredir=1&article=1870&context=etd

Garrett, P. B., & Baquedano-Lopez, P. (2002). Language socialization: Reproduction and continuity, transformation and change. *Annual Review of Anthropology, 31,* 339–361.

Graham-Marr, A., & Pellowe W. (2016). Taking a literature circles approach to teach academic English. *Journal of Language and Cultural Education 4*(1), 133-139.

Guo, Y., & Lin, S. (2016). L2 oral academic discourse socialization through group discussion in TESOL. *The Asian Journal of Applied Linguistics, 3*(1), 17-26.

Guttierez, K. (1995). Unpacking academic discourse. *Discourse Processes, 19,* 21-37.

Hagen, S. (2015). *Academic discourse socialization: A discursive analysis of student*

Identity (Master's thesis). Retrieved from http://uir.unisa.ac.za/bitstream/handle/10500/20000/dissertation_hagen_sn.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y

Ho, M. (2011). Academic discourse socialization through small-group discussions. *An International Journal of Educational Technology and Applied Linguistics*, *39*(4), 437-450.

Holmes, R. (1997). Genre analysis, and the social sciences: An investigation of the structure of research article discussion sections in three disciplines. *English for Specific Purposes*, *16*(4), 321–338.

Hutchinson, T., & Waters, A. (1987). *English for specific purposes*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. *39*(4), 437-450.

Hymes, D. (1972). Introduction. In C. Cazden, V. John-Steiner, & D. Hymes (Eds.), *Functions of language in the classroom*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Jacobs, M. (2015). *Using literature circles to increase reading comprehension and student motivation* (Master's thesis). Retrieved from http://rdw.rowan.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1567&context=etd

Johns, A.M. (1997). *Text, role, and context: Developing academic literacies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Karolides, N. (1997). *Reader response in elementary classrooms: Quest and discovery*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Elbaum Associates.

Kirk, J.J., & Orr, R.L. (2003). A primer on the effective use of threaded discussion forums. Retrieved from https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED472738

Kobayashi, M. (2003). The role of peer support in ESL students' accomplishment of oral academic tasks. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, *59*(3), 337-369.

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

Leki, I. (2001). "A narrow thinking system": Non-native English speaking students in group projects across the curriculum. *TESOL Quarterly, 35*(1), 39-67.

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

Mahfoodh, O. (2014). Oral academic discourse socialization: Challenges faced by international undergraduate students in a Malaysian public university. *International Education Studies, 7*(2), 10-17.

Maloch, B. (2002). Scaffolding student talk: One teacher's role in literature discussion groups. *Reading Research Quarterly, 37*(1), 94-112.

Mathews, J. A. (1999). *The socialization of students from the developing world into the academic discipline of international relations* (Master's thesis). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 30460089)

Mehan, H. (1979). Learning lessons: Social organizations in the classrooms. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Mertz, E. (2007). *The language of law: Learning to think like a lawyer*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press. *17*(2), 193-206.

Monroe-Baillargeon, A., & Shema, A. L. (2010). Time to talk: An urban school's use of literature circles to create a professional learning community. *Education and Urban Society, 46*(6), 651-673.

Montgomery, M., Durant, A., Fabb, N., Furniss, T., & Mills, S. (2012). *Ways of reading: Advanced reading skills for students of English literature* (4th ed.). NY: Routledge.

Morales, S.A., & Carroll, K. S. (2015). Using literature circles in the ESL college

classroom: A lesson from Puerto Rico. *Colombia Applied Linguistics Journal*, *17*(2), 193-206.

Moreillon, J. (2009). Learning and teaching in WANDA wiki wonderland: Literature circles in the digital commons. *Teacher Librarian*, *37*(2), 23–28.

Morita, N. (2000). Discourse socialization through oral classroom activities in a TESL graduate program. *TESOL Quarterly*, *34*(2), 279–310.

Morita, N. (2004). Negotiating participation and identity in second language academic communities. *TESOL Quarterly*, *38*(4), 573–603.

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* (pp. 243–256). New York: Springer**.**

Nam, M., & Beckett, G.H. (2011). Use of resources in second language writing socialization. *TESL-EJ, 15* (1), 1-20.

Nolasco, J. L. (2009). *Effects of literature circles on the comprehension of reading expository texts* (Master's thesis). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 305172713)

Nowell, L. S., Norris, J. M., White, D. E., & Moules, N. J. (2017). Thematic analysis: Striving to meet the trustworthiness Criteria. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods, 16*, 1-13.

Pierre, L. (2016). *A reader's experience: How teachers can utilize literature circles and reader response theory in an all-male environment to evaluate reader engagement, motivation, and identifying with a text* (Master's thesis). Retrieved from http://digitalcommons.lsu.edu/gradschool_theses/3580/

Propp, V. (1968). *Morphology of the folk tale*. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.

Randall, L. E., & DeCastro-Ambrosetti, R. (2012). Analysis of student responses to participation in literature circles in a university classroom. *Journal on Excellence in College Teaching*, *20*(2), 69-103.

Richards, M. (2008). *The" how-to" and" whys?" of literature circles* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from http://discoverarchive.vanderbilt.edu/handle/1803/478

Rosenblatt, L. M. (1978). *The reader, the text, the poem: The transactional theory of the literary work*. Carbondale, Illinois: Southern Illinois University Press.

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

Selden, R. (1989). *A reader's guide to contemporary literary theory* (2nd ed.). Lexington, KY: The University Press of Kentucky.

Séror, J. (2008). *Socialization in the margins: Second language writers and feedback practices in university content courses* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from https://open.library.ubc.ca/cIRcle/collections/ubctheses/24/items/1.0066739

Severino, C., & Traschel, M. (2008). Theories of specialized discourses and writing fellows programs. *Across the Disciplines, 5*. Retrieved from https://wac.colostate.edu/atd/fellows/severino.cfm

Shelton-Strong, S. (2011). Literature circles in ELT. *ELT Journal, 66*(2), 214-223.

Lightbown, P., & Spada, N. M. (2006). *How languages are learned*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Spalding, E., & Wilson, A. (2002). Demystifying reflection: A study of pedagogical

strategies that encourage reflective journal writing. *Teachers College Record, 104*(7), 1393-1421.

Street, B.V. (1996). Academic literacies. In D. Baker, J. Clay, & C. Fox (Eds.), *Challenging ways of knowing: In English, mathematics and science* (pp. 101-134). London, UK: Falmer Press.

Sutton, J., & Austin, Z. (2015). Qualitative research: Data collection, analysis, and management. *The Canadian Journal of Hospital Pharmacy, 68*(3), 226-231. Retrieved from https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC4485510/

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

Vickers, C. (2007). Second language socialization through team interaction among electrical and computer engineering students. *Modern Language Journal, 91*(4), 621–640.

Wang, S. (2009). *Academic discourse socialization: A case study on Chinese graduate students' oral presentations* (Doctoral Dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 304858649)

Wang, S. & Slater, T. (2016). Oral academic discourse socialization of an ESL Chinese student: Cohesive device use. *International Journal of English Linguistics, 6*(1), 65-72.

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

Yahya, W. R. W., & Abd Rahim, N. (2009). Adult L2 learning of Victorian novels using literature circles. *International Journal of Learning, 16*(1), 195-209.

Yang, L. (2010). Doing group presentation: Negotiations and challenges experienced

by five Chinese ESL students of commerce at a Canadian university. *Language Teaching Research, 14*(2), 141-160.

Yim, Y. K. (2011). Second language students' discourse socialization in academic online communities. *Canadian Modern Language Review, 67*(1), 1-27.

Zamel, V. (1997). Toward a model of transculturation. *TESOL Quarterly, 31*, 341-352.

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

APPENDIX A

Questions Addressed in the First Semi-structured Focus Group Interview with Undergraduate ELIT Students

1. Did you study any texts from English literature at high school? Have you ever worked in small groups?
2. What difficulties do you face with when studying in the ELIT department?
3. Do you search for extra information about the texts you are reading, either from books or on the Internet? If so, do you have particular sources or websites you go to first?
4. Do you know exactly what is expected from you to be a successful ELIT student?

APPENDIX B

Questions Addressed in the Second Semi-structured Focus Group Interview with Undergraduate ELIT Students

1. What did you learn from your literature circle discussions? Did they contribute to your interpretation of the book? Did you learn from your peers' ideas?

2. How would you compare in-class discussions and online discussions? What are advantages or disadvantages of each? Which one would you prefer? Why?

3. How did you prepare for your discussions in reading groups? Did you benefit from any secondary resources?

4. What do you think about the role sheets? Were they helpful? If so, in what ways? If not, why?

5. What do you think about keeping a reflective journal? How often did you write? Did it contribute to your understanding of a text? Would you keep a journal for the other courses in the future? Why ? Why not?

6. What do you think about coming up with a question for your essay?

APPENDIX C

Questions Addressed in the Semi-structured Individual Interviews with the ELIT Faculty Members

1. What challenges do you think ELIT students face while studying literature?

2. What challenges do you face when teaching ELIT students?

3. What do you think ELIT students should do to become successful in their department?

APPENDIX D

Descriptions of the Role Sheets

1. Director: Identifies some key questions about the text for the group to discuss and manages the group's discussion

2. Connector: Makes connections between his/her reading and the world beyond the text such as other readings, personal experiences, text's own historical context or contemporary events and debates

3. Illuminator: Finds a key section of the text and helps the group explore why that particular section is significant and how it relates to the wider themes of the text as a whole and what literary devices and techniques are used

4. Summarizer: Prepares a brief summary of the text. He/she is required not only to summarize the content or plot but the form as well

5. Word Watcher: Looks out for significant words and/or semantic fields

6. Responder: Prepares a creative response such as a letter or a poem to the author or to one of the characters, or a story or drama of his/her own