

A Language Socialization Approach to Uzbek Language Learning

Baburhan Uzum
Sam Houston State University

Abstract

Using an ethnographic case study design, this study investigates language learners' socialization into the cultural values of Uzbek language. Informed by a language socialization theoretical framework, the study focuses on the classroom routines and interactions that socialize students into certain social values through mini-lectures that are beyond the linguistic objectives of the curriculum. The research questions addressed are: What social values are being taught implicitly or explicitly? What cultural values are students being socialized into? What constitutes valuable cultural knowledge as claimed by the teacher? In the audio and video recorded observation data, a selected excerpt of typical classroom interactions is analyzed adopting discourse analysis methods. The findings of the study could be implemented in teacher education programs and in designing textbooks and curriculum for less commonly taught languages.

Introduction

Parallel to the increasing rate of globalization, less commonly taught languages such as Uzbek are becoming more popular at American higher education institutions. A member of the Ural-Altaic languages family and a genetic neighbor of Turkish, the Uzbek language is spoken by around 20 million people in Uzbekistan and several neighboring countries. Historically, the Uzbek language has been influenced by various conquerors of the region, such as Persian, Arabic, and most recently Russian (Sjoberg, 1963). In North American universities, the Uzbek language classes are generally offered by Fulbright Language Teaching Assistants (FLTA). The FLTA program was first established in 1968 in order to improve foreign language instruction in the U.S. and to create opportunities for both native-speaking teaching assistants and American students to learn about each other's cultures and traditions by encouraging mutual understanding. The program now employs teachers from 45 countries and offers 32 lan-

guages in nearly all 50 U.S. states and Washington, DC (Fulbright FLTA program, 2011).

Through the FLTA program, learners in Uzbek classes have the opportunity to interact with an Uzbek speaker and gain access to the authentic cultural content. Therefore, students not only learn language as a system, but also as a social and cultural construction (Uzum, 2012). The present study follows an ethnographic case study design and uses discourse analysis methods, adopting language socialization as the theoretical framework.

Language socialization

In the present study, language socialization is defined as the process through which novices become competent members of a community through participation in routine interactions with more experienced members of that community (Ochs & Schieffelin, 1984). Language socialization theory draws from sociocultural approaches to language learning and teaching (Johnson, 2009; Lantolf, 2000) and situated learning (Lave & Wenger, 1991), sharing the notions that learning takes place within a context and through a novice's interactions with the context. It was started by two linguistic anthropologists—Bambi Schieffelin and Elenor Ochs, in the 1980s “to consider aspects of the sociocultural environment of children's communicative practices that were left out of linguistic, psychological, and anthropological studies” (Ochs & Schieffelin, 2012, p. 2).

Language socialization literature examines two kinds of socialization: (a) socialization to use language; and (b) socialization through language. Earlier socialization research focused on the former, and more contemporary research studies the latter. Socialization to use language includes the process in which a novice acquires forms and the social meanings of these forms. For example, a novice learns to say “please,” not only with its orthography and phonology, but with its social function as well: when, where, and to whom to say “please”. Socialization through language is a more implicit process, in which language is utilized as a medium to transmit sociocultural knowledge such as the local beliefs and values of a particular community. Some of the contemporary examples of socialization through language focus on academic discourse socialization. In these studies,

international students' socialization into oral and written discourse communities is examined with a focus on language.

Academic Discourse Socialization

Foreign language classrooms have a widely accepted role in socializing students into certain linguistic and cultural behaviors. These language classrooms are not isolated from the realities of life, but are strategically embedded within an institutional context and a broader social political context. Therefore, institutional, social, historical, and political settings create multiple layers around these classrooms.

The social, cultural, political, and historical macrostructures also influence the language ideology taught in classes. Byon (2006) studied the ways Korean-as-a-foreign-language (KFL) students are socialized implicitly and explicitly into the social values and cultural norms of Korean language such as the use of honorifics to index hierarchy and authority. For example, the teacher, in this study, used assertive directives to signal a position of authority. This hierarchy came up several times in the teacher's speech through assertive directives, personal pronouns/occupational terms (sensayngnim [teacher honorific title]), and error corrections (to use the humble personal pronoun while speaking to someone of higher status). Byon's findings contrast with those of Poole (1992), in which the researcher found that teachers aligned with the students in an effort to minimize the appearance of power differences. In Byon's data set, the hierarchical differences were highlighted through implicit and explicit socialization, and students were socialized into these cultural norms. Whereas, in Poole's data set, the teachers used inclusive *we* (e.g., Where should we put the things in the room?) to avoid an overt display of asymmetry, employing indirect strategies to run the classroom practices and avoiding directly telling students what to do. Students in these two studies were sometimes successful in responding to these signals, and sometimes not. In the latter, the teacher corrected them or provided them a model, lending further support to the consideration of corrective feedback as an implicit socialization practice (Friedman, 2010).

In her review article, Duff (2010) addressed the question: "How do newcomers to an academic culture learn how to participate successfully in the oral and written discourse and related practices of

that discourse community?” (p. 169). She reviewed early and recent studies that explored novices’ socialization to oral and written discourse communities, academic publication and textual identities, and electronic modes of discourse such as Computer Mediated Communication. Early work on discourse socialization, drawing on sociology, rhetoric, and the history and sociology of science, tended to focus on written discourse socialization, while neglecting oral discourse practices such as classroom discussions or conference presentations. Emphasizing the importance of oral discourse socialization, parallel to the expansion of multicultural communities, Duff argued for “joint responsibility” between instructors and students, “appropriate mediation”, and “scaffolding” (p. 186) for the successful socialization of novices.

An important example of oral discourse socialization is the study of Morita (2004) at a Canadian university. In her ethnographic multiple case study, Morita investigated the discourse socialization experiences of six female graduate students from Japan. The theoretical framework was guided by communities of practice, activity theory, and critical discourse research. The author argued that learners’ discourse socialization to oral classroom activities was diverse and contextually situated, and therefore cannot be explained with the folk view of cultural and gender roles ascribed to Japanese female students. The learners in this study participated in a variety of ways in different classes. For example, their silence was not to be interpreted by being uninterested or the assumed cultural value, but it reflected personal preference, resistance, struggle to gain membership, and position-taking. In addition to their internal conflicts, their access to classroom discussions and opportunities given for them to speak were also limited. Therefore, their struggle was situated on the cognitive plane and in social interactions. Learners continuously negotiated their modes of participation, and in many cases sought out for help from the instructors. Morita’s argument of giving legitimacy to learners as “valuable intellectual and cultural resources” (p. 598) also resonates with Duff’s (2010) suggestions of “scaffolding” and “joint-responsibility” of the instructors in this shared endeavor.

In the present study, Uzbek classes taught by an FLTA are placed within an American higher education institution; therefore, the academic discourse produced in this institutional setting may reflect

the beliefs and values of the larger community. Furthermore, academic and disciplinary discourses may be different across institutions and cultures. The Uzbek FLTA, previously socialized into the Uzbek ESL teacher community, brings her initial beliefs and practices to the new educational context, which will inevitably interact with the routines in the classroom and the expectations of students. The analysis in this paper focuses on the teacher's practices that are socializing students into certain social values through mini-lectures that go beyond language practice and textbook objectives. The mini-lectures the teacher frequently delivers in this class are rather explicit forms of socialization, in which the teacher tells students about Uzbek culture and history. These episodes can be argued to socialize students explicitly into Uzbek social values rendering language teaching as a space to reproduce culture. The questions the analysis addresses are: What social values are being taught implicitly or explicitly? What cultural values are students being socialized into? What constitutes valuable cultural knowledge as claimed by the teacher?

Method

Research Context

The audio and video recorded classroom observation data for the study were collected in a beginner level Uzbek class at a Midwestern American University throughout Spring 2012. One classroom hour was selected on the basis of its representation of typical classroom activities in this classroom and was transcribed in detail. The participants in this selected excerpt are: the teacher (native of Uzbekistan, female, 29 years old, visiting FLTA for a year), and two undergraduate students: Calvin and Thomas (pseudonyms). The students are in their second semester of Uzbek, and both are interested in being advanced Uzbek speakers and possibly working there. The institutional objectives in the less-commonly-taught-languages (LCTL) program at this university emphasize student-centered instruction and communicative methods of language teaching. The teacher's specific objectives, perpetuated by the assumed role of "cultural ambassador" through Fulbright, focus on meaningful learning through the presentation of cultural and historical exemplars. For this teacher, learning about the culture and history of a language community is just as important as learning the structure of a language.

In the selected segment, Calvin's one-page writing assignment about Uzbekistan is reflected on the projector with the teacher's markings. These markings do not indicate the nature of an error, but identifies its location by underlining or circling. In this error correction practice, the students read this text sentence by sentence with the teacher, and Thomas is expected to correct the marked words or sentences. The text starts with the geographical information about Uzbekistan, continues with its famous people, and finishes with the statement "I love my country" or "I am proud of my country"; a structure that students have learnt in this chapter. For this writing assignment, the students gathered facts about Uzbekistan (e.g., its location, neighbors, climate, major cities, and major people).

Analysis

In this excerpt, the students are portrayed to be the novices being socialized into the Uzbek discourse community. In order to be a member of this community, the novices are expected to speak like Uzbek people and know their cultural values. The teacher's mini-lecture practices are centered on enabling students' membership into Uzbek linguistic and cultural ideologies (e.g., what constitutes valuable knowledge). The analysis focused on initiation-response-evaluation (IRE) sequences, and addressed the questions: What exactly is the teacher trying to teach in this practice? What is the purpose of this lesson? The students are not only learning to speak Uzbek, they are also learning the national legacy of Uzbek culture. This national legacy is presented through the teacher's advice about what they "should" know about Uzbekistan, thereby socializing them into valued knowledge and practices.

The Classroom Materials

The socializing agents in this excerpt are not only the teacher, but also the textbooks and the curriculum attached to it; "some [language ideologies] are under metapragmatic (re)construction via every socializing interaction, and some have been fixed and codified in institutional law and handed down through careful pedagogy" (Riley, 2012, p. 509). It is a widely accepted phenomenon that textbooks have a significant role in socializing students into particular language ideologies and social values (e.g., Curdt-Christiansen, 2008; Gulliver, 2010).

The beginner Uzbek textbook aims to “provide learners and their instructors with a wide selection of materials and task-oriented, communicative activities to facilitate the development of language learning” (Azimova, 2010, p. 13). It has sixteen chapters, and each chapter has a theme (e.g., work, study, family, shopping, and travel), language use (e.g., being a host and being a guest), language tools (e.g., verbal nouns, adverbs), and language and culture (e.g., Uzbek families) sections. Through its focus on daily life in Uzbekistan, the textbook has an authoritative voice and is an influential discourse type. Students not only learn subject matter, but acquire identities, values, interests, and habits via this powerful medium of socialization.

The Classroom Interaction Data

The following excerpt is taken from a one hour long class in Spring 2012. Each turn by the teacher and the students is marked with the participants’ initials. The Uzbek speech is written in Italics and is matched by English translations below each sentence. Interrupting and accompanying speech is marked with brackets and located where the accompanying speech starts (see Appendix for complete transcription conventions).

T: Teacher, C: Calvin, Th: Thomas, Ss: Students

- 1 T And do you have enough information about Uzbekistan?
If I ask you next time for example, *O'zbekiston qayerde joylashgan? O'zbekistanin aholisi qanche? O'zbekistonin hududu qanche? O'zbekiston qande shaharlar bor? O'zbekistonin nemasi bilan mashhur?* Can you answer at least two five questions?
Hum? Next time if I ask you now?
Where is Uzbekistan located? What is its population?
How large is the country? What cities are there? What is it known for?
- 2 Ss (Students laugh) (2 secs)
- 3 Ss *Ha*
Yes
- 4 T *Bashlariq.* Calvin. *O'zbekiston qayerde joylashgan?*
Let's start. Calvin. Where is Uzbekistan located?
- 5 C Himm. (4 secs) *otacha*
- 6 T [Orta?

- Middle?
- 7 C *Orta Asyada* (3secs) *oyish- oyisha?*
In the Middle East
- 8 T *Orta Asyada*
- 9 C [Orta Asyada
- 10 T *Joylashgan yaxshi*
Located, very good!
- 11 T Umm, Thomas (2 sec) *O'zbekistonin poytaxti* (2 secs) *nema?*
What is the capital of Uzbekistan?
- 12 Th Tashkent?
- 13 T Tashke:nt! *Yaxshi!*
Very good!
- 14 T Calvin, *O'zbekistonin hududi qanche?*
What is the size of Uzbekistan?
- 15 C Umm (4 secs) it's *erk?* *beshinchi*
It's fifty fifth
- 16 T I am. not asking. What place it is. but *hudud* what is the
territory of O'zbekiston?
- 17 C What is the territory of Uzbekistan?
- 18 T Uzbek Republic?
- 19 C Exact number? I don't know
- 20 T [dort yuz kirk yedi ming'
Four hundred forty thou-
sand-
- 21 Ss (students laugh) (2 secs)
- 22 C I don't know what the exact number is.
- 23 T Okay, *dort yuz kirk yedi ming-*
Four hundred forty thousand-
- 24 C [ko'p?
A lot?
- 25 T (laughs) *ko'p*. you cannot say *ko'p*
- 26 Ss (laugh)
- 27 T Approximately. *o'rtacha, taxminan* If you are suspicious
that it's not the right number you can say (1sec) *taxminan'*
dort yuz kirk yedi ming dort yuz kilometer quadrat or *quadrat*
kilometer
Approximately, four hundred forty thousand four hun-
dred kilometer square

- 28 T *Yaxshi, abalisi qancha*, Thomas?
Very good, what is its population, Thomas?
- 29 Th Umm (5 secs)
- 30 T Was it mentioned here? (2 secs) I think it wasn't mentioned. *abalisi* It was twenty-six million people. It was mentioned that it was at the: (1 sec) this place because of its population, but it's not mentioned how many population it had. In Uzbekistan, there are more than twenty six million people (2 secs) *yaxshi*:
- 31 T Calvin. *O'zbekistan nemasi bilan meshbur?*
What is Uzbekistan known for?
- 32 C Umm (3 secs) *mevalar', sabza'* or-
Fruits, veggie-
- 33 T [*sabzavotlari?*
vegetables?
- 34 C *taxi-* umm (1sec) *joylar?*
histo- cities?
- 35 T *topa dogri!*
very correct.
- 36 T *asosiyi?* The most important one is:
major one?
- 37 C umm *poytaxta?*
capital?
- 38 T *poytaxtasi: bilan mashbur.*
its capital is well known
- 39 C *poytaxtasi*
its capital
- 40 T umm (2 secs) Thomas? *Asosiy shaharlari qaysi?*
O'zbekistanda?
What are the major cities in Uzbekistan?
- 41 Th Which are-
- 42 T [*asosiy shaharlar?*
major cities?
- 43 Th like, which are the major cities?
- 44 T uhhum.
- 45 Th *Bukhara'*
- 46 T *Bukhara.*
- 47 Th *Khorez- Khorez.m'*

- 48 T [Khorazm.
 49 Th (3 secs) *Semerkan?*
 50 T *Semerkan.*
 51 Th (4 secs) *Tashkent. Tab-tahr?*
 52 T *Tashkent shahr?*
 53 Th (3 secs)
 54 T *boldi!*
 These are... (laughs)
 55 T Uzbekistan has twelve regions and one autonomy republic. It's *Qoraqalpog'iston*. Have you heard about it? What is the problem of the Aral sea (?) Have you heard? It's *Qoraqalpog'iston autonomi respublikasi*, (2 secs) *yaxshi*,
 56 T Calvin, *onda qande adamlar yashiygen, qande alimlar yashiygen? Tug'ilgen?*
 Who lived there? Which scholars have lived there? Or born there?
 57 C umm (3 secs) Did you ask how many people lived there? Or?
 58 T No. What kind of scien-scientists?
 59 C oh! (2 secs)
 60 T Who are they?
 61 C Their names? (laughs)
 62 T Their names. Do you remember that?
 63 Th uhh Merto Ulug?
 64 C [Ulugbek?
 65 T Merzo Ulug'bek. Merzo Ulug'bek
 66 C umm (3secs)
 67 Ss (laugh)
 68 T And? He is the founder of medicine? (3 secs) Ibin-?
 69 Ss (laugh)
 70 T You should-. You should know these names. Ibin Sina' at least. He is the founder of medicine. Some people said it is (1 sec) medicine means as an asset (product) of **Sina**. He firstly treated the diseases he wrote books about different type diseases and how to treat them. It's Ibin Sina. Next is Beruniy. Abraham Beruniy, he was a great geographer that he-at that time, he:... as-as I read from historical books, he just-he was able to say that, (acted speech)

“there is a place or there is a country beyond the ocean”,
he predicted that there was America!

- 71 **Th** uhhum
- 72 **T** look-US-umm. Central Asia (1 sec) is in the East part of the world yes? But in history, there-they don't have any equipment to see where is what? What is what? But at that time he said that. Umm. The earth is round' (1 sec) and there is one land' it was America!. And after him, that America Vespucci discovered America. In history, but before them umm (2 secs) three or four centuries ago. It was he who said that. There is a place. And Al-Khorezmi is-em (2 secs) the founder of mathematics and algebra (2 secs) the rules of mathematics and algorithms' something like this stuff. And Merzo Ulug'bek? You know about him, yes? Who was he?
- 73 **Th** The guy who got murdered?
- 74 **T** (1 sec) (smiling) haaa: you just know that-
- 75 **Ss** (laugh)
- 76 **C** by son?
- 77 **T** yeah by son
- 78 **Th** but he was for-
- 79 **T** [but what was his profession?
- 80 **Th** He created the-umm (2 secs)
- 81 **C** [translator?
- 82 **Th** the-um-plan-planetarium?
- 83 **T** Yes. *U' yildizlarni qozetken*. He just.umm analyzed umm stars and he found more than one thousand and one stars on the sky. (2secs) Morze'Ulug'bek. You shouldn't say, (acting speech) “oooohh *U ogli tamamge oldirilgen*”. He observed stars. He was killed by his son.
- 84 **Ss** [(students laugh)
- 85 **T** but you should know what he did. what they did in general, just a few things, okay? (1 sec) names and few things? What they-what was their field? (2 secs)
- 86 **Ss** (students keep laughing)
- 87 **T** (laughs stop) for what they were familiar-famous till these days? Why Uzbek people proud of them? They are –their ancestors. Because of what? Because they have did a lot

- of things' (2 secs)
- 88 Ss uhhum
- 89 T That's why we are. When you say I am from Uzbekistan, some people will say, (acting speech) "oooh! You are from the country of Karezmi' the country of Sina' " but I cannot say at that time in history it was exact place, which Uzbek people are living now. (1 sec) but the origin of theirs from Uzbekistan, this territory.
- 90 Ss uhhum
- 91 T Have you understood? (2 secs) *sualler bor mi?* (Do you have any questions?) so on Wednesday we'll have quiz in quiz I am going to include some questions about Uzbekistan, okay? It means you have to reread again. *Yaxshi.* Umm (1 sec) *bugunku dersimiz* (today's lesson) Today I am going to explain how you can express ability. (2 secs) So what does it mean? (2 secs) for example, Calvin can say. I can swim. I can cook. I can speak Uzbek, yes? This expressing ability.

The lesson continues with a new grammar topic: "expressing abilities".

Discussion

The socializing role of the teacher along with the textbook is visible in such areas of "what constitutes socially valuable knowledge". In line 17, the teacher raises the question "what is the size of Uzbekistan?" which reflects the ideologies of valuable knowledge reflected in the textbook, since she is quizzing them about a fact in the book. After reviewing this information on the practiced text, she expects the learners to remember this factual information and be able to produce it when asked. Calvin responds to this question, "I don't know what the exact number is" (line 19), and the teacher repeats this information, "four hundred forty thousand-" (line 20). As she repeats the size of Uzbekistan again, Calvin attempts to simplify this information into an adverb "*ko'p*" (a lot?) in line 24. The teacher is first entertained by this attempt and laughs at it briefly, but immediately rejects such simplification, and negotiates a middle way by abandoning her initial insistence on the precise measurement of the geographical area: "If you are suspicious that it's not the right number you can

say *taxminan* (approximately). Although the size of Uzbekistan is mentioned in the textbook, the students do not necessarily attend to it as “important information,” however the teacher pulls it out and quizzes students on this fact. When the teacher observes that the students do not recall the exact numbers, she teaches them a marker of epistemic stance and a context in which it could be used. Ochs (1993) identifies marking certainty as a cross-cultural phenomenon that can be performed through factive predicates, determiners, cleft constructions, and other presupposing structures; whereas, uncertainty can be marked with modals and rising intonations. By teaching the word *taxminan* as an epistemic marker, the teacher socializes students *into* using the language to *act*, out uncertainty. The teacher ends this IRE episode with her evaluation “*yaxsh!*” in line 28, and continues with the next question addressing, the next person. The next question is about the population of Uzbekistan, which was mentioned in the text, but not as a number. The teacher realizes this after asking the question and during Thomas’ long pause (line 29), and provides this information herself: “In Uzbekistan, there are more than twenty-six million people”. The teacher’s inquiries about the size of Uzbekistan and the population of Uzbekistan prompts Calvin to interpret the question in line 56 as another number question: “Did you ask how many people lived there?” (line 57). The teacher’s emphasis on exact numbers prompts students to look for numbers as important information. By quizzing students on these facts, the teacher displays her epistemological preferences (e.g., knowing quantities and sizes in exact numbers is valuable information), and socializes students into looking out for this information.

In addition to the teacher’s expectations that the students should remember the size and population of Uzbekistan in numbers, she displays similar epistemic preference for names in lines 56 and 60, reflecting her stance leaning toward certainty, when she asks students the names of well-known scholars that have lived in Uzbekistan’s territories. Calvin is surprised by the question and the fact that he was supposed to remember the names of these people (line 61). Calvin and Thomas together produce parts of the name “Merzo Ulug’bek”, and the teacher asks for other names by providing some clues; facts about these people and parts of their names. “And? He is the founder of medicine? Ibin-?” (line 68). Students, unable to put these clues to-

gether, pause and laugh briefly, in response to which, the teacher gives a mini lecture about the importance of these people and their contributions to modern science (lines 70 and 72). Thomas shows understanding of the significance of these people, and produces an audible confirmation sound “uhhum” in line 71 and again in lines 88 and 90, following the mini-lectures.

In these mini lectures, the teacher does not necessarily teach a linguistic point, but socializes students into the social values of Uzbekistan: “Why Uzbek people [are] proud of them” (line 87), and claims legitimacy for Uzbekistan due to its less-known contributions to modern science and geography (line 70 and 72). The teacher’s knowledge is based not solely on personal experience but the facts in history books: “as I read from historical books” (line 70). The students respond to these mini lectures with confirming nods, and often audible acknowledgements (lines 71, 88, and 90). In line 92, when the teacher asks if they remember Ulug’bek, the students respond: “the guy who got murdered” (line 73). This stands to be accurate information, but not necessarily relevant, appropriate, or prioritized, as shown in the teacher’s rejection and acted imitation of their response: “oohh he was killed by his son” (line 83). The teacher is initially entertained by how they came up with this side note about Ulug’bek, but she diverts their attention into more relevant and valuable areas of facts, in her perspective: “but what was his profession” (line 79). Thomas was able to respond to this question by the right area of work “Planetarium” (line 82), and the teacher continued to give further information about his profession and contributions to modern science (line 83), which ended with a slight reprimand about what they should not say: “you shouldn’t say ‘oooohh *U ogli tamamge oldirilgen*’ but you should know what he did.” with an emphasis on “did”. This rule also applies to other scholars of Uzbekistan: “what they did in general, just a few things, okay? names and a few things? what they-what was their field” (line 85).

Second language classrooms exhibit and teach a set of cultural and epistemological assumptions with varying degrees of explicitness (Watson-Gegeo & Nielsen, 2003). These language classrooms are not isolated from the realities of life, but are strategically embedded within an institutional context and a broader sociopolitical context. Therefore, institutional (e.g., Fulbright and LCTL programs),

social, historical, and political settings create multiple layers around the classroom and inform the language teaching practices to a certain extent (Kumaravadivelu, 2006). In this study, through the teacher's mini lectures on the geographical facts about Uzbekistan and historical figures and scholars, students are socialized into what constitutes valuable knowledge in addition to speaking the language. Therefore, competence in the Uzbek language is not limited to producing the language, but expands to the awareness of the culture and values of its speakers. The cultural information is often initiated by the textbook, but it is the teacher who elaborates on it and expands its focus to other relevant topics in her perspective. For example, the information about Beruniy and his discovery of America (line 70) was not in the textbook, but was the teacher's contribution. Through these mini lectures, learners become aware that people might be offended, if learners do not show enough respect to the values and national and cultural legacy of Uzbeks. It is also noteworthy that her mini lecture is assessment-worthy, and that the students are going to be evaluated on their knowledge of Uzbekistan on their next quiz (line 91).

Conclusion and Implications

The findings of this study could be implemented in assisting students to operate in study abroad contexts, in teacher training programs for less commonly taught languages, and designing textbooks and materials. Teaching culture in LCIL classrooms has significant impact on learners' language learning experience. When students know about the values and traditions of the target culture, they can use their local knowledge to establish solidarity with the speakers of this language and use it as leverage to enable their membership to the community. Teachers can use mini lectures of cultural practices to stimulate conversation, which not only leads to meaningful practice opportunities, but also introduces learners to the beliefs and values of the target community. However, given the fact that teachers and textbooks are such powerful mediums in socializing students into certain ideologies and values, teachers and textbook writers should be careful about which cultural values are represented in the curriculum. In order to avoid a simplistic view of culture and essentialized beliefs about the whole community (e.g., everybody in Uzbekistan does it this way), the classroom content should be shaped with an emphasis on the flu-

id and diverse nature of culture. If culture is constructed as homogeneous in classroom discourse, the regional, social, racial, socioeconomic, and religious variations are ignored. In everyday classroom conversations, teachers may tend to draw from their own cultural background, but should at least show awareness of regional variations and acknowledge their own subjectivity in their representations of the target cultural practices (Uzum, 2013). The present study shows that teachers and textbooks are strong socialization mediums and operate like gateways into the cultural practices of a community. In most LCTL classes, learners' only exposure to the target language and culture are these two resources; therefore, administrators, curriculum designers, textbook writers, and teachers should be attentive to the importance of cultural representations on the LCTL classroom content.

References

- Azimova, N. (2010). *Uzbek: An elementary textbook*. Georgetown University Press
- Byon, A. S. (2006). Language socialization in Korean-as-a-foreign-language classrooms. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 30(265-291).
- Curdt-Christensen, X. L. (2008). Reading the world through words: Cultural themes in heritage Chinese language textbooks. *Language and education*, 22, 95-113.
- Duff, P. (2010). Language socialization into academic discourse communities. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 30, 169-192.
- Friedman, D. (2010). Speaking correctly: Error correction as a language socialization practice in a Ukrainian classroom. *Applied Linguistics*, 31, 346-367.
- Fulbright FLTA program. (2011). Retrieved October 6, 2011, from <http://flta.fulbrightonline.org/about.html>
- Gulliver, T. (2010). Immigrant success stories in ESL textbooks. *TESOL Quarterly*, 44, 726-745.
- Johnson, K. (2009). *Second language teacher education: A sociocultural perspective*. New York: Routledge.
- Kumaravadivelu, B. (2006). TESOL methods: Changing tracks, challenging trends. *Tesol Quarterly*, 40, 59-81.
- Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Lantolf, J. P. (2000). *Sociocultural theory and second language learning*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Morita, N. (2004). Negotiating participation and identity in second language academic communities. *Tesol Quarterly*, 38(4), 573-603.
- Ochs, E., & Schieffelin, B. (1984). Language acquisition and socialization: Three developmental stories and their implications. In R. A. Shweder & R. A. LeVine (Eds.), *Culture theory: Essays on mind, self and emotion* (pp. 276-320). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Ochs, E. (1993). Constructing social identity: A language socialization perspective. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 26, 287-306.
- Ochs, E., & Schieffelin, B. B. (2012). The theory of language socialization. In A. Duranti, E. Ochs, & B. B. Schieffelin (Eds.), *The*

- handbook of language socialization* (pp. 1-21). West sussex: United Kingdom: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Poole, D. (1992). Language socialization in the second language classroom. *Language Learning*, 42, 593-616.
- Riley, K. C. (2012). Language socialization and language ideologies. In A. Duranti, E. Ochs, & B. B. Schieffelin (Eds.), *The handbook of language socialization* (pp. 493-514). West Sussex: United Kingdom: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Sjoberg, A. (1963). *Uzbek Structural Grammar*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Uzum, B. (2012). A microethnographic case study of Fulbright language teaching assistants: Dialogic mediation and conceptual thinking for professional identity development. In G. Gorsuch (Ed.), *Working theories for teaching assistant and international teaching assistant development*. Stillwater, OK: New Forums Press.
- Watson-Gegeo, K. A., & Nielsen, S. (2003). Language socialization in SLA. *The handbook of second language acquisition*, 15, 155. Wiley-Blackwell.

Appendix

Transcription Rules

Italicized: Foreign language

: lengthened vowels

Underline: erroneous utterances

Bold: emphasized

?: rising intonation

.: brief pauses, shorter than 1 second

ˆ: slightly rising intonation

Italic: original utterance in foreign language

() : accompanying actions, transcriber comments

(2 secs): length of pause longer than 1 second

(?) guessed transcription uncertain word

Word- :false starts, incomplete utterances

[interruption or accompanying speech