The Journal of Language Teaching and Learning™

2026 Volume 16/Issue 3 Article 11

Learning Beyond the Curriculum: An Extracurricular Model for Sociolinguistic Development

Osman Solmaz, Dicle University, Diyarbakır, Türkiye, osolmaz@dicle.edu.tr
Ece Halime Nazlı, Dicle University, Diyarbakır, Türkiye, ebaris@dicle.edu.tr
Kadri Nazlı, Dicle University, Diyarbakır, Türkiye, knazli@dicle.edu.tr

Recommended Citations:

APA
Solmaz, O., Nazlı, E. H., & Nazlı, K. (2026). Learning beyond the curriculum: An extracurricular model for sociolinguistic development. *The Journal of Language Teaching and Learning*, *16*(3), 203-225.

MLA
Solmaz, Osman, Ece Halime Nazlı, and Kadri Nazlı. "Learning Beyond the Curriculum: An Extracurricular Model for Sociolinguistic Development." *The Journal of Language Teaching and Learning*, vol. 16, no. 3, 203-225.

https://doi.org/10.66887/jltl.v16i3.942

Contents lists available at www.jltl.com.tr

The Journal of Language Teaching and Learning

Published by the Association of Applied Linguistics

www.jltl.com.tr

The Journal of Language Teaching and Learning, 2026*(3)*, 203-225

Learning Beyond the Curriculum: An Extracurricular Model for Sociolinguistic Development

Osman Solmaz[1], Ece Halime Nazlı[2], Kadri Nazlı[3]

ARTICLE INFO

Article History:
Received 20 Aug 2025
Revisions completed 13 Apr 2026
Published 4 July 2026

Keywords:
Sociolinguistic awareness
Teacher education
English as a foreign language
Teacher identity
Extracurricular learning

ABSTRACT

This study introduces and evaluates an extracurricular instructional model designed to foster sociolinguistic awareness among pre-service English as a Foreign Language (EFL) teachers in Türkiye. In response to the limited inclusion of sociolinguistic resources in formal ELT curriculum content, the workshop provided a three-day non-formal learning context that was based on reflective practice, collaborative work, and the development of pedagogy. Qualitative data collected from the participants' letters of intent, produced materials, and post-workshop reflections supported thematic analyses to identify how participants' sociolinguistic awareness influenced their views of themselves as teachers and their instructional approaches. Findings indicated that participants moved from an intuitive understanding of linguistic diversity to a critically informed perspective, with a focus upon creating learner-centered, inclusive pedagogies grounded in sociolinguistic principles. The workshop experience contributed to participants' identity formation as culturally responsive educators and advocates for linguistic equity. The study underscores the transformative potential of extracurricular initiatives in addressing curricular gaps and cultivating teacher agency in sociolinguistically complex educational contexts. Implications for teacher education include the need to support experiential, ideologically aware pedagogies that legitimize diverse Englishes and embrace linguistic diversity.

[1] Dicle University, Diyarbakır, Türkiye, osolmaz@dicle.edu.tr
[2] Dicle University, Diyarbakır, Türkiye, ebaris@dicle.edu.tr
[3] Dicle University, Diyarbakır, Türkiye, knazli@dicle.edu.tr

Solmaz, O., Nazlı, E. H., & Nazlı, K. (2026). *Learning beyond the curriculum: An extracurricular model for sociolinguistic development*. *The Journal of Language Teaching and Learning*, *16*(3), 203-225.

Although there is a growing recognition of the need to include sociolinguistic awareness in the education of English language teachers due to linguistic and ideological complexities surrounding the spread of English, increasing linguistic diversity, and changing language ideologies around the world, the inclusion of sociolinguistic awareness in English language teaching curricula varies widely across countries. Therefore, for prospective English as a foreign language (EFL) teachers in multilingual contexts such as Türkiye, developing sociolinguistic competence is crucial for negotiating classroom linguistic diversity and establishing pedagogies which are inclusive and affirm students' identities (Bayyurt & Sifakis, 2017; Selvi, 2017). Moreover, sociolinguistic competence is important for raising students' awareness of linguistic diversity and interculturality in expanding circle contexts such as Türkiye (Bayyurt, 2013). Currently, language teachers are expected to have knowledge about issues related to language variation, multilingual practices, translanguaging, and linguistic discrimination. Unfortunately, while the majority of formal English Language Teaching (ELT) curricula provide opportunities for teacher candidates to acquire the knowledge necessary to meet these expectations, there is evidence suggesting that some formal ELT curricula may be deficient in preparing teacher candidates to meet these needs (Abd Rahman et al., 2022; Korkmaz & Karatepe, 2023).

Sociolinguistic education in Türkiye is generally limited within the national ELT Curriculum. While sociolinguistics is available as an optional course of study in Turkish universities, its availability is irregular, and when available it often is not integrated into classroom practice. Many prospective teachers therefore complete their university education without engaging with significant aspects of sociolinguistic theory such as code switching, dialectal variation, language ideologies, or English as a global language. Empirical evidence from the Turkish context supports this concern: pre-service EFL teachers have been shown to display ambivalent or slightly negative attitudes toward non-native varieties of English, suggesting that exposure to sociolinguistic diversity remains insufficient in many programs (Atar, 2026). Additionally, although educators recognize the importance of sociolinguistic competence, conventional notions of linguistic correctness and/or curricular constraints, along with standard language ideologies, limit the use of sociolinguistic competence in the classroom (Borg, 2003; Rehner & Lasan, 2023). Recent classroom based studies conducted in Türkiye suggest that employing sociolinguistically-informed pedagogies such as using translanguaging practices can increase student comprehension and create more inclusive classrooms (İlhan & Özkan, 2025).

These differences in providing opportunities for developing sociolinguistic competence are most apparent during the process of developing professional identities for non-native English speaking teachers. Non-native English speaking teachers must navigate both linguistic authority and intercultural tensions in their evolving roles (Bayyurt & Sifakis, 2017; Karakaş, 2021).

This study addresses the lack of opportunity for teacher candidates to develop sociolinguistic competence by presenting an extracurricular educational model (the Sociolinguistic Awareness and Practical Application Workshop) designed to help EFL teacher candidates develop sociolinguistic competence. The three-day workshop provided a structured, immersion learning experience that included reflection, collaboration, and pedagogical application. The workshop focused on several foundational sociolinguistic themes including multilingualism, language and identity, and translanguaging. Each participant created original classroom materials that represented their developing critical awareness. This model was intended to address two major gaps in the current curriculum: first, to act as a supplement to the deficiencies in the curriculum; second, to give voice to, allow access to, and reflect the evolving identities of teacher candidates as they navigated new understandings of language and pedagogy.

The primary purpose of this study is to present and document an extracurricular model used to enhance sociolinguistic awareness in EFL teacher education. A secondary objective is to examine how this model impacted participants' conceptual understanding, professional identities, and pedagogical practices. By examining these

purposes, this study demonstrates how informal learning environments can support context-sensitive and reflective practices in language teacher education. In addition, this study provides empirical insights regarding how informal learning environments can be sites of transformation for future teachers who are confronting linguistic and ideological complexity.

Accordingly, the present study is guided by the following research questions:

1. How do EFL teacher candidates develop sociolinguistic awareness through participation in an extracurricular workshop setting?
2. In what ways do participants reimagine their professional roles and classroom responsibilities through sociolinguistic insights?
3. What pedagogical designs, classroom practices, and reflective applications emerge from participants' engagement with sociolinguistic learning?

2. Literature Review

This review synthesizes previous research from three related areas: the role of sociolinguistic awareness in teacher education; the limitations of formal curricula; and the potential of non-formal learning environments. Additionally, it explores how teachers' beliefs and perceptions influence their instructional decisions.

Sociolinguistic Awareness in Language Teacher Education

Sociolinguistic competence represents one of two fundamental components of communicative competence. Canale and Swain's (1980) definition states that communicative competence involves the ability to communicate effectively in a variety of situations. It addresses "how" we use language to convey meaning and refers to an individual's ability to select appropriate linguistic features for the specific social setting in which they will be communicating (Mede & Dikilitaş, 2015; Yu, 2006). Although it has become a widely accepted concept, it has received limited attention in English language teacher education programs (Abd Rahman et al., 2022). Frameworks for language education, such as the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR), attempt to address this omission through references to the significance of the sociocultural context of communication. However, the application of the CEFR framework to language teacher education and classroom instruction is sporadic and typically limited to surface-level implementations.

Developing sociolinguistic awareness among language teachers is essential for several interrelated reasons. Developing sociolinguistic awareness helps teachers model and teach learners to use language that is appropriate to the particular situation and thus prevents learners from engaging in miscommunication or experiencing pragmatic failure (Yu, 2006, 2008). Furthermore, developing sociolinguistic awareness enhances teachers' understanding of linguistic diversity and motivates them to challenge deficit views about non-standard forms of language (Amorim, 2022; Atar, 2026; Briceño et al., 2018). It also promotes critical consciousness by making explicit the relationship between language, identity, and power (Lindahl et al., 2021). Moreover, when teachers use language themselves, they serve as models for learners and consequently shape classroom discourse and interactions (Abd Rahman et al., 2022). Finally, viewing English as a lingua franca and using a sociocultural approach empower non-native speakers of English by recognizing different types of English and increasing their options for teaching (Bayyurt & Sifakis, 2017). Building upon Bayyurt's (2013) work, sociolinguistic awareness has emerged as an important area of focus for both teachers and learners who engage with issues surrounding linguistic variation, World Englishes, and intercultural communication.

Although sociolinguistic instruction offers numerous advantages, it is difficult to implement in teacher education programs due to a number of challenges. For example, many teachers indicate that they were exposed to little actual use of English in real-life settings during their education; therefore, they lack experience to adequately deal with sociolinguistic aspects in the classroom (Abd Rahman et al., 2022; Mede & Dikilitaş, 2015). Systemic barriers, including fixed curricula, standardized test driven school systems, and

inadequate institutional resources also limit the incorporation of sociolinguistic instruction (Aslan & Nazlı, 2024; Hsieh & Chuang, 2021; Korkmaz & Karatepe, 2023). Furthermore, the existing linguistic ideologies, such as nativisms and purisms of language influence teachers' beliefs concerning what is acceptable in terms of language variation and non-standard forms of English (Briceño et al., 2018).

To develop greater awareness and pedagogical self-confidence regarding sociolinguistic knowledge, researchers recommend that students receive direct instruction in sociolinguistic knowledge combined with meta-linguistic reflection (Rehner & Lasan, 2023; Yu, 2006). Utilizing authentic materials as well as experiential learning techniques, such as role-playing, case studies and Linguistic Landscape (LL) tasks has proven successful in supporting students in learning about the social contexts in which language is used and critically evaluating those contexts (Solmaz, 2023). Research conducted recently have demonstrated that sociolinguistically focused instruction delivered via structured means and utilizing technology can produce demonstrable changes in learners' use of language based on context (Mujiono & Herawati, 2021). Supporting the theoretical base provided above, İlhan and Özkan's (2025) study demonstrates empirically that instruction oriented toward translanguaging contributes to not only linguistic growth but also learners' attitudes toward multilingualism positively. Therefore, the research provides evidence of the benefit of sociolinguistic approaches in the Turkish EFL context. The above mentioned studies support the necessity for specifically designed pedagogical interventions. In addition, reflective practices, such as language portraits or ideology trees and other similar tools enable instructors to reveal implicit bias and facilitate teacher language awareness and ultimately contribute to creating responsive and inclusive learning environments (Lindahl et al., 2021).

Therefore, for teacher education programs to provide meaningful and sustainable integration of sociolinguistics, program developers need to reassess their priorities. Programs should not only prioritize the development of pragmatic, sociolinguistic, and linguistic competence, they need to provide prospective teachers with opportunities to learn about Global Englishes (GE), English as a Lingua Franca (ELF), and GE-informed approaches in their professional development programs (Selvi, 2017; Solmaz, 2023).

Such approaches problematize the idea that there is one singular standard English and validate multiple standards of English. Nevertheless, recent research indicates that although pre-service teachers acknowledge the value of GE approaches, they sometimes exhibit ambivalence toward them because of tension between GE approaches and their professional identity or anticipated future roles as educators (Karakaş, 2021). Managing these tensions can assist in enabling teachers to create inclusive classrooms. Recent research further identifies the potential contribution of sociolinguistic awareness in ELT by demonstrating its role in defining learner identity, promoting inclusive classroom processes and broadening pedagogical possibilities. According to Elyas and Solmaz (2024), authors of a recent editorial overview on the intersectionality of sociolinguistic-ELT issues, sociolinguistic awareness is not simply a theoretical issue; rather it is a practical requirement for developing responsiveness to diversity and developing culturally responsive pedagogies in international classrooms. Their work underscores the need to develop policies and practices that provide instructors with opportunities for sociolinguistic reflection so that they may prepare to face the linguistic and cultural realities of today's learners.

Finally, fostering sociolinguistic awareness among language teachers is more than adding new vocabulary or introducing new ways of using pragmatics. Fostering sociolinguistic awareness among language teachers require a change of perspective in how teachers think about language and pedagogy. By identifying underlying ideologies, providing authentic and meaningful learning experiences, and encouraging critical thinking regarding the socio-political dimensions of English language teaching, teacher education programs can provide prospective educators with opportunities to understand and manage linguistic diversity, to contest inequality, and to reflect

thoughtfully on their practice regarding the sociopolitical aspects of teaching English.

Addressing Curricular Gaps through Extracurricular and Non-Formal Learning

Despite growing calls for more inclusive and context-sensitive pedagogy, sociolinguistic instruction remains underrepresented in formal ELT curricula (Yu, 2006, 2008). A focus on grammar and vocabulary for exams often dominates instructional priorities, leaving little room for pragmatic and sociolinguistic development (Hsieh & Chuang, 2021; Korkmaz & Karatepe, 2023). Because of the constraints of curriculum requirements and the need to prepare students for examinations, both at home and abroad, much of the instruction provided in ELT classrooms is still focused primarily on developing students' proficiency in grammar and vocabulary for examinations, while leaving very little space for the development of pragmatic and sociolinguistic skills (Hsieh & Chuang, 2021; Korkmaz & Karatepe, 2023). Many teachers have reported feeling inadequate or unprepared to teach the complexities of sociolinguistic issues, and therefore tend to avoid teaching those aspects altogether (Aslan & Nazlı, 2024; Hseieh & Chuang, 2021). Moreover, in many parts of the world where native speaker models of English dominate the educational system, curricular content tends to represent a static view that reflects neither the evolving nature nor the pluralistic realities of English use in real-world interactions (Amorim, 2022; Solmaz et al., 2023; Vettorel & Lopriore, 2017).

Given these limitations in formal ELT instruction, extracurricular and non-formal learning opportunities have become important means of supporting the development of sociolinguistic competence. For example, learners can obtain real-life examples of language variation through media and interpersonal dialogue, and they can learn how speakers make choices about their language based upon the situational demands of communication (Abd. Rahman et al., 2022; Rehner & Lasan, 2023).

Research has demonstrated that extensive exposure to a target language environment combined with regular social interaction greatly enhances learners' capacity to successfully negotiate variations in sociolinguistic behavior (Li, 2010). Through this type of exposure learners will typically acquire an understanding of informal language norms and how different languages are used in varying communicative environments. Additionally, given the increasing presence of English in globalized and digital contexts, informal contact through various media formats such as social media and intercultural communication channels will become increasingly important for learners' sociolinguistic development (Vettorel & Lopriore, 2017). The growing number of instances in which English is found throughout daily digital and local landscapes underscores the importance for educators to support multiple and flexible uses of english in everyday communication (Solmaz, 2023).

A variety of non-formal learning methods have been identified as being useful for enhancing students' development of sociolinguistic competence. Some examples include using media such as sitcoms, music videos and films to illustrate pragmatic language elements (Hsieh & Chuang, 2021), and encouraging learner-to-learner exchange projects that may involve video conferencing, online chat rooms or other types of e-learning platforms that allow learners to simulate real-time communication (Korkmaz & Karatepe, 2023). Another approach for creating sociolinguistically-aware learners is to use linguistic landscape (LL) activities to encourage learners to document and analyze publicly displayed signs written in english within their community. Learners gain insight into how public displays of English function as a lingua franca and as a representation of Global Englishes (GE) (Solmaz, 2023).

Students can also increase their contextual sensitivity regarding communication through engaging in reflective activities such as role playing, case studies and comparative analyses of language use. These activities provide additional opportunity for students to recognize the emotional obstacles associated with communication differences and reduce students' anxiety about communicating cross-culturally (Ismail, 2022). Such initiatives promote the role of non-formal settings in reducing the affective barriers associated with cross-cultural communication. Digital platforms and professional

learning communities also offer teachers valuable venues for collaborating with peers, sharing resources and reflecting critically on practices related to teaching sociolinguistic aspects of English as an international language (Bayyurt & Sifakis, 2017).

Although non-formal learning holds considerable potential as a vehicle for improving students' sociolinguistic competence, several institutional challenges hinder its widespread adoption. Specifically, formal institutions emphasize assessment and rigid curricula that do not provide sufficient time or flexibility for incorporating extracurricular activity-based instruction (Hsieh & Chuang, 2021; Korkmaz & Karatepe, 2023). Some educators indicate a lack of access to technology such as computers or smart phones equipped with internet capabilities or ready-made instructional materials that would enable them to integrate sociolinguistic instruction into their classes (Diniz de Figueiredo & Sanfelici, 2017). Furthermore, in many EFL contexts there are very few opportunities for students to encounter genuine language variation (Abd. Rahman et al., 2022). This is true particularly when English is rarely spoken outside the confines of an educational setting. By providing students with non-formal learning opportunities educators may create authentic experiences for students to observe how native speakers communicate informally. Educators may also model how native speakers use language variation in casual conversations and how these forms of communication are shaped by the participants' shared history and identity (Abd. Rahman et al., 2022). Thus far in many cases it appears that educators have avoided discussing language variation due to a concern for creating anxiety around culturally acceptable ways of speaking (Yu, 2008).

Nonetheless, despite the obstacles described above, it can be argued that non-formal learning can provide a complementary source of instruction that can serve as a tool for facilitating experiential, reflective and contextually grounded engagement with language variation that typically occurs infrequently if ever in formal curricula. For non-formal learning to reach its maximum potential, however, institutional reforms will likely be required. These include better preparing educators to develop greater confidence in their abilities to provide instruction that addresses linguistic diversity (Diniz de Figueiredo & Sanfelici, 2017).

Beliefs and Perceptions Influencing the Teaching of Sociolinguistic Competence

Teachers' belief systems developed through past language learning experiences, professional training, and broader social/cultural influences contribute substantially to determining how and to what degree sociolinguistic competency is taught in classrooms (Borg, 2003; Hsieh & Chuang, 2021). While many prospective teachers acknowledge the benefits of sociolinguistic instruction, this acknowledgment typically translates poorly into actual instructional design. One major reason is a lack of confidence in their ability to teach pragmatic and cultural aspects of English use. This lack of confidence stems largely from inadequate preparation or limited exposure to the pragmatic and cultural characteristics of English use (Mede & Dikilitaş, 2015).

Both curricular pressure and test-driven instructional designs further restrict teachers' abilities to include sociolinguistic content in their courses. Even when textbooks contain sociolinguistic material, teachers may choose to exclude these sections from their course content in order to devote more class time to content that is more closely linked to evaluations (Korkmaz & Karatepe, 2023). Teachers' familiarity and comfort level with linguistic variation, particularly deviation from normative standards, can similarly impact teachers' instructional decision-making. Some teachers find sociolinguistics too abstract or vague, thus leading some teachers to exclude sociolinguistic topics from their course content (Yu, 2008). Teachers who believe their own language use deviates from standard norms may be even less willing to formally introduce variation into their course content.

Ideologies, including native speakerism, influence teachers' views regarding linguistic diversity. Those who adhere to native speaker norms may object to introducing 'Englishes' into their instruction. They worry that validating non-

standard varieties may lower academic and professional standards and disadvantage their students relative to others competing academically and professionally (Bayyurt & Sifakis, 2017; Korkmaz & Karatepe, 2023; Selvi, 2017).

Even after receiving training on globalization-related ideas about Global Englishes during their initial educator preparation program(s), many teachers continue to express reservations about legitimate representations of Global Englishes. Their concerns generally relate to issues concerning intelligibility, authority and students' perceptions. These concerns frequently stem from their internalization of ideology and unclear notions about themselves professionally (Karakaş, 2021).

In addition to internalized ideology, prospective teachers' personal histories of language learning often include negative experiences with culture or grammar instruction, and questions about their own sociolinguistic knowledge base. When faced with an instructional approach that potentially addresses these areas, prospective teachers frequently avoid these options or fail to initiate spontaneous discussion about language variation (Borg, 2003).

As a result of the complexity involved in addressing educators' deep-seated beliefs, moving language education towards a more inclusive and critically conscious direction represents a serious undertaking. According to Lindahl et al. (2021), developing a 'sociolinguistic consciousness' among educators involves more than simply conveying knowledge; rather it requires continuous reflection regarding existing ideologies surrounding language, and an acceptance of linguistic diversity as a positive attribute. Teacher education programs, therefore, need to establish venues for educators to critically evaluate their assumptions, engage with the socio-political aspects of language, and develop confidence in implementing transformative pedagogies.

To summarize, the literature indicates a disconnect between the perceived value of sociolinguistic competence and its implementation in ELT. However, while formal curricula tend to neglect the needs for developing sociolinguistic competencies, non-formal learning opportunities provide significant possibilities for authentic and reflective engagement with language variation. Teachers' views and ideologies of teaching impact whether they are willing or able to educate students in how to use their sociolinguistic competencies. Sociolinguistic competence can be demonstrated as both teachable and demonstratively improved by teachers who instruct with an intentionality of developing context-rich instruction (Mujiono & Herawati, 2021). The gap between a lack of development of sociolinguistic competence through teaching and what is possible with responsive teacher education lies in providing a framework for educators to engage in critical thinking about current educational ideology surrounding language, provide positive attitudes towards linguistic diversity, and develop socially inclusive educational practices.

4. Methodology

The present study applied a qualitative methodology in order to determine how participants became aware of sociolinguistic aspects as they progressed through a workshop, how they conceptualized themselves as professionals and as classroom role models based on new perspectives acquired from the workshop, and how they (re)developed sociolinguistic awareness were translated into classroom-based teaching methodologies, designs, and practices. Because the study examined the developing understandings, reflections, and meaning making processes of participants, it utilized a qualitative inquiry. This approach provided the opportunity to delve into participants' conceptual growth, identity negotiations, and instructional innovations, while drawing attention to the ways in which participants' interpretations, reflections, and contextual considerations influenced their learning.

Workshop Context and Pedagogical Model

The workshop was part of a three-day extracurricular instructional model referred to as the Sociolinguistic Awareness and Practical Applications Workshop. This workshop was created to develop sociolinguistic awareness in pre-service English as a Foreign Language (EFL) teachers in Türkiye. The workshop was developed

due to shortcomings in current teacher preparation programs and aimed to engage participants in prolonged practice-focused sociolinguistic learning experiences. In general, although sociolinguistics is formally taught as an elective component of the national English Language Teaching (ELT) curriculum in Türkiye, it has been implemented limitedly or irregularly in educational settings, resulting in teacher candidate graduates lacking a deep understanding of language variation, multilingualism or the ideologically laden aspects of language teaching. Thus, the workshop model was designed to create a systematic, dialogical, practical application-orientated learning experience for participants beyond typical coursework.

The workshop was funded by TÜBİTAK (The Scientific and Technological Research Council of Türkiye). It was conducted at a public university in southeastern Türkiye in 2024. A national call for participation was distributed through institutional networks and digital platforms. Criteria for eligibility included enrollment in either the third or fourth year of an ELT undergraduate program, completion of a minimum number of hours of coursework toward graduation, writing of a letter of intent, and lack of previous involvement in similar programs. Of a large applicant pool, twenty-four participants were selected, and twenty-four others were placed on a waiting list. Participants came from a variety of geographic locations, institutions, and languages thereby creating a diverse learning environment and enhancing the dialogue dimensions of the workshop.

In terms of content delivery, the workshop's pedagogical design (see Appendix A) included both theoretical instruction and reflective engagement with participants. Over the course of eleven workshops, participants learned about key sociolinguistic topics such as language variation, translanguaging, multicultural education, textbook analysis, pedagogical linguistic landscapes, and sociolinguistic assessment. The first set of workshops included introductory topics on sociolinguistics. For example, "Introduction to Sociolinguistics" covered basic concepts such as regional and social variation in language, multilingualism, and the relationship between language and identity. Later sessions built upon those introductory concepts and applied them to specific pedagogical contexts. Topics such as "Sociolinguistics and Foreign Language Education," "Micro-Sociolinguistics: Classroom Interaction," "Sociolinguistic Activities in the Classroom," "Textbook Analysis," "Curriculum Design from Multicultural Perspectives," "Translanguaging in Practice," "Sociolinguistic Assessment Strategies," and "Using Rubrics and Reflective Portfolios to Assess Student Learning." The final session involved each participant delivering a short lesson based upon what they had learned during the workshop. Peer and facilitator feedback were solicited via mini-teachings during that session. After the final day of the workshop, there was a synthesis session where participants reflected on what they had learned during the workshop.

During the workshop, teacher candidates participated in structured reflection exercises. Before and after the workshop, they completed reflective journal entries to record their changing thought patterns. Those reflections provided a diagnostic function to assess how participants had taken up sociolinguistic concepts. Participants worked together to plan teaching materials and lesson plans that incorporated sociolinguistic principles. Facilitators for the workshop included professionals who have expertise in sociolinguistics, ELT, and teacher education. Methods used to deliver instruction included interactive lectures, small group work, analysis of cases simulations etc. so that participants could engage with the material through both conceptually and pedagogically.

The workshop was held on campus using facilities available through the university. Interactive white boards, breakout rooms and multimedia classrooms were used during the education. Participants were housed on campus which enabled informal learning opportunities as well as professional networking outside of formal sessions.

Participants

A nationwide application process was used to select participants for the workshop. An attempt was made to ensure diversity in geography,

institution type, and language experience. That diversity added richness to both the learning community during the workshop and to the data generated. When this study was conducted, all participants were pursuing degrees leading to certification as English language teachers. Specifically, fourteen (58%) participants were in their third year of an ELT undergraduate degree program, ten (42%) participants were in their fourth year. In total, there were twenty-one females and three males in the cohort. The demographic characteristics, specifically age and academic development, provide a rich source of variability in terms of professional experience, viewpoint, and pedagogical preparedness.

Data Collection

There were three types of qualitative data (see Table 1) collected at different points in time throughout the workshop. These included: (1) letters of intent submitted prior to attending the workshop, (2) the pedagogical materials that the participants designed, and (3) written reflections submitted the following week. These sources provided a way for the researchers to follow the participants' transition from an intuitive understanding of the sociolinguistics concepts to a more critical and reflective understanding of those same concepts.

Table 1
Summary of Data Sources and Collection Phases

Data source	Timing	Purpose	Format
Letters of intent	Pre-workshop	Capture initial motivations, perceived learning needs, and conceptualizations	Written submissions (Online form)
Pedagogical materials	Workshop day 3	Document applied understanding of sociolinguistic concepts	Posters, lesson plans, activities
Post-workshop reflections	Week following the workshop	Explore shifts in awareness, identity, and pedagogy	Open-ended written responses (Online form)

All data were collected with informed consent from the participants. All data were anonymized prior to analysis. The data collection phases mirrored both the structure and pedagogical progression of the workshop allowing for a comprehensive understanding of how participants constructed their developing sociolinguistic awareness and pedagogical thinking over the course of the workshop.

Data Analysis

Data analysis followed Braun and Clarke's (2022) six-phase reflexive thematic analysis framework. The six stages were iterative, reciprocal and highly interpretive.

In the *familiarization* stage, the lead researcher engaged in repeated readings of all data sources, recording early impressions, emotional undertones, and emerging pedagogical concerns through memo writing. During *coding*, the data were manually and reflexively coded, capturing both semantic and latent dimensions. Codes such as *standard language ideologies*, *linguistic identity*, *teaching as advocacy*, and *student voice* reflected both explicit and implicit discourses. Semantic codes included statements made by participants, i.e., "dialects and accents are not mistakes" was coded as recognition of linguistic variation awareness. Latent codes identified the underlying ideologies present in a participant's comments, i.e., the same comment was also coded as rejecting the ideology of native speakerism. Participants implicitly rejected a monolingual standard language ideology when they referenced dialects and accents, even if they did not use the term "native-speakerism".

Once initial codes were developed, the lead researcher began developing preliminary themes. Preliminary themes were derived by grouping similar initial codes together based on shared meanings. Initial themes included *Reimagining the Role of the Teacher*, *From Awareness to Pedagogical*

Action, and *Sociolinguistics as Ethical Practice.* These candidate themes were then refined through ongoing engagement with the data during the *theme development and review* phase, ensuring each represented a coherent organizing concept with explanatory power, overlapping categories were merged or restructured to improve conceptual clarity. In the *definition and naming* phase, themes were further specified and labeled to reflect participants' experiences while maintaining analytical precision, supported by illustrative data excerpts that showcased variation and complexity. Finally, in *writing the report*, these themes were integrated into a theoretically grounded narrative that highlighted participants' voices and situated their learning within broader discussions of sociolinguistic awareness, teacher identity, and pedagogical transformation.

Reflexivity played a central role in the analytical process. As the lead researcher was responsible for designing and facilitating the workshops, he was also the lead analyst of the data generated from those workshops. As a result of this dual role, there is an inherent potential for confirmatory bias, i.e., interpreting participant feedback so that it validates the merits of the workshop instead of providing critical insights regarding its shortcomings. We acknowledge that confirmatory bias can never be completely eliminated, but it can be actively managed by employing specific practices. For example, the lead researcher kept an analytic memo journal during the entire analysis process to record decision-making processes, identify unexamined assumptions, and capture instances where he experienced ambiguity or conflicting interpretations. Data was examined from a perspective of contextually-based expressions of experience by participants rather than simply viewing their responses as direct indicators of learning outcomes produced by the workshop. The lead researcher examined codes and preliminary themes repetitively with deliberate consideration for examples of ambivalence, resistance or complexity in responses given by participants to avoid solely positive assessments of their responses. Additionally, the lead researcher maintained an ongoing dialogue with fellow researchers concerning possible biases in selecting participant voices to include in the written report. However, we acknowledge that although perhaps unintendedly, the lead researcher's stake in the design of the pedagogy may have influenced the selection of participant voices to include in the written report as well as how those voices were emphasized and interpreted.

Strategies to promote trustworthiness were employed to enhance credibility, transferability and dependability for this study. First, since data was collected from three different sources (letters of intention, post-workshop reflections, pedagogical materials), triangulating the data allowed for a deeper and more complex understanding of participants' perspectives over time. Second, systematic memo writing was employed throughout the analysis to provide a detailed audit trail supporting analytic transparency. Third, despite member checking limitations created by time constraints, participants were asked to express any concerns they might have regarding representation of their data. All aspects of the research design were compliant with the ethical standards established by the local university. In addition, prior to participating in this study, informed consent was obtained from all participants. Furthermore, participants were made aware that they could terminate their involvement in this study at any time. Lastly, pseudonyms were utilized to protect the identities of all participants.

Three members formed a research team to assist with the planning and implementation of this research; however, the lead researcher conducted the data analysis. As recommended by Braun and Clark (2022) the use of a single analyst is a key aspect of the reflexive thematic analysis method and acknowledges both subjectivity and interpretation when developing meaning from qualitative data. Through out the analysis process the lead researcher recorded all decision making systematically and maintained regular communications with other members of the research team to ensure consistency of concepts developed within the study and accepted full responsibility for assigning codes and developing themes. Therefore, this approach to analysis has clearly emphasized transparency, self-awareness and quality of methodological practice consistent with the interpretivist paradigm. It

should also be noted that although using a single coder provides complete control over coding assignments and theme development it does limit opportunities for discussions about cross-coding and potential alternative interpretations of qualitative data that may add additional validity and richness to qualitative studies.

4. Findings

The results of this section are based upon participant responses to all three of the study's research questions and it explores how they developed sociolinguistic awareness, reimagined their professional roles, and applied new insights through pedagogical design.

4.1 Constructing Sociolinguistic Awareness through Extracurricular Engagement

The section addresses Research Question 1, which investigates how EFL teacher candidates develop sociolinguistic awareness during participation in an extracurricular workshop. Using letters of intention, pedagogical materials, and post-workshop reflections, the development of the conceptualization of sociolinguistic awareness is traced, moving from an implicit awareness to a conscious, pedagogic awareness of sociolinguistic problems. Participants developed from a subjective and experiential perspective on linguistic diversity to a more consciously-informed, pedagogically-situated awareness of sociolinguistic issues.

Initial Orientations: From Intuition to Sociocultural Orientation

Pre-workshop letters of participants demonstrated early evidence of sociolinguistic sensitivity, formed by their direct experience rather than by prior theoretical preparation. While few candidates mentioned formal terminology, all referenced concerns related to diversity, identity and inclusion in language teaching. These perspectives are similar to those associated with culturally responsive pedagogy.

Some participants stated that sociolinguistics could provide students with insight into language beyond grammatical and lexical levels. As Dilan observed, sociolinguistics could help learners see language *"not only in terms of grammar and vocabulary but also through social and cultural lenses."* The perspective she takes reflects Canale and Swain's (1980) concept of sociolinguistic competence, that appropriate use of language depends upon social context and not solely on grammatical correctness, even though she does not have the theoretical terminology to label her thinking as such. Other participants linked their personal histories to a desire to create more inclusive approaches. Gönül wrote that she wants to teach in a way that recognizes each student has their own "unique world," and draws on her multilingual history to support this position. This representation of the learner as a "unique world" represents an identity affirming pedagogy (Lindahl et al. 2021), which treats students' linguistic backgrounds as positive resources to recognize rather than as barriers to overcome. Likewise, Yeliz links her past experiences teaching students from linguistically diverse backgrounds to her desire for *"understanding language diversity and sociocultural factors in a more systematic way."* Her expressed need illustrates a practitioner-oriented awareness of the complexities of sociolinguistics, prior to formally engaging with theories.

Even though these writings frequently lack explicit reference to power relationships, language ideologies and questions regarding the legitimacy of languages, they demonstrate growing awareness of language as socially contextualized and dependent upon specific contexts. Most participants did not address concepts such as code switching, native speakerism and standard language ideology directly. This suggests that while there was some awareness of sociolinguistic matters, the vocabulary to articulate these ideas was still developing.

Deepening Perspectives: Language as Contextual and Ideological

Post-workshop reflections showed notable movement toward a more theoretically grounded understanding. They began to articulate a more theoretically informed understanding of language variation, multilingualism, and sociocultural

meaning. Following the workshop, they articulated a more complexly conceived of language based on context, identity and power. For example, Murat noted: *"I realized that sociolinguistics is much more than the relationship between society and language."* Similarly, Pelin wrote: *"Initially, I thought sociolinguistics was only about dialects. Now I see it touches everything from culture, gender, values, to religion and region."* Both participants demonstrate the development of critical language awareness, recognizing that language is not a neutral communication system but is involved in constructing and negotiating social categories such as gender, region and religion.

Participants' perspectives of linguistic variation greatly shifted as well. Many participants reported viewing English dialects, accents, and multilingualism as legitimate forms of cultural and identity-based communication. As Sena observed: *"I now see dialects, accents, code-switching, and translanguaging as valuable expressions of identity and culture, rather than errors."* This conceptualizing marks a transition away from negative views of nonstandard uses of language to pluralistic models of Englishes (Amorim, 2022), in which variation is considered a useful resource rather than a departure from a native speaker model. Likewise, Ennur wrote: *"I realized non-native speakers don't have to try to speak like British or Americans. There are different dialects and accents and these are normal."* These comments represent the initial rejection of native-speakerism (Selvi, 2017) and the beginning acceptance of various forms of English as legitimate within language education.

In addition, participants have become aware of how language ideologies can influence the academic experience of students. Some participants pointed out that the prescriptive attitudes toward 'proper' use of English can have negative effects on students. For example, Dilan stated: *"Dialect marginalization affects learners not only linguistically but also socially and academically. I now see the need to promote linguistic justice in the classroom."* In referencing linguistic justice here, the participants demonstrates an awareness of how standard language ideologies act as instruments of social exclusion, which is a conceptual jump beyond mere tolerance for diversity. For Arda, sociolinguistics acted as a lens to investigate systems of exclusion: *"It's not just about language in society. It's about identity, power, and belonging."* This positioning aligns closely with 'sociolinguistic awareness', which is the ability to perceive language not simply as a communication vehicle but as a mechanism through which social hierarchies, identities and belonging are established, negotiated, and reproduced.

Awareness as Critical Lens

The changes in perception do not simply reflect an expansion of participants' knowledge base. Rather, these changes demonstrate a shift in their perceptions of language itself. At the end of the workshop, participants reported perceiving language as an arena of ideological conflict in which identity, power, and access to social position are constructed.

The development of the participants' awareness has provided a base for gaining a critical perspective. According to the data, they viewed learning language as acquiring social significance, historical customs, and making value-based decisions about when to speak or write (as opposed to viewing language acquisition solely as a linguistic task). While pedagogical implications are addressed in later sections, the development of a fundamental awareness of language as ideologically charged, socially contextualized, and fundamentally human was a crucial conceptual milestone for participants' professional and academic development.

In summary, participants arrived at the workshop with an intuitive appreciation for linguistic diversity; however, they lacked the conceptual vocabulary to describe it. They developed an understanding of sociolinguistic theory and frameworks via an additional level of structured reflection, thus developing a critical lens for observing language as variable, powerful, and related to individual identity.

4.2 Reimagining Professional Identity through Sociolinguistic Insight

This part addresses Research Question 2 and explores how the participants recast their perceptions of professional responsibilities and classroom duties using the sociolinguistic paradigm. The data are used to illustrate an evolution in the participants' views of themselves: from teachers who saw their role as primarily transmitting linguistic information to educators who view themselves as cultural brokers, advocates for equity, and providers of support for learners to develop their identities and develop feelings of belonging.

Initial Dispositions: Teaching with Values, not Theory

Pre-workshop intent letters demonstrated the participants' willingness to engage in pedagogical orientations; however, while many of the them appeared unfamiliar with specific sociolinguistic paradigms, virtually all of the participants articulated values and ideals consistent with the underlying principles of sociolinguistics. Some participants noted that they wanted to implement sociolinguistics to move beyond a focus on grammar instructional design and incorporate social aspects into their instructional designs. For example, Dilan wrote that she was interested in providing students with opportunities to explore language *"not only in terms of grammar and vocabulary but also through social and cultural lenses."* Melek expressed a desire to cultivate *"social consciousness"* and *"intercultural understanding"* in her classroom, while Nalan emphasized the importance of designing *"inclusive and effective teaching strategies"* that reflect students' linguistic and cultural backgrounds. These expressions suggest a predisposition toward accepting sociolinguistic principles even if not employing specific phrases such as 'language ideology', or 'linguistic marginalization'.

A few of the participants documented criticisms of current ELT practice models that failed to account for students' experiences with language outside of the classroom. For example, Murat wrote: *"I want to use every piece of knowledge I gain to improve English teaching in our country."* In addition, Sara advocated for "visionary" and "self-aware" teachers, recognizing the necessity for reflective practice and ideologically grounded critiques.

Overall, the data show a peer group of prospective EFL teachers who have already questioned conventional assumptions that underlie standards for grammar-based instruction. While they lacked a theoretical lexicon, their interest in creating meaningful learning contexts that connect student's lives at home to learning within classrooms, as well as their desire to create inclusive learning environments demonstrated their openness to applying an identity-oriented approach to sociolinguistic learning.

From Awareness to Identification: Identity in Transition

At the conclusion of the workshop, the participants had begun describing themselves not only as English instructors, but as educators devoted to achieving sociolinguistic justice. This change was both conceptual and idealized: they began to voice a vision for teaching English in a manner that emphasized equity, representation and identity.

A common thread throughout these reflections was the participants' rejection of nativespeakerism and standard language ideologies. Gülsüm wrote: *"I realized that sounding 'native' isn't the goal. English belongs to everyone who uses it. Accents and dialects aren't mistakes. They're part of our identities."* Dilan reiterated this thought process by saying: *"We can't just push 'standard English.' I will value all varieties and show how they're appropriate in different contexts."* These comments signified an increasing comprehension of the fact that English represents a diverse, global and disputed area of communication. Therefore, when establishing classroom discussion formats, educators should acknowledge this reality.

Participants' views on what type of classroom they desired to establish also evolved due to this changing perception. Elif said: *"I will include multiculturalism in my classes so students feel like they belong."* Nehir underscored the significance of representing diversity: *"Instead of using materials with only one accent, I'll use those that show cultural differences more broadly."* These comments went further than expressing general support for

inclusiveness; rather they appeared to represent an actual commitment to giving learners voice, visibility and identification within their own identity.

Teaching as Ethical Practice: Becoming Advocates and Mediators

Throughout the final reflections, the participants increasingly positioned themselves as professionals with ethical and social responsibilities as well as pedagogical ones. They began to view language teaching as a form of cultural work in which power, voice and recognition are negotiated alongside grammar and vocabulary.

Several students expanded the role of the teacher beyond language instruction, positioning themselves as cultural mediators and equity advocates. Yeliz noted: *"We need to reflect differences in class, not hide them."* Sara built on this by writing: *"Rather than seeing these [differences] as problems, I'll use them as chances to unify, to share cultural values."* These comments reflected a critical shift: participants no longer viewed difference as a classroom challenge, but as a resource for community and connection.

Some participants also began to imagine themselves as agents of broader institutional or societal change, beyond immediate classroom strategies. For example, Pelin shared: *"I guess my PhD will be in sociolinguistics. I'm enthusiastic. I want to be a part of this community."* Others described the experience as a turning point in their professional development. Ahmet reflected: *"It helped me think beyond CEFR and monolingual practices. I feel freer now as a teacher."* Deniz simply concluded: *"This course changed the field I want to work in."*

These reflections revealed participants' growing engagement with sociolinguistic concepts. These concepts became more than teaching tools. They became part of how participants defined themselves and their work. This pattern suggests an emerging shift in how participants perceived the role of the teacher from technically skilled to intellectual and advocacy-based.

Throughout the workshop, participants renegotiate their professional identities in response to sociolinguistic learning. Initially positioned as well-meaning yet uncritical instructors, they showed early signs of becoming reflective practitioners who viewed language teaching as a culturally embedded, ethically charged and ideologically shaped practice. Sociolinguistics shifted from being an optional extra to becoming a fundamental lens through which participants viewed language, justice, and their own classroom responsibilities. Rather than viewing English language teaching as the neutral transmission of forms, participants embraced a teaching approach centred on identity, difference, and equity. In doing so, they began to reimagine themselves as educators who can confront linguistic hierarchies, amplify student voices and build classrooms that reflect the multilingual and multicultural realities of English as a global language.

4.3 From Awareness to Practice: Materials, Creativity, and Pedagogical Application

Based on participant-produced materials and post-workshop reflections, this section addresses Research Question 3 and illustrates how participants' sociolinguistic learning translated into classroom practice. Once seen as theoretical or abstract, sociolinguistics became a practical framework through which participants could design inclusive, learner-centered lessons that challenged dominant language norms. Instead of simply applying theories of sociolinguistics, participants actively embodied them through creative design choices and critical thinking about their learners.

Early Pedagogical Intentions: Seeds of Practical Innovation

Participants before the workshop frequently stated they wanted to relate sociolinguistic ideas to the "how-to" or practical ways of implementing them in their own classrooms. Though there were few mentions of specific concepts in their letters, all participants frequently wrote about wanting to teach in a manner that is culturally appropriate for each student's needs. They mentioned developing culturally responsive teaching strategies and learner centered approaches and providing materials for their students. Ceren wrote that she hoped the

workshop would assist her in creating *"lesson plans that incorporate sociolinguistic elements"* and give her *"practical training for creating culturally responsive learning environments"*. A similar comment came from Pelin who wrote that she hoped to *"design lesson plans and materials that reflect linguistic diversity and create inclusive classrooms."* Eda had similar hopes when she said she wanted to *"learn how to integrate sociolinguistics into everyday teaching so that students feel seen, heard, and respected for their linguistic identities."* All of these comments were written in an optimistic style, however they suggested a teacher oriented point of view. It implied a beginning towards a pedagogically based approach where sociolinguistics was viewed as something to apply to bring significant changes to the classroom rather than as something to simply remember.

Designing Instruction: Classroom Materials as Sociolinguistic Praxis

Materials developed during the workshop gave insight into how participants began to convert their increasing knowledge of sociolinguistics into tangible ways to implement the sociolinguistic principles into classroom practices. There were materials created for posters, lesson plans, games, and scripts which allowed participants to demonstrate variation, inclusion, and critical awareness of language. The materials showed participants conceptualized application and demonstrated growth in confidence in creating instructional practices consistent with sociolinguistic principles.

Perhaps one of the most common themes developed in relation to the materials were the intentional challenges made to both gendered language and conventionally selected lexicon. Participants created vocabulary-based tasks that evaluated occupational terminology and phrases based on binary ideologies. Tasks including *"ADS-Free Gender Dictionary"*, *"Flip the Script"*, *"Not Your Grand's Dictionary"* were intended to encourage students to think about alternative and inclusive language options when choosing vocabulary. *Firefighter* instead of *fireman*, *humankind* instead of *mankind*, and *partner* instead of *husband/wife* were examples of some of these types of modifications. This was not limited to replacing individual words with other words, and it was part of a larger semiotic field. Visual posters, word play, and bold captions such as *'money doesn't have a gender'*, asked learners to examine how language has subtle implications regarding power. These tasks indicated that participants did not just replace vocabulary words. They promoted learners' critical awareness of language while turning classroom activities into potential sites for ideological reflection.

Another focus area related to multilingualism and regional variation through place-based pedagogical practices. Series of lessons titled "*A Day in Diyarbakır"*, *"Giving Directions with Local Context"* utilized learners' immediate linguistic environments, regional dialects, local geography, and multilingual interactions as entrees to instructional practices. Participants conducted dialogue in regional dialects, such as "*Anlamadım, güzel insan. Sen ne dirsen?"* (I didn't understand it, my dear. What are you saying?) along with questions of intelligibility, identity, and regional pride. Through contextualizing language learning in geographic and linguistic areas familiar to learners, these lessons challenged participants to evaluate what is considered authentic English Language Teaching. Students did not simply decode dialogs, they were expected to think about how language varies by location, culture, and speaker background: a sociolinguistic principle applied practically through the class materials.

Many participants reflected on their increased incorporation of emotions and embodiment into their instructional designs. In order to allow learners to link emotion words with facial expressions, tasks such as *"Guess the Emotion"* and *"Show Your Culture"* were incorporated. Additionally, questions such as *"How do people in your culture express sadness?"* allowed learners to make connections among language, emotion, and culture. This broadened the focus of sociolinguistic research from the study of variation and ideology to the study of emotionally and physically charged aspects of language usage. Learners researched how culturally-defined emotional expression can be linguistically encoded via visual cards, dramatizations and reflective prompts.

Additionally, pragmatic variation was addressed in some of the workshop's tasks. Examples of these types of tasks included the *"Pragmatics Mini-Analysis,"* which asked students to compare different request forms based upon relationship (informal: *"Help me ya"*, polite: *"Can you please assist me?"*, and formal: *"Would you mind helping me?*"). Participants realized that the same message can take on a different connotation depending upon the context or situation in which it is delivered. Furthermore, students seemed to recognize that social factors such as power, status, and familiarity impact the language we select to communicate. Thus, through participation in tasks such as those previously mentioned, participants understood that language is not a fixed entity, but is instead highly variable and responsive to contextual factors. Therefore, these types of tasks demonstrate that even introductory-level courses can address complex sociolinguistic issues if framed appropriately for novice educators.

Reflections on Implementation: Ownership, Voice, and Flexibility

Many participants reported a paradigmatic shift from developing pre-packaged lesson plans to creating their own materials grounded in the lived experience of students and their language practices. A notable trend was the emergence of translanguaging as a preferred methodological choice. Not only did participants view translanguaging as a means to scaffold comprehension, they saw it as a tool to validate all of the languages brought to class by learners. As Yeliz stated: "*Translanguaging helps students feel more confident and less anxious while using English.*" For Elif, this preference for translanguaging also signaled a desire to move away from reliance on commercial textbooks and toward her own development of supplemental materials: "*I will develop my own materials to complement textbooks. Because they almost never raise sociolinguistic awareness.*" In essence, participants were not simply applying what they learned during the workshop, they were asserting their own pedagogical agency and responding to the needs of their students and classrooms.

A second theme of reflection centered around the perceived untapped potential of the linguistic landscape (LL) as a site for pedagogical inquiry. Prior to the workshop, participants viewed public signage, graffiti, metro announcements and advertisements as mere background noise; however, after engaging with this concept, they began to see each as sites of potentially rich sociolinguistic inquiry. As Nehir reflected: *"There are thousands of signs around us. We just never looked at them that way. I will definitely use this in my classroom."* Likewise, Pelin similarly reflected: *"If students learn to notice [language in public spaces], their attention and awareness will improve."* In so doing, participants appeared to be developing a new critical observational orientation toward language, in which language is intentionally examined and interrogated within the context of everyday life rather than passively received.

In addition, participants discussed ways in which they could connect language to biography and a learner's sense of self. Specific strategies for incorporating identity into their curricula were developed including dialect mapping, oral histories, home language presentations, and linguistic autobiography. As Sedat articulated his vision for identity work: *"I want to help students understand that their language use is part of their cultural identity, not something to suppress."* Similarly, Damla emphasized the importance of reflective practice: *"Activities like identity journals will help students connect their language choices to who they are."* Through these practices, participants conceived of the classroom as a place where not only language development occurs but also identity formation and affirmation occur.

Of significant interest was the evident sense of autonomy and professionalism that characterized participants' post-workshop reflections. With respect to their task-based explorations, including their development of multilingual posters (by Başak and Pelin), their design of bilingual menus (by Cemre), and their collaborative critique of a textbook (by Ecem and Murat), participants explored three related concepts: legitimate content, designer/teacher roles, and centering diverse voices. Rather than being seen as merely entertaining, these initiatives were examples of intentional efforts on

the part of participants to disrupt and extend existing pedagogical frameworks through a sociolinguistic lens.

At the end of the workshop, it became clear that participants had moved from a position of conceptual understanding to practical implementation. We observed that they were able to translate sociolinguistic principles into actual classroom tools. The materials and reflections of participants demonstrated a high degree of proficiency in areas including design for variation, identity, critical inquiry, and multilingual inclusion. Unlike viewing sociolinguistics as a stand-alone theory of language behavior, participants chose to adopt it as an educational stance, which prioritizes learners' realities, challenges existing linguistic hierarchies, and encourages creative possibilities within language education.

5. Discussion, Conclusion and Implications

This study explored whether an extracurricular workshop could assist pre-service EFL teachers in Türkiye develop sociolinguistic awareness. The primary focus was on understanding how teacher candidates utilized major sociolinguistic concepts while engaging in an alternate type of instruction, how this process of engagement influenced students' developing sense of themselves as professionals, and, how this ultimately influenced their views toward their future classrooms. A secondary goal of the research included examining types of pedagogical practices that emerged as a result. In doing so, the research aimed to address one of several ongoing gaps present in formal ELT curricula. In particular, it offered an additional site for students to engage in critical thinking about their own identities, negotiate their developing identities as educators, and experiment with new ideas regarding teaching and learning. It should be noted, however, that the results reported here are representative of stated orientations and early conceptual shifts during the course of a short, intense learning experience, and do not reflect proven or sustained modifications to classroom practices over time.

Findings demonstrated that participants were able to internalize fundamental principles of sociolinguistics through a combination of structured reflection and collaborative instructional planning and design. Examples of these include: recognition of the legitimacy of language variation, recognition of the ideologically-based nature of language standards, and, the importance of identity in language use. Evidence supporting these conclusions were found in both participant-produced written reflections and instructional resources developed by them. Materials developed by the students highlighted inclusive, culturally responsive and critically reflective models of teaching. In addition, the experience provided participants with an introductory foundation upon which to begin questioning their role as professional culture brokers and advocates for inclusive language use instead of transmitters of standard norms. The model provided a theoretical base for participants to challenge dominant paradigms and explore alternatives to traditional forms of English language instruction.

These findings are consistent with prior research, which highlights that while sociolinguistics provides important insight into how students use language and what they learn through it, sociolinguistics has historically been marginalized within ELT programs (Abd Rahman et al., 2022; Korkmaz & Karatepe, 2023; Yu, 2008). The workshop's dialogic and pedagogical design allowed the participants to move beyond their initial intuition-based understanding to develop critical, applicable knowledge. As described by Lindahl et al. (2021) and Rehner and Lasan (2023), this movement is part of the necessary transformation in teacher education from transmission of information and knowledge to continuous critical reflection. Furthermore, as Bayyurt (2013) pointed out, this is also part of the larger reconceptualization in teacher education regarding awareness of the linguistic diversity of students and the role of English as an International Language and intercultural communication in the classroom are becoming more central components of pedagogical responsibilities.

In addition to learning new vocabulary terms, participants applied sociolinguistic concepts to create innovative, reflective pedagogical designs. For example, many tasks that were similar to those

identified in previous research (Mujiono & Herawati, 2021; Solmaz, 2023) including identity journals, contrastive pragmatics, and digital mapping demonstrated the potential of experiential, contextualized learning experiences to support the development of sociolinguistic competence. Similarly, as recommended by Amorim (2022) and Hsieh and Chuang (2021), authentic materials and the application of critical reflection are both effective methods for supporting the development of sociolinguistic awareness.

Additionally, Özkan and İlhan (2025) provide quantitative evidence demonstrating that translanguaging-oriented pedagogies can positively impact learners' sociolinguistic skills and promote learners' positive attitudes towards multilingualism. The participant's reflections in the current study mirror these results. Overall, the data indicates that regardless if the opportunity is presented as part of a formal course or extracurricular workshop, reflective approaches using authentic opportunities can foster increased sociolinguistic awareness and ability to navigate languages in multiple settings.

Equally significant finding from the study is related to changes in participants' perception of themselves as future educators. Specifically, several participants viewed themselves as linguistically aware advocates and as inclusive practitioners, which aligned with existing research on the relationship between language ideology and teacher identity (Bayyurt & Sifakis, 2017; Karakaş, 2021). While previous studies have documented that pre-service teachers may experience ambiguity when thinking about Global Englishes and alternatives to traditional language ideologies, this study demonstrates how ongoing critical engagement can counteract these feelings and help facilitate the development of more active reflection-oriented teacher identities.

The workshop's informal, explorative nature was important to the extent of conceptual and attitudinal change expressed by participants. Given that the vast majority of the literature regarding professional development focuses on curriculum-based projects (e.g., Mede & Dikilitaş, 2015), the workshop's format, emphasizing dialogue and emotional connection, allowed for deeper levels of conceptual and attitude change compared to those of more structured formats. These commonalities support the claims of Diniz de Figueiredo and Sanfelici (2017) and Vettorel and Lopriore (2017) about non-formal learning environments being valid and productive sites for developing the awareness needed to understand issues of sociolinguism and ideology.

Several researchers have argued that sociolinguistic content is often too abstract or unpractically applied in classrooms (Hsieh & Chuang, 2021; Yu, 2008). However, when sociolinguistic concepts were contextualized to the participants' experiences, facilitated through group discussion, and designed into pedagogy, they were rendered relevant and valuable. In this way, the study supports Lindahl et al.'s (2021) claim that the cultivation of 'sociolinguistic consciousness' requires purposeful, critical and creative pedagogical spaces that allow students to think critically about instruction and creatively plan lessons.

Notwithstanding the contribution of the study, there were limitations. First, due to a number of factors including an initial small pool of applicants, selection bias occurred during the application process. While this was likely to result in a self-selecting pool of candidates with critical thinking skills related to pedagogy, which limits the generalizability of the findings. Second, as previously stated, the workshop itself lasted only three days and allowed only minimal time for participants to begin to implement changes to their pedagogical practices. Third, the primary source of data collected was participants' self-reporting via written reflection and their own production (i.e., video recordings), thus, social desirability bias and short-term enthusiasm may have affected reporting. Finally, because only one person coded and analyzed themes using the reflexive thematic analysis method, no inter-coder agreement or validation existed and lessened the validity of the results. Lastly, since no longitudinal data were collected regarding participants' teaching practices in subsequent years, determining whether any knowledge or skills gained through participation in the workshop resulted in long-term positive classroom practices remains uncertain.

Given these findings, future research will be necessary to demonstrate how sociolinguistic competencies can be developed in formal coursework and extracurricular programming in ELT curricula. Future studies examining how participants apply their knowledge and skills after entering the workforce will help establish whether the insights created through such programs are translated into lasting classroom practices. Furthermore, comparative studies exploring how sociolinguistic awareness is influenced by varying educational environments will contribute to understanding differences among countries and institutions.

Integrating classroom observation, students' perceptions, and co-created teaching tools will enhance our understanding of the pedagogical influence as well. Ultimately, teacher education programs should create experientially-based, reflective, ideologically-aware learning opportunities that see linguistic diversity as a resource for pedagogy rather than an obstacle to it. This call is reinforced by recent quantitative evidence showing that pre-service EFL teachers in Türkiye continue to display negative attitudes toward non-native varieties of English, pointing to systemic gaps that experiential and ideologically-aware curricula must address (Atar, 2026). Future scholarship should further develop participatory, contextualized, and learner-centered approaches to sociolinguistic teacher education based upon the lived experiences of both teachers and students around the world.

This study demonstrates that non-formal extracurricular learning settings can contribute to the development of sociolinguistic competence among pre-service English as a Foreign Language (EFL) teachers in Türkiye. Through reflective, practice-based engagement, participants engaged with their professional identity formation, challenged prevailing language ideologies, and constructed inclusive learner-centered pedagogies. The findings emphasize the importance of situating sociolinguistic awareness at the center of teacher education.

The workshop model used in this study was contingent upon specific institutional and funding conditions (TÜBİTAK funding, a national recruitment system, hosting capacity of a public university). Thus, it would be mistaken to portray the workshop model as easily transferable to other contexts. Resource constraints, institutional priorities, lack of competitive funding mechanisms may make large scale replication impossible in many places. Nevertheless, the core pedagogical design architecture of the workshop (i.e., the thematic sequence, design of reflective tasks, micro-teaching component, multimodal data collection) do not require unique institutional arrangements. Teacher educators working within regular coursework, professional development days, or departments' smaller-scale initiatives could integrate each element independently without duplicating the entire logistical structure. Therefore, the model should be considered as a modular pedagogical template whose components can be selected and incorporated into existing teacher education programs to address local needs and constraints.

Acknowledgments

The authors gratefully acknowledge the support of the Scientific and Technological Research Council of Türkiye (TÜBİTAK) for funding the workshop, which provided the context for this study. We also thank the team of instructors for their valuable contributions to the workshop and the participating pre-service English language teachers for their enthusiastic engagement, reflective insights, and creativity, all of which enriched the research.

The authors further acknowledge the use of artificial intelligence (AI) tools for language editing purposes in preparing this manuscript. The responsibility for the content, analysis, and interpretations rests solely with the authors.

References

Abd Rahman, S. N., Razali, A. B., Abd Samad, A., Jeyaraj, J. J., & Abdullah, N. S. (2022). Developing sociolinguistic competence in the ESL classroom: A case study of ESL instructors in a Malaysian university. *Asian Journal of University Education, 18*(4), 1156–1170. https://doi.org/10.24191/ajue.v18i4.20038

Amorim, F. da S. (2022). Educational sociolinguistics: Towards a pedagogical model for teaching Englishes instead of English. *Entretextos, 22*(3), 199–215. https://doi.org/10.5433/1519-5392.2022v22n3p199-215

Aslan, K., & Nazlı , E. H. . (2024). A case study with Sponge Bob through sociolinguistics: Improving the English language learning awareness in young learners. *Focus on ELT Journal, 6*(3), 1–15. https://doi.org/10.14744/felt.6.3.1

Atar, C. (2026). Focusing on sociolinguistic attitudes and media literacy: A correlational study on pre-service English language teachers. S*tudies in Linguistics, Culture, and FLT, 14*(1). https://doi.org/10.46687/ONPC1800

Bayyurt, Y. (2013). Current perspectives on sociolinguistics and English language education. *Journal of Language Teaching and Learning, 3*(1), 69-78.

Bayyurt, Y., & Sifakis, N. C. (2017). English language education for intercultural communication and English as a lingua franca. In L. E. Arnold & A. Murata (Eds.), *Reflections on English language teaching in the 21st century* (pp. 45–58). Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Borg, S. (2003). Teacher cognition in language teaching: A review of research on what language teachers think, know, believe, and do. *Language Teaching, 36*(2), 81–109. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444803001903

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2022). Conceptual and design thinking for thematic analysis. *Qualitative Psychology, 9*(1), 3–26. https://doi.org/10.1037/qup0000196

Briceño, A., Rodriguez-Mojica, C., & Muñoz-Muñoz, E. (2018). From English learner to Spanish learner: Raciolinguistic beliefs that influence heritage Spanish speaking teacher candidates. *Language and Education, 32*(3), 212–226. https://doi.org/10.1080/09500782.2018.1429464

Canale, M., & Swain, M. (1980). Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing. *Applied Linguistics, 1*(1), 1–47.

Diniz de Figueiredo, E. H., & Sanfelici, A. M. (2017). Addressing Culture from an EIL Perspective in a Teacher Education Course in Brazil. In A. Matsuda (Ed.), *Preparing Teachers to Teach English as an International Language* (pp. 147–156). Multilingual Matters. https://doi.org/10.21832/9781783097036-012

Elyas, T., & Solmaz, O. (2024). Preface to the special issue "Exploring the intersection of Sociolinguistics and English language teaching (ELT): Navigating diversity, dynamics, and discourse". *Focus on ELT Journal, 6*(3), i-iv. https://doi.org/10.14744/felt.6.3.0

Hsieh, M.-H., & Chuang, H.-H. (2021). Investigating pre-service English teachers' beliefs of sociolinguistic instruction in EFL classes in Taiwan. *TESOL and Technology Studies, 2*(2), 16–28. https://doi.org/10.48185/tts.v2i2.219

Ismail, H. (2022). Bridging the gaps between knowledge and needs: Sociolinguistics materials based on project-based learning. *Journal of Research and Innovation in Language, 4*(3), 276–289.

İlhan, B.,& Ozkan, Y.(2025). Translanguaging Pedagogy: Benefits and Perceptions in EFL Listening and Reading Comprehension. *The Journal of Language Teaching and Learning, 15*(2), 24-43.

Karakaş, A. (2021). İngilizce öğretmenlerinin 2023 Eğitim Vizyonu'nda yer alan yabancı dil eğitimi ile ilgili hedeflere yönelik görüşleri. *MAKÜ Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü Dergisi, 9*(11), 47–86.

Korkmaz, S., & Karatepe, Ç. (2023). Exploring the pragmatic awareness and competence of EFL instructors at tertiary level. *Anadolu Journal of Educational Sciences International, 13*(1), 34–55. https://doi.org/10.18039/ajesi.1086084

Li, X. (2010). Sociolinguistic variation in the speech of learners of Chinese as a second language. *Language Learning, 60*(2), 366–408. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9922.2009.00560.x

Lindahl, K., Fallas-Escobar, C., & Henderson, K. I. (2021). Linguistically responsive instruction for Latinx teacher candidates: Surfacing language ideological dilemmas. *TESOL Quarterly, 55*(4), 1190–1220. https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.3079

Mede, E., & Dikilitaş, K. (2015). Teaching and learning sociolinguistic competence: Teachers' critical perceptions. *Participatory Educational Research, 2*(3), 14–31. https://doi.org/10.17275/per.15.29.2.3

Mujiono, M., & Herawati, A. N. (2021). Developing students' sociolinguistic competence using e-learning: A quasi-experimental study. *International Journal of Language Education, 5*(4), 67–77.

Rehner, K., & Lasan, I. (2023). Developing second language learners' sociolinguistic competence: How teachers' CEFR-related professional learning aligns with learner-identified needs. *Education Sciences, 13*(3), 1–17. https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci13030282

Selvi, A. F. (2017). Preparing teachers to teach English as an international language: Reflections from Northern Cyprus. In A. Matsuda (Ed.), *Preparing Teachers to Teach English as an International Language* (pp. 114–128). Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Solmaz, O. (2023). Linguistic landscapes tasks in global Englishes teacher education. *ELT Journal, 77*(4), 416–425. doi:10.1093/elt/ccad027

Solmaz, O., Nazlı, E. H., & Nazlı, K. (2023). *Toplumdilibilim Araştırmaları: Kuramsal ve Uygulamalı Yaklaşımlar*. Çizgi Yayınları.

Vettorel, P., & Lopriore, L. (2017). WE, EIL, ELF and awareness of their pedagogical implications in teacher education programs in Italy. In A. Matsuda (Ed.), *Preparing teachers to teach English as an international language* (pp. 195–207). Multilingual Matters.

Yu, M. (2006). On the teaching and learning of L2 sociolinguistic competence. *The Asian EFL Journal, 8*(2), 111–126.

Yu, M. (2008). Teaching and learning sociolinguistic skills in university EFL classes in Taiwan. *TESOL Quarterly, 42*(1), 31–53.

Appendix. The Course Layout and Content

Day	Time	Course Title	Instructors
Day 1	08:00–09:45	Introduction & Program Overview	Instructors 1, 2, 3
Day 1	10:00–11:45	Introduction to Sociolinguistics	Instructor 2
Day 1	13:00–14:45	Sociolinguistics and Foreign Language Education	Instructor 4
Day 1	15:00–16:45	Micro-Sociolinguistics: Classroom Interaction	Instructor 5
Day 2	08:00–09:45	Sociolinguistic Activities in the Classroom	Instructor 2
Day 2	10:00–11:45	Sociolinguistics and English Textbooks	Instructor 6
Day 2	13:00–14:45	Pedagogical Linguistic Landscapes as a Field of Sociolinguistics and Its Practical Applications	Instructor 1
Day 2	15:00–16:45	Multiculturalism in Foreign Language Education	Instructor 7
Day 3	08:00–09:45	Translanguaging in Foreign Language Classrooms	Instructor 8
Day 3	10:00–11:45	Assessment of Sociolinguistic Elements in Language Classrooms	Instructor 5
Day 3	13:00–14:45	Participant Presentations on the Use of Sociolinguistics in English Classrooms	All Instructors
Day 3	15:00–16:45	Sociolinguistic Activity Assessment and Feedback Review & Closure	All Instructors