

Encyclopedia of
Language and Education
Series Editor: Stephen May

SPRINGER
REFERENCE

Patricia A. Duff
Stephen May *Editors*

Language Socialization

Third Edition

 Springer

Encyclopedia of Language and Education

Series Editor

Stephen May

Faculty of Education and Social Work

The University of Auckland

Auckland, New Zealand

In this third, fully revised edition, the 10 volume *Encyclopedia of Language and Education* offers the newest developments, including an entirely new volume of research and scholarly content, essential to the field of language teaching and learning in the age of globalization. In the selection of topics and contributors, the Encyclopedia reflects the depth of disciplinary knowledge, breadth of interdisciplinary perspective, and diversity of sociogeographic experience in the language and education field.

Throughout, there is an inclusion of contributions from non-English speaking and non-Western parts of the world, providing truly global coverage. Furthermore, the authors have sought to integrate these voices fully into the whole, rather than as special cases or international perspectives in separate sections.

The Encyclopedia is a necessary reference set for every university and college library in the world that serves a faculty or school of education, as well as being highly relevant to the fields of applied and socio-linguistics. The publication of this work charts the further deepening and broadening of the field of language and education since the publication of the first edition of the Encyclopedia in 1997 and the second edition in 2008.

More information about this series at <http://www.springer.com/series/15111>

Patricia A. Duff • Stephen May
Editors

Language Socialization

Third Edition

 Springer

Editors

Patricia A. Duff
University of British Columbia
Vancouver, BC, Canada

Stephen May
Faculty of Education and Social Work
The University of Auckland
Auckland, New Zealand

ISBN 978-3-319-02254-3 ISBN 978-3-319-02255-0 (eBook)
ISBN 978-3-319-02256-7 (print and electronic bundle)
DOI 10.1007/978-3-319-02255-0

Library of Congress Control Number: 2017945922

1st edition: © Kluwer Academic Publishers 1997

2nd edition: © Springer Science+Business Media LLC 2008

© Springer International Publishing AG 2017

This work is subject to copyright. All rights are reserved by the Publisher, whether the whole or part of the material is concerned, specifically the rights of translation, reprinting, reuse of illustrations, recitation, broadcasting, reproduction on microfilms or in any other physical way, and transmission or information storage and retrieval, electronic adaptation, computer software, or by similar or dissimilar methodology now known or hereafter developed.

The use of general descriptive names, registered names, trademarks, service marks, etc. in this publication does not imply, even in the absence of a specific statement, that such names are exempt from the relevant protective laws and regulations and therefore free for general use.

The publisher, the authors and the editors are safe to assume that the advice and information in this book are believed to be true and accurate at the date of publication. Neither the publisher nor the authors or the editors give a warranty, express or implied, with respect to the material contained herein or for any errors or omissions that may have been made. The publisher remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.

Printed on acid-free paper

This Springer imprint is published by Springer Nature

The registered company is Springer International Publishing AG

The registered company address is: Gewerbestrasse 11, 6330 Cham, Switzerland

Editor in Chief's Introduction to the "Encyclopedia of Language and Education"

This is one of ten volumes of the *Encyclopedia of Language and Education* published by Springer. The *Encyclopedia* – now in this, its 3rd edition – is undoubtedly the benchmark reference text in its field. It was first published in 1997 under the general editorship of the late David Corson and comprised eight volumes, each focused on a single, substantive topic in language and education. These included: language policy and political issues in education, literacy, oral discourse and education, second language education, bilingual education, knowledge about language, language testing and assessment, and research methods in language and education.

In his introductory remarks, David made the case for the timeliness of an overarching, state-of-the-art review of the language and education field. He argued that the publication of the *Encyclopedia* reflected both the internationalism and interdisciplinarity of those engaged in the academic analysis of language and education, confirmed the maturity and cohesion of the field, and highlighted the significance of the questions addressed within its remit. Contributors across the 1st edition's eight volumes came from every continent and from over 40 countries. This perhaps explains the subsequent impact and reach of that 1st edition – although no one (except, perhaps, the publisher!) quite predicted its extent. The *Encyclopedia* was awarded a Choice Outstanding Academic Title award by the American Library Association and was read widely by scholars and students alike around the globe.

In 2008, the 2nd edition of the *Encyclopedia* was published under the general editorship of Nancy Hornberger. It grew to ten volumes as Nancy continued to build upon the reach and influence of the *Encyclopedia*. A particular priority in the 2nd edition was the continued expansion of contributing scholars from contexts outside of English-speaking and/or developed contexts, as well as the more effective thematic integration of their regional concerns across the *Encyclopedia* as a whole. The 2nd edition also foregrounded key developments in the language and education field over the previous decade, introducing two new volumes on language socialization and language ecology.

This 3rd edition continues both the legacy and significance of the previous editions of the *Encyclopedia*. A further decade on, it consolidates, reflects, and expands (upon) the key issues in the field of language education. As with its predecessors, it overviews in substantive contributions of approximately 5000 words each, the historical development, current developments and challenges, and

future directions, of a wide range of topics in language and education. The geographical focus and location of its authors, all chosen as experts in their respective topic areas, also continues to expand, as the *Encyclopedia* aims to provide the most representative international overview of the field to date.

To this end, some additional changes have been made. The emergence over the last decade of "superdiversity" as a topic of major concern in sociolinguistics, applied linguistics, and language education is now a major thread across all volumes – exploring the implications for language and education of rapidly changing processes of migration and transmigration in this late capitalist, globalized world. This interest in superdiversity foregrounds the burgeoning and rapidly complexifying uses of language(s), along with their concomitant deconstruction and (re)modification, across the globe, particularly (but not exclusively) in large urban environments. The allied emergence of multilingualism as an essential area of study – challenging the long-held normative ascendancy of monolingualism in relation to language acquisition, use, teaching, and learning – is similarly highlighted throughout all ten volumes, as are their pedagogical consequences (most notably, perhaps, in relation to translanguaging). This "multilingual turn" is reflected, in particular, in changes in title to two existing volumes: *Bilingual and Multilingual Education* and *Language Awareness, Bilingualism and Multilingualism* (previously, *Bilingual Education* and *Language Awareness*, respectively).

As for the composition of the volumes, while ten volumes remain overall, the *Language Ecology* volume in the 2nd edition was not included in the current edition, although many of its chapter contributions have been reincorporated and/or reworked across other volumes, particularly in light of the more recent developments in superdiversity and multilingualism, as just outlined. (And, of course, the important contribution of the *Language Ecology* volume, with Angela Creese and the late Peter Martin as principal editors, remains available as part of the 2nd edition.) Instead, this current edition has included a new volume on *Language, Education and Technology*, with Steven Thorne as principal editor. While widely discussed across the various volumes in the 2nd edition, the prominence and rapidity of developments over the last decade in academic discussions that address technology, new media, virtual environments, and multimodality, along with their wider social and educational implications, simply demanded a dedicated volume.

And speaking of multimodality, a new, essential feature of the current edition of the *Encyclopedia* is its multiplatform format. You can access individual chapters from any volume electronically, you can read individual volumes electronically and/or in print, and, of course, for libraries, the ten volumes of the *Encyclopedia* still constitute an indispensable overarching electronic and/or print resource.

As you might expect, bringing together ten volumes and over 325 individual chapter contributions has been a monumental task, which began for me at least in 2013 when, at Nancy Hornberger's invitation, Springer first approached me about the editor-in-chief role. All that has been accomplished since would simply not have occurred, however, without support from a range of key sources. First, to Nancy Hornberger, who, having somehow convinced me to take on the role, graciously

agreed to be consulting editor for the 3rd edition of the *Encyclopedia*, providing advice, guidance, and review support throughout.

The international and interdisciplinary strengths of the *Encyclopedia* continue to be foregrounded in the wider topic and review expertise of its editorial advisory board, with several members having had direct associations with previous editions of the *Encyclopedia* in various capacities. My thanks to Suresh Canagarajah, William Cope, Viv Edwards, Rainer Enrique Hamel, Eli Hinkel, Francis Hult, Nkonko Kamwangamalu, Gregory Kamwendo, Claire Kramersch, Constant Leung, Li Wei, Luis Enrique Lopez, Marilyn Martin-Jones, Bonny Norton, Tope Omoniyi, Alastair Pennycook, Bernard Spolsky, Lionel Wee, and Jane Zuengler for their academic and collegial support here.

The role of volume editor is, of course, a central one in shaping, updating, revising and, in some cases, resituating specific topic areas. The 3rd edition of the *Encyclopedia* is a mix of existing volume editors from the previous edition (Cenoz, Duff, King, Shohamy, Street, and Van Deusen-Scholl), new principal volume editors (García, Kim, Lin, McCarty, Thorne, and Wortham), and new coeditors (Lai and Or). As principal editor of *Language Policy and Political Issues in Education*, Teresa McCarty brings to the volume her longstanding interests in language policy, language education, and linguistic anthropology, arising from her work in Native American language education and Indigenous education internationally. For *Literacies and Language Education*, Brian Street brings a background in social and cultural anthropology, and critical literacy, drawing on his work in Britain, Iran, and around the globe. As principal editors of *Discourse and Education*, Stanton Wortham has research expertise in discourse analysis, linguistic anthropology, identity and learning, narrative self-construction, and the new Latino diaspora, while Deoksoon Kim's research has focused on language learning and literacy education, and instructional technology in second language learning and teacher education. For *Second and Foreign Language Education*, Nelleke Van Deusen-Scholl has academic interests in linguistics and sociolinguistics and has worked primarily in the Netherlands and the United States. As principal editors of *Bilingual and Multilingual Education*, Ofelia García and Angel Lin bring to the volume their internationally recognized expertise in bilingual and multilingual education, including their pioneering contributions to translanguaging, along with their own work in North America and Southeast Asia. Jasone Cenoz and Durk Gorter, principal editors of *Language Awareness, Bilingualism and Multilingualism*, bring to their volume their international expertise in language awareness, bilingual and multilingual education, linguistic landscape, and translanguaging, along with their work in the Basque Country and the Netherlands. The principal editor of *Language Testing and Assessment*, Elana Shohamy, is an applied linguist with interests in critical language policy, language testing and measurement, and linguistic landscape research, with her own work focused primarily on Israel and the United States. For *Language Socialization*, Patricia Duff has interests in applied linguistics and sociolinguistics and has worked primarily in North America, East Asia, and Central Europe. For *Language, Education and Technology*, Steven Thorne's research

interests include second language acquisition, new media and online gaming environments, and theoretical and empirical investigations of language, interactivity, and development, with his work focused primarily in the United States and Europe. And for *Research Methods in Language and Education*, principal editor, Kendall King, has research interests in sociolinguistics and educational linguistics, particularly with respect to Indigenous language education, with work in Ecuador, Sweden, and the United States. Finally, as editor-in-chief, I bring my interdisciplinary background in the sociology of language, sociolinguistics, applied linguistics, and educational linguistics, with particular interests in language policy, Indigenous language education, and bilingual education, along with my own work in New Zealand, North America, and the UK/Europe.

In addition to the above, my thanks go to Yi-Ju Lai, coeditor with Kendall King, and Iair Or, coeditor with Elana Shohamy. Also, to Lincoln Dam, who as editorial assistant was an essential support to me as editor-in-chief and who worked closely with volume editors and Springer staff throughout the process to ensure both its timeliness and its smooth functioning (at least, to the degree possible, given the complexities involved in this multiyear project). And, of course, my thanks too to the approximately 400 chapter contributors, who have provided the substantive content across the ten volumes of the *Encyclopedia* and who hail from every continent in the world and from over 50 countries.

What this all indicates is that the *Encyclopedia* is, without doubt, not only a major academic endeavor, dependent on the academic expertise and good will of all its contributors, but also still demonstrably at the cutting edge of developments in the field of language and education. It is an essential reference for every university and college library around the world that serves a faculty or school of education and is an important allied reference for those working in applied linguistics and sociolinguistics. The *Encyclopedia* also continues to aim to speak to a prospective readership that is avowedly multinational and to do so as unambiguously as possible. Its ten volumes highlight its comprehensiveness, while the individual volumes provide the discrete, in-depth analysis necessary for exploring specific topic areas. These state-of-the-art volumes also thus offer highly authoritative course textbooks in the areas suggested by their titles.

This 3rd edition of the *Encyclopedia of Language and Education* continues to showcase the central role of language as both vehicle and mediator of educational processes, along with the pedagogical implications therein. This is all the more important, given the rapid demographic and technological changes we face in this increasingly globalized world and, inevitably, by extension, in education. But the cutting edge contributions within this *Encyclopedia* also, crucially, always situate these developments within their historical context, providing a necessary *diachronic* analytical framework with which to examine *critically* the language and education field. Maintaining this sense of historicity and critical reflexivity, while embracing the latest developments in our field, is indeed precisely what sets this *Encyclopedia* apart.

Volume Editor's Introduction to "Language Socialization"

Since the late 1970s, a growing and increasingly diverse body of research on *language socialization* has examined how young children and others become communicatively and culturally competent within their homes, educational institutions, and other discourse communities, both local and transnational, and how language (in its many varieties and modes) mediates that process. The research has examined the spoken, written, signed, embodied, multimodal, multilingual, and additional (often syncretic) semiotic systems people use to construct meanings with others in their everyday lives. In doing so, people also index their positionalities within their social spheres. This work has studied the identities, stances, values, and practices that characterize membership in a particular cultural group that newcomers (and others) are expected to appropriate when learning and using language and which the newcomers may in fact take up, dismiss, or contest in many possible ways. In recent years, as many chapters in this volume indicate, language socialization has also given prominence to linguistic and other ideologies powerfully implicated in people's intellectual and practical engagements with language and with other human beings.

This 3rd edition volume of the *Encyclopedia of Language and Education*, with its focus squarely on language socialization, complements other volumes in this Encyclopedia series in several ways: (1) it uses insights and methods from linguistic anthropology, in particular, to attend to the social, cultural, and interactional contexts in which language and other kinds of knowledge are inculcated and displayed, both formally and informally; (2) it examines closely the role of teachers, caregivers, peers, siblings, and other more experienced members of the culture who explicitly or implicitly help those needing support to gain expertise in the ways of the community; (3) it generally involves ethnographic and discourse analytic approaches to linguistic enculturation but also draws on interdisciplinary theoretical perspectives and methods from within and outside of anthropology to understand learning ecologies and activities; (4) it considers language learning as a complex sociocultural and cognitive process that occurs on many developmental, temporal, and spatial scales, both in observed moments of interaction and over generations or centuries of social evolution; and (5) it engages critically with macro-social, political, and (other) ideologies of language, culture, and habitus, on the one hand, and with micro-level

aspects of language use, such as grammatical particles, on the other, seeing phenomena at these different levels or scales as mutually constitutive and inseparable.

This volume complements another edited volume devoted to language socialization research published since the 2nd edition version of this volume (2008): the very impressive *Handbook of Language Socialization*, coedited by Duranti, Ochs, and Schieffelin (2012, Wiley-Blackwell). There are several key differences between this volume and theirs, however. This current volume focuses much more on education in institutions of learning beyond the home; and in research situated within homes in this volume, there is a greater emphasis, over all, on meaning making through multilingual semiotic systems. Finally, many chapters in this volume address issues of transnational socialization among young children, adolescents, and adults across highly heterogeneous geographical, academic, professional, linguistic, digital, and ethnolinguistic communities affected by globalization.

Although most chapters in this volume include a section on the early developments of research within the particular learning context featured, Elinor Ochs and Bambi Schieffelin, in their important first chapter, provide a helpful retrospective narrative and framing of the historical and disciplinary roots of language socialization in psychology, anthropology, linguistics, sociology, and education. They chart its development by scholars situated in the United States in particular, where the majority of researchers conducting language socialization research have been educated even if their landmark fieldwork was conducted in distant lands, as it was in many cases. Indeed, because of its early and enduring association with American linguistic anthropology, language socialization research has only gradually been taken up by researchers located in non-English-dominant societies; some of these latter researchers examine similar phenomena but from different theoretical and analytic traditions, which they may or may not frame as "language socialization." As a result of the field's genesis in, and diffusion from, the United States, Vol. 8 has fewer authors from institutions outside Anglophone regions of North America than other Encyclopedia volumes. Yet, the research represented in this volume includes work being undertaken in a wide and diverse range of ethnolinguistic communities and geographical regions of the world, from small-scale and preindustrialized societies to highly industrialized ones. Authors describe practices in Australia, Cameroon, Canada, Caribbean countries, Finland, France (and other parts of *la francophonie*), Japan, Hungary, Israel, Italy, Papua New Guinea, Samoa, South Korea, Sweden, Thailand, the United Kingdom, and the United States, among other regions and combinations thereof.

A crucial principle of language socialization emphasized in each chapter is the following: that gaining competence in ways of using language and representing meanings, including in our primary languages, is a dynamic, ongoing process that occurs throughout one's life, from birth to death. However, whereas many studies of infants' and children's language socialization have been conducted over the past generation or two, insufficient research has examined the middle and far end of the continuum, namely, older adults – not (only) as socializers but as "socializees." Whether living together in seniors' communities or functioning within multi-generational households and neighborhoods, too little attention has been paid to

language and aging from a language socialization perspective. In some cases, degenerative health conditions such as dementia necessitate the learning of new ways of communicating with loved ones, caregivers, and medical and other personnel. In view of the quickly aging populations in most industrialized countries, this topic of language and aging requires considerably more interdisciplinary research going forward – among healthy older individuals learning new languages and literacy practices required for work, for leisure, and for short-term or permanent residence in other linguistic communities or in multilingual extended families; among older adults learning new communication strategies as their erstwhile “normal” functioning or that of their significant others begins to deteriorate for a variety of social, psychological, and medical reasons; and among the caregivers and (other) professionals and acquaintances who interact with these individuals and must also be socialized into effective new modes of communication in response to the changing needs and abilities of their interlocutors.

In addition to being a lifelong process of learning and adaptation, language socialization and its accompanying discourse practices vary across the activities and communities one participates in at any given age or stage in life. Each family, classroom, or cultural group has its own norms, preferences, and expectations about language and literacy practices based on local (and nonlocal) ideologies and policies. The chapters in this volume reflect that diversity of experience and also change over time by noting the different ways in which people may engage in language socialization across activities – and languages – within homes, schools, and universities. They also reveal how, in many (in)migrant contexts, newcomers may not find themselves accommodated or welcomed, due to racism, class bias, and other forms of prejudice, resulting in conflict and social exclusion.

Although language socialization has typically examined the practices and norms of “neurotypical” populations, insights regarding the experiences and orientations of neuro-atypical individuals, such as those with autism spectrum disorder, are discussed in this volume. In addition, linguistically mediated socialization within arts-based youth groups, in gangs, and in online (digital) communities and interactions is given some prominence. Highly competitive and creative hiphop ciphers, for example, constitute an intriguing context for language socialization research, where members learn to hone their skills at speaking out artfully, using a wealth of critical semiotic resources, against social injustice and marginalization and other topics. The challenges of first-language and additional-language socialization involving academic literacies in higher education and vocational training, across a range of professions, are documented in this volume as well.

Certainly, these are but a few of the communities and types of socializing agents and experiences that could have been included in this volume. Missing are accounts of language socialization within a variety of religious communities (for established members as well as outsiders seeking entry and affiliation); in subcultures of gender and sexual minorities in which particular kinds of language use may constitute important markers of social belonging and difference; in sports and other recreational groups; in political organizations; and in the myriad professions or vocations not described here. Missing, too, is a detailed account of socialization in

non-Western communities in South Asia and the Middle East, and among people across a wider range of abilities/disabilities. The chapters in this volume therefore represent a partial selection of current scholarship on language socialization or of what could conceivably be studied from this approach. Fortunately, the research surveyed in the other nine volumes in the Encyclopedia extends what is presented here. In this volume, we are happy to include a fuller discussion of socialization into and through particular languages and contexts than in the 2nd edition. However, geographical, linguistic, and cultural absences from the scholarly accounts reflect the dearth of research in those domains connected with education.

The parts in this volume, within the home or at school (with a focus on children), among adolescents and adults, or, alternatively, in particular communities where an age group is not being foregrounded, reflect an organic and socially situated lifespan approach. As many authors note, successful engagement in the discourse practices in one context (e.g., at school, in higher education, or work) typically presupposes prior language and literacy socialization in other relevant contexts albeit possibly in another language or culture. Furthermore, scholars recognize that language socialization is a bi- or multidirectional and contingent process in which not only novices but also more experienced community members are being socialized by means of mutual engagement in language and literacy practices. However, a focus on children in the home or at school sometimes inadvertently obscures the notion that within those same contexts older siblings, parents, teachers, and others are simultaneously being socialized into new practices, languages, orientations, mediational means, and understandings. Furthermore, although attention to hierarchies of power and knowledge has been central to much language socialization research, in this volume there is increasing recognition that *peer socialization*, especially among youth, is an equally rich, but less hierarchical, context for learning and induction into local groups. What is more, language socialization at home, in community groups, and in educational institutions is often concurrent and interdependent; it may occur in a very similar, compatible, and complementary manner – or in a completely different, even contradictory, way. Thus, the part divisions in this volume are mainly used for heuristic thematizing purposes, but readers should think of these parts as layers in multilayered and heavily textured experiences of lifeworld as well as lifelong socialization.

In addition to conceiving of these contexts as different, overlapping, and intersecting layers of experience, we must understand the potential for innovation and syncretism within any particular stratum or locus of socialization that may have ripple effects throughout local social ecologies. Language socialization for many people and communities in the twenty-first century involves the coexistence of more than one language or dialect, may be mediated by new information and communication technologies, and may entail the development of syncretic linguistic, discursive, and cultural practices and corresponding hybrid identities. Nowhere is such hybridity and multilingualism more apparent than in some of the transnational, diasporic, immigrant, and postcolonial communities described in this volume and in hip-hop culture. Such hybridity and syncretism contrasts with earlier work that focused on primarily monolingual populations and discourse processes (often

involving different registers and genres). Naturally, in many regions of the world numerous languages and cultures have coexisted or been in contact for generations if not millennia, so this hybridity and multiplicity of linguistic and cultural experience is not a new phenomenon. However, it is an important current focus in language socialization. Much research in "foreign-" or second-language learning contexts, as well as in multilingual or diglossic contexts in which a colonial language may be the language of formal education, highlights the different language ideologies and norms into which newcomers are socialized and the discontinuities as well as continuities that may exist between home/community and school practices.

This volume is organized around six parts. **Part 1** presents historical, theoretical, and methodological approaches to language socialization research and the emergence of language socialization as a distinct subfield of linguistic anthropology and applied linguistics with obvious relevance to education. Following the detailed historical overview chapter by Ochs and Schieffelin, Sune Vork Steffensen and Claire Kramsch examine theoretical issues in second language acquisition and socialization in light of current ecological perspectives. Next, Geoff Williams presents a systemic functional linguistic approach to language socialization, drawing on the foundational scholarship of Basil Bernstein, Michael Halliday, and Ruqaiya Hasan, in particular. Last in this part, the chapter by Duanduan Li examines research on the socialization of pragmatics, including speech acts and politeness routines, in first and second language contexts and among both children and adults.

Part 2 focuses to a great extent on children in their interactions with family members and peers at home and in the community. Explicit or implicit family language policies often govern language choice and other aspects of language use within the home. The first piece, by Shoshana Blum-Kulka (now deceased), describes studies of language socialization in the context of family dinnertime discussions in the United States, Italy, Greece, and Israel, and other countries. Next, Lyn Wright Fogle and Kendall King describe the politics and practices of language use in bilingual and multilingual homes in terms of language socialization. Amy Paugh then considers how children are socialized into understandings about the nature, value, and tensions connected with work as a result of hearing about and observing the working lives of their parents. Kate Pahl highlights language socialization and multimodality (e.g., involving different kinds of juxtaposed images, scripts, and texts) in multilingual urban homes in the UK and elsewhere. The last chapter in this part, by Amy Kyratzis and Marjorie Goodwin, describes dynamic processes of peer language socialization among children.

Part 3 surveys research on language and literacy socialization in the context of schools. Ariana Mangual Figueroa and Patricia Baquedano-López, citing seminal sociological research, discuss issues connected with (re)production, resistance, and transformation in linguistic and cultural practices in schools (e.g., in classrooms and parent-teacher meetings) in diaspora and other settings, and particularly those schools affected profoundly by globalization and increasing diversity. Leslie Moore presents research on additional-language education (i.e., beyond primary languages) and multilingualism in non-Western settings – in Africa (e.g., Cameroon), East Asia, and Central Europe – and the effects of colonialism, religious

education, and globalization on indigenous practices and language ideologies. Kathryn Howard provides examples of research in a similarly broad cross section of geographical domains, from Papua New Guinea and Thailand to islands in the Caribbean, where vernacular and national standard languages used at home and at school, respectively, may give way to syncretic or hybrid codes and practices or may cross domains (e.g., use of the vernacular language at school or the standard national variety at home). She examines cross-generational language shift among school-aged children in terms of language ideologies. Agnes He describes research on heritage language education and socialization, a fertile area for language socialization research, particularly in immigrant-receiving countries such as the United States in which families try to maintain their ancestral languages through home-language and community-school engagements. Finally, Xiao Lan Curdt-Christiansen deals with an understudied topic in relation to language/literacy socialization and education by examining the crucial socializing role played by textbooks and the messages they contain about citizenship and social histories and imaginaries.

In **Part 4**, Shirley Brice Heath provides a far-reaching, multicentury perspective on the socialization and apprenticeship of adolescents and young adults into a range of semiotic practices within their voluntary learning communities, both those condoned by society and not. Celeste Kinginger reviews research on socialization in study abroad language learning contexts, such as when American university students take part in sojourns in France or China for purposes of language study. Also connected to university language socialization, Masaki Kobayashi, Sandra Zappa-Hollman, and Patricia Duff describe academic discourse socialization, examining how students learn to take part in oral, written, multimodal, and online course-related communication and assignments using the language of instruction, typically English, and other languages they may know. Patricia Duff then examines the relationship between language socialization in higher education contexts, such as universities and vocational programs, and socialization for work in the service sector and in professions such as medicine, law, and education. Last in this part, Pamela Saunders examines the possibilities for applying a language socialization approach to research on persons with dementia and their caregivers, a field that in the past has relied mainly on methods such as lab-based cognitive assessments associated with biomedical fields, psycholinguistics, psychology, speech pathology, nursing, and gerontology. She underscores the multifaceted nature of socialization, where not only interlocutors must find suitable ways to communicate anew, but professional programs must socialize new practitioners into appropriate practices (i.e., to *not* use "elderspeak") and dispositions toward more person-centered, identity-affirming interactions with those with dementia.

Part 5 contains timely accounts of socialization within and across particular ethnolinguistic communities where the focus is less on the age of learners or the institutional context of socialization and more on the particularities of the languages and communities themselves in their myriad varieties and historical (often colonial and dispersed) contexts. Diane Pesco and Martha Crago describe language socialization in Canadian Aboriginal communities, including both rural and urban, and monolingual and bi- or multilingual groups (e.g., Cree, Inuit, or Algonquin, in

combination with French and/or English). Haruko Cook and Matthew Burdelski document research in Japanese as a first and second language in Japan and elsewhere, highlighting how (and why) learners of Japanese are socialized to encode affect, honorifics, gender-appropriate forms, and formal register in their speech. Netta Avineri and Sharon Avni describe the many languages (e.g., English, Hebrew, and Yiddish) and linguistic styles used within Jewish communities in the diaspora, and especially in the United States. They discuss the notion of "metalinguistic communities" in which members orient to particular Jewish linguistic or cultural ideologies and practices, such as the formulaic use Yiddish, to index their group identification, nostalgia, and imagined community rather than as a means of developing or expressing their linguistic competence in that language.

Juyoung Song describes language socialization in Korean transnational communities, typically in families seeking English education for their children in Anglophone countries in order to gain (and display) social and symbolic capital and cosmopolitanism (English-knowing international cachet and Korean "coolness"). Song also documents Korean first- and second-language studies examining micro-linguistic aspects of socialization to index social hierarchy, morality, group harmony, and other culturally valued and encoded meanings. Robert Bayley describes socialization in Latina/o/x (hereafter Latino) communities in North America, emphasizing diversity in a category ("Latinos") that is often discussed generically, but includes not only Spanish-speaking bilinguals negotiating English societal norms as well as different regional varieties of Spanish, but also Deaf and Indigenous Latino persons invested in other languages and (sub-)cultures and identities as well, including religious ones. Finally in this part, Kathleen Riley, citing Bourdieusian and other French sociolinguistic/sociological intellectual traditions as well as theory stemming from linguistic anthropology, reviews research in Francophone communities around the world (in *la francophonie*). Much of the research, especially in metropolitan Paris, focuses on socialization at mealtimes into acceptable ways of speaking and orienting to food and thus into valued "foodways." Riley also notes that due to the legacy of France as a colonial power, in former colonies French and many other local languages, including creoles, coexist but are assigned different institutional roles, status, and prestige depending on local ideologies and processes of language shift. French also competes with English in some of these same postcolonial contexts.

Finally, **Part 6** contains chapters on research in a far-ranging cluster of additional communities and contexts. These include Deaf individuals, digital community members, young people with autism, hiphop artists and groups, and diverse immigrant populations in Europe. Carol Erting and Marlon Kuntze present research on signed-language socialization for Deaf individuals around the world. This socialization into signed languages often occurs in late childhood or even adulthood, depending on whether the Deaf learners' parents are also proficient in a signed language. Next, Jonathon Reinhardt and Steven Thorne discuss language socialization in digital contexts, both synchronous and asynchronous, where turn taking and other aspects of interaction may be completely different from those in face-to-face interactions. Drawing on sociolinguistics as well as language socialization, they examine fan fiction (fandom communities), online multiplayer gaming, and social

networking sites such as Facebook as vital contemporary contexts for translingual, intercultural, digitally mediated language socialization and identity work. Laura Sterponi discusses recent research involving people with autism. She notes the oft-cited dimensions of pragmatics, echolalia, pronominal usage, perspective-taking, and too-literal interpretations displayed by individuals with autism that can make communication challenging. She also suggests that language socialization perspectives (theories and methods) can shed light on interactional and communicative practices and can challenge certain beliefs about autism by attending to sociocultural as well as psychological/interpersonal processes.

Marcyliena Morgan describes how language socialization insights can be extended to African-American hip-hop culture, particularly in the context of hip-hop *ciphers*. These are groups that meet in schools and communities to perform, hear, and judge hip-hop, and where counterlanguage ideologies (e.g., related especially to race-based discrimination, but other social ills as well), identities, and practices are inculcated and performed through language in highly creative, historically constituted, intertextual ways. Inmaculada García-Sánchez and Kristina Nazimova, in the final chapter in the volume, report on language socialization research in immigrant communities in Europe. They investigate the ideologies, identities, and cultural/linguistic practices associated with newcomers and their local counterparts (e.g., other children at school) that shape some (e.g., Muslim and North African) immigrants' experiences of social stigmatization and lack of belonging within mainstream society. They demonstrate how these ideologies become very salient when analyzing interactions at school, such as when newcomers are denied access to playtime with their peers, or are routinely teased, blamed, and shamed because of their perceived difference and inferiority.

The chapters in all six parts showcase exciting developments in the young field of language socialization and possibilities for future work both using traditional language socialization methods and other approaches. As noted above, most of the authors approach the phenomenon of language socialization from a similar starting point but then engage with various additional intellectual traditions and disciplines, using a range of methods from linguistic anthropology, functional linguistics, psychology, applied linguistics, semiotics, and sociolinguistics. As a set, the chapters provide compelling insights into the complex and often fraught sociocultural and ideological territory that novices enter into vis-à-vis a community's codes and practices. Less well documented, however, is the successful adaptation (i.e., socialization) of more established members to new members and their changing contexts, practices, linguistic varieties, and ideologies.

Authors in this volume critique taken-for-granted theoretical binaries such as theory/method, first/second (or additional) language, home/school, novice/expert, local/global, structure/agency, learner/world, and oral/written modes as the distinctions between each binary become increasingly blurred and blended in actual practice. Indeed, reifications of the constructs of community, identity, language, ideology and learner, for example, or any particular ethnolinguistic designation made above, are problematic. So too are discussions of these elements as independent of the complex ecologies and histories of each, and stratifications each is

subjected to. Similarly, the authors contest notions of *deficit* in situations where language users do not exhibit full control of certain linguistic resources; instead, language socialization scholars illustrate the resourcefulness and ingenuity of language users using the semiotic tools and repertoires at their disposal to maintain a sense of voice and personhood even when societal and other factors threaten to erase or demean these. The authors also suggest greater reflexivity among researchers as well as research participants about their respective roles, actions, and sense-making in the research enterprise.

The conditions for learning vary considerably across the chapters. In some contexts, strong, stable models of the valued target practices exist (e.g., in longstanding family dinnertime narrative traditions); in others, practices are being contested or are undergoing significant change or innovation, as in communities experiencing language shift, language revitalization, or the development of new communication codes (e.g., in online communication and groups). In yet other contexts, expert models of communicative competence may be fleeting, inaccessible, or absent from language learners' immediate lives (e.g., for the deaf children of hearing parents who do not have access to signed language in the home, community, or school, sometimes for many years; or for Indigenous persons yearning to reclaim their ancestral languages with few fluent speakers of those languages left). The communication skills once possessed by mature, communicatively competent individuals, for complex reasons, may demonstrate dramatic regression in their abilities or, in the case of some individuals with autism, may never fully gain a "normal" repertoire of linguistic and communicative ability. The coexistence of multiple language codes, orthographies, and symbolic or semiotic systems only increases the possible range of trajectories, experiences, challenges, and epistemologies learners might experience in any of the above contexts.

It is our sincere hope that this volume will contribute meaningfully to current understandings and debates about language socialization and language education and will also catalyze future research in areas recommended by the authors as well as in those ethnolinguistic, geographical, developmental, and other community contexts that have not been adequately represented here or investigated up to now. Further scholarship in language socialization, as demonstrated so well in these chapters, will help illuminate the often taken-for-granted richness and complexity of everyday interactions in the service of human learning, enculturation, and communicative competence and will also inform effective educational interventions for novices seeking legitimacy, proficiency, and integration in their new discourse communities.

Acknowledgment

Thanks to the following for their key editorial support:

Consulting Editor: Nancy Hornberger

Editorial Assistant: Lincoln Dam

Contents

Part I Language Socialization: Theoretical and Methodological Issues	1
Language Socialization: An Historical Overview	3
Elinor Ochs and Bambi Schieffelin	
The Ecology of Second Language Acquisition and Socialization	17
Sune Vork Steffensen and Claire Kramsch	
Language Socialization: A Systemic Functional Perspective	33
Geoff Williams	
Pragmatic Socialization	49
Duanduan Li	
Part II Children's Language Socialization at Home and in the Community	63
Language Socialization and Family Dinnertime Discourse	65
Shoshana Blum-Kulka	
Bi- and Multilingual Family Language Socialization	79
Lyn Wright Fogle and Kendall A. King	
Language Socialization in Working Families	97
Amy L. Paugh	
Language Socialization and Multimodality in Multilingual Urban Homes	111
Kate Pahl	
Language Socialization in Children's Peer and Sibling-Kin Group Interactions	123
Amy Kyratzis and Marjorie Harness Goodwin	

Part III Language Socialization and Schooling	139
Language Socialization and Schooling	141
Ariana Mangual Figueroa and Patricia Baquedano-López	
Multilingual Socialization and Education in Non-Western Settings	155
Leslie C. Moore	
Language Socialization, Language Ideologies, and Language Shift Among School-Aged Children	169
Kathryn M. Howard	
Heritage Language Learning and Socialization	183
Agnes Weiyun He	
Language Socialization Through Textbooks	195
Xiao Lan Curdt-Christiansen	
Part IV Language Socialization Among Adolescence and Adults ...	211
Language Socialization in the Learning Communities of Adolescents ...	213
Shirley Brice Heath	
Language Socialization in Study Abroad	227
Celeste Kinginger	
Academic Discourse Socialization	239
Masaki Kobayashi, Sandra Zappa-Hollman, and Patricia A. Duff	
Language Socialization, Higher Education, and Work	255
Patricia A. Duff	
Language Socialization Among Persons with Dementia and Their Caregivers	273
Pamela A. Saunders	
Part V Language Socialization in Particular Ethnolinguistic Communities	289
Language Socialization in Canadian Indigenous Communities	291
Diane Pesco and Martha B. Crago	
Language Socialization in Japanese Communities	309
Haruko Minegishi Cook and Matthew Burdelski	
Language Socialization in Jewish Communities	323
Netta Avineri and Sharon Avni	

Language Socialization in Korean Transnational Communities	339
Juyoung Song	
Language Socialization in Latino Communities	351
Robert Bayley	
Language Socialization in Francophone Communities	363
Kathleen C. Riley	
Part VI Language Socialization in Additional Communities and Contexts	381
Signed Language Socialization in Deaf Communities	383
Carol J. Erting and Marlon Kuntze	
Language Socialization in Digital Contexts	397
Jonathon Reinhardt and Steven L. Thorne	
Language Socialization and Autism	411
Laura Sterponi	
Language Socialization Through Hip-hop Culture	425
Marcyliena Morgan	
Language Socialization and Immigration in Europe	441
Inmaculada García-Sánchez and Kristina Nazimova	
Index	457

About the Editors



Patricia (Patsy) Duff is Professor and Distinguished University Scholar in the Department of Language and Literacy Education at the University of British Columbia, Canada. Her research and publications examine language teaching, learning, and socialization in multi-lingual, transnational contexts primarily and qualitative research methods in applied linguistics. Her books include: *Teaching and Learning English Grammar: Research Findings and Future Directions* (coedited with M. Christison, D. Christian and N. Spada, Routledge, 2015); *Learning Chinese: Linguistic, Socio-cultural, and Narrative Perspectives* (with coauthors T. Anderson, R. Ilnyckyj, E. VanGaya, R. Wang and E. Yates; De Gruyter, 2013); *Language Socialization* (in the 2nd edition of the *Encyclopedia of Language and Education*, coedited with N. Hornberger, Springer, 2008); *Case Study Research in Applied Linguistics* (Lawrence Erlbaum/Taylor & Francis, 2008); and *Inference and Generalizability in Applied Linguistics* (coedited with M. Chalhoub-Deville and C. Chapelle; John Benjamins, 2006). Her articles and chapters have appeared in many other books and journals. Her website is: <http://pduff.lled.educ.ubc.ca/>



Stephen May is Professor of Education in Te Puna Wānanga (School of Māori and Indigenous Education) in the Faculty of Education and Social Work, University of Auckland, New Zealand. He is an international authority on language rights, language policy, bilingualism and bilingual education, and critical multicultural approaches to education and, to date, has published 15 books and over 90 articles and chapters in these areas. His key books include *The Multilingual Turn* (2014), *Language and Minority Rights* (2nd edition, 2012) and, with Christine Sleeter, *Critical Multiculturalism: Theory and Praxis*

(2010). In addition to being Editor-in-Chief of the 3rd edition of the *Encyclopedia of Language and Education*, he is a Founding Editor of the interdisciplinary journal *Ethnicities* and was from 2005–2015 Associate Editor of *Language Policy*. He is also a Fellow of the American Educational Research Association (AERA). His homepage is <http://www.education.auckland.ac.nz/uoa/stephen-may>.

Advisory Board

Suresh Canagarajah Pennsylvania State University, University Park, PA, USA

William Cope Common Ground Publishing, Champaign, IL, USA

Jim Cummins University of Toronto, Toronto, ON, Canada

Viv Edwards University of Reading, Reading, UK

Eli Hinkel Seattle University, Seattle, WA, USA

Francis Hult Lund University, Lund, Sweden

Nkonko Kamwangamalu Howard University, Washington, DC, USA

Gregory Kamwendo University of Kwazulu-Natal, Durban, South Africa

Claire Kramsch University of California, Berkeley, CA, USA

Rainer Enrique Hamel Universidad Autónoma Metropolitana, Mexico City, Mexico

Constant Leung King's College, London, UK

Li Wei University College London, London, UK

Luis Enrique Lopez Universidad Mayor de San Simón, Cochabamba, Bolivia

Marilyn Martin-Jones University of Birmingham Edgbaston, Birmingham, UK

Bonny Norton University of British Columbia, Vancouver, BC, Canada

Tope Omoniyi London, UK

Alastair Pennycook University of Technology, Sydney, Australia

Bernard Spolsky Bar-Ilan University, Ramat Gan, Israel

Lionel Wee National University of Singapore, Singapore, Singapore

Jane Zuengler University of Wisconsin, Madison, WI, USA

Tope Omoniyi: deceased.

External Reviewers

Language Socialization

Duanduan Li
Trini Stickle
Martin Guardado
Eva Lam
Jérémie Séror
Bambi Schieffelin
Ava Becker-Zayas

Contributors

Netta Avineri Middlebury Institute of International Studies at Monterey (MIIS), Monterey, CA, USA

Sharon Avni City University of New York (CUNY), New York, NY, USA

Patricia Baquedano-López University of California, Berkeley, Berkeley, CA, USA

Robert Bayley Department of Linguistics, University of California, Davis, Davis, CA, USA

Shoshana Blum-Kulka Hebrew University of Jerusalem, Jerusalem, Israel

Matthew Burdelski Osaka University, Osaka, Japan

Haruko Minegishi Cook University of Hawai'i, Honolulu, HI, USA

Martha B. Crago McGill University, Montreal, Canada

Xiao Lan Curdt-Christiansen University of Bath, Bath, UK

Patricia A. Duff University of British Columbia, Vancouver, BC, Canada

Carol J. Erting Gallaudet University, Washington, DC, USA

Lyn Wright Fogle Department of English, University of Memphis, Memphis, TN, USA

Inmaculada García-Sánchez Department of Anthropology, Temple University, Philadelphia, PA, USA

Marjorie Harness Goodwin UCLA, Los Angeles, CA, USA

Agnes Weiyun He Stony Brook University, Stony Brook, NY, USA

Shirley Brice Heath Stanford University, Stanford, CA, USA

Kathryn M. Howard Teacher Education and Foundations Department, California State University, San Bernardino, CA, USA

Kendall A. King University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, MN, USA

Celeste Kinginger Department of Applied Linguistics, Pennsylvania State University, University Park, PA, USA

Masaki Kobayashi Department of English, Kanda University of International Studies, Chiba, Chiba Prefecture, Japan

Claire Kramsch Graduate School of Education, University of California, Berkeley, Berkeley, CA, USA

Marlon Kuntze Gallaudet University, Washington, DC, USA

Amy Kyratzis University of California at Santa Barbara, Santa Barbara, CA, USA

Duanduan Li The University of British Columbia, Vancouver, BC, Canada

Ariana Mangual Figueroa Graduate School of Education, Rutgers University, New Brunswick, NJ, USA

Leslie C. Moore The Ohio State University, Columbus, OH, USA

Marcyliena Morgan Harvard University, Cambridge, MA, USA

Kristina Nazimova Department of Anthropology, Temple University, Philadelphia, PA, USA

Elinor Ochs Department of Anthropology, University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA), Los Angeles, CA, USA

Kate Pahl University of Sheffield, Sheffield, UK

Amy L. Paugh Department of Sociology and Anthropology, James Madison University, Harrisonburg, VA, USA

Diane Pesco Concordia University, Montreal, QC, Canada

Jonathon Reinhardt University of Arizona, Tucson, AZ, USA

Kathleen C. Riley Rutgers University, New York, NY, USA

Pamela A. Saunders Georgetown University School of Medicine, Washington, DC, USA

Bambi Schieffelin Department of Anthropology, New York University, New York, NY, USA

Juyoung Song Murray State University, Murray, KY, USA

Sune Vork Steffensen Department of Language and Communication, University of Southern Denmark, Odense M, Denmark

Laura Sterponi University of California, Berkeley, Berkeley, CA, USA

Steven L. Thorne Portland State University, Portland, OR, USA
University of Groningen, Groningen, Netherlands

Geoff Williams Department of Language and Literacy Education, The University of British Columbia, Vancouver, BC, Canada

Faculty of Education and Social Work, University of Sydney, Sydney, NSW, Australia

Sandra Zappa-Hollman Department of Language and Literacy Education, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, BC, Canada

Part I

**Language Socialization: Theoretical and
Methodological Issues**

Language Socialization: An Historical Overview

Elinor Ochs and Bambi Schieffelin

Abstract

Language socialization hinges on the potential of embodied communication to engage novices in apprehending and realizing familiar and novel ways of thinking, feeling, and acting with others across the life span. Language socialization presupposes that community members desire and expect children and other novices to display appropriate forms of sociality and competence. Language becomes instrumental in effectuating these ends through symbolic and performative capacities that mediate human experience. Language socialization is rarely explicit, relying instead of novices' ability to infer meanings through routine indexical associations between verbal forms and socio-cultural practices, relationships, institutions, emotions, and thought-worlds. Socialization is sometimes cast as the passive transmission of knowledge from experts to novices. Language socialization instead is viewed as an outcome of synergistic communicative entanglements of novices with sources of knowledge, human, or otherwise. Asymmetries in knowledge do not neatly map on to power and maturity. Indeed, novices' flexibility towards shifting socio-political conditions and technological tools propels innovation. Early language socialization studies analyzed linguistic "input" as enmeshed in ideologies relevant to children's communicative competence. Communities that routinely align infants as partners in dyadic conversations predominantly use simplified speech in their presence. Communities that routinely direct infants' attention to others in multiparty surroundings align them as onlookers, overhearers, and relayers of prompts, thereby immersing them in

E. Ochs (✉)

Department of Anthropology, University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA), Los Angeles, CA, USA

e-mail: eochs@anthro.ucla.edu

B. Schieffelin

Department of Anthropology, New York University, New York, NY, USA

e-mail: bs4@nyu.edu

appropriate registers of adults and older siblings. Contemporary research focuses on language socialization's role in shaping language and cultural hybridity and shift, in both diasporic communities in industrialized societies and indigenous communities in contact with postcolonial institutions.

Keywords

Linguistic Anthropology • Language Ideology • Communicative Competence

Contents

Language Socialization and Language Acquisition	4
Language Socialization and Linguistic Anthropology	8
Related Articles in the Encyclopedia of Language and Education	11
References	12

Language Socialization and Language Acquisition

Research in the area of language socialization initially considered the relation between language acquisition and socialization, which had been separated by disciplinary boundaries, psychology, on the one hand, and anthropology and sociology, on the other. Developmental psycholinguistic research focused (and continues to focus) upon phonological and grammatical competence of young children as individuals who are neurologically and psychologically endowed with the capacity to become linguistically competent speakers of a language along a developmental progression (Bloom 1970; Brown et al. 1968; Slobin 1969). Language acquisition research since the late 1960s has debated the source of linguistic competence as located either in innate structures, as the product of verbal input from the child's environment, or some combination of both (Chomsky 1965; Pinker 1994; Snow 1972, 1995). Socialization research posed a set of complementary but independently pursued questions, primarily revolving around the necessity for children to acquire the culturally requisite skills for participating in society, including appropriate ways of acting, feeling, and thinking. In foundational anthropological studies of childhood and adolescence cross-culturally (e.g., LeVine et al. (1994), Mead (1928), Whiting et al. (1975)) as well as in pre-1960s sociological theorizations of continuities and discontinuities in social order across generations, verbal resources generally were not investigated as a critical component of socialization processes (Mead 1934; Parsons 1951). As a result, the sociocultural nexus of children's communicative development remained largely an uncharted academic territory, and the disciplines that addressed the paths of different types of knowledge acquisition – psycholinguistic and sociocultural – remained isolated from each other.

The first systematic initiative to bridge these academic divisions took place at the University of California Berkeley Language Behavior Research Laboratory, where a team of psychologists, linguists, and anthropologists formulated a comparative research agenda for studying language acquisition, set forth in *A Field Manual for Cross-cultural Study of the Acquisition of Communicative Competence* (Slobin 1967).

This endeavor drew from and was strengthened by Gumperz's (1968) notion of the "speech community" as a unit of analysis and Hymes' (1972a) formulation of "communicative competence," which encompasses the realm of sociocultural knowledge necessary for members of a speech community to use language in socially appropriate ways. Integral to communicative competence is members' ability to participate in "speech events," that is, socially recognized activities that occur in specified situational settings, involving participants performing one or more socially relevant acts using communicative resources in conventionally expected ways to achieve certain outcomes (Duranti 1985; Hymes 1972a, b). In linguistic anthropology, the enterprise called Ethnography of Communication (Hymes 1964a; Gumperz and Hymes 1972) inspired field investigations of a speech community's repertoire of communicative forms and functions as they complexly interface in communicative events in relation to "facets of the cultural values and beliefs, social institutions and forms, roles and personalities, history and ecology of a community" (Hymes 1974, p. 4).

From the late 1960s through the 1970s, the cross-cultural study of children's developing communicative competence began to take empirical shape. Ethnographies of communication modeled on the 1967 field manual presented children's communicative development as organized by linguistic, social, and cultural processes (cf. Blount 1969; Kernan 1969; Stross 1969). In addition, children's socio-culturally organized ways of becoming literate inside and outside the classroom as well as an interest in the social shaping of classroom communication became a topic of interest (Cazden et al. 1972; Heath 1978). And paralleling linguists' and psychologists' interest in the pragmatic underpinnings of grammar, the study of children's discourse competence (Ervin-Tripp and Mitchell-Kernan 1977) as well as the field of "developmental pragmatics" (Ochs and Schieffelin 1979) became focal areas of study. Developmental pragmatics broadly addresses the interactional and discursive context of and precursors to children's acquisition of syntactic and semantic structures along with the development of children's discursive and conversational competence.

In 1975–1977, Schieffelin conducted a longitudinal study of children's language acquisition among the Kaluli people of Papua New Guinea (Schieffelin 1985). In 1978–1979, Ochs conducted a longitudinal study of Samoan children's language acquisition (Ochs 1985). Informed by both psycholinguistic and linguistic anthropological approaches and issues in children's language development, each researcher assumed responsibility for (1) systematically collecting and analyzing a corpus of young children's spontaneous utterances recorded at periodic intervals and (2) documenting the sociocultural ecology of children, including prevailing and historically rooted beliefs, ideologies, bodies of knowledge, sentiments, institutions, conditions of social order, and practices that organize the lifeworlds of growing children within and across social settings.

Reuniting at the completion of their fieldwork, Ochs and Schieffelin (1984) proposed that the process of acquiring language is embedded in and constitutive of the process of becoming socialized to be a competent member of a social group and that socialization practices and ideologies impact language acquisition in concert

with neurodevelopmental influences. The first proposition echoes Hymes' (1972a) notion that linguistic competence is a component of communicative competence, noted above. The second proposition – that local socialization paradigms (together with biological capacities) organize language acquisition – poses a stronger claim. The argument presents linguistic and sociocultural development as intersecting processes and the language-acquirer as a child born into a lifeworld saturated with social and cultural forces, predilections, symbols, ideologies, and practices that structure language production and comprehension over developmental time.

These ideas coalesced in the generation of a research field called *language socialization* (Ochs and Schieffelin 1984, 1995; Schieffelin and Ochs 1986a, b), which encompasses socialization *through* language and socialization *into* language. The term draws from Sapir's classic 1933 article on "Language" in the *Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences*, in which he states, "Language is a great force of socialization, probably the greatest that exists" (p. 159). A primary goal of language socialization research is to analyze children's verbal interactions with others not only as a corpus of utterances to be examined for linguistic regularities but also, vitally, as socially and culturally grounded enactments of preferred and expected sentiments, aesthetics, moralities, ideas, orientations to attend to and engage people and objects, activities, roles, and paths to knowledge and maturity as broadly conceived and evaluated by families and other institutions within a community (Heath 1983, 1990).

The spark that fueled the launching of language socialization research was Ochs and Schieffelin's observation that the widespread linguistic simplification and clarification associated with baby talk register did not characterize how Samoan and Kaluli caregivers communicated with young children (Ochs 1982; Ochs and Schieffelin 1984). Caregivers in both of these communities scaffolded infants' and young children's language and social development by constantly orienting them to pay attention to people, positioning them as observers and overhearers of recurrent social activities, and prompting them to repeat utterances to those in their environment. Ochs and Schieffelin proposed a language socialization typology in which communities and/or settings within communities are categorized as predominantly orienting young children to adapt to social situations (situation-centered) or predominantly orienting social situations to adapt to young children (child-centered). In this typology, baby talk register is part of a larger set of child-centered socio-cultural dispositions in communities (see Solomon (2012)). Alternatively, the Samoan and Kaluli dispreference for simplifying and clarifying in communicating with young children is consonant with local ideologies regarding the limits of knowledge, the paths to knowledge, and the social positioning of children. Kaluli and Samoan caregivers' reluctance to clarify children's unintelligible utterances with an "expansion," for example, was linked to a prevailing reluctance for a person to explicitly assert or guess another person's unexpressed or unclear thoughts or feelings (Ochs 1988; Schieffelin 1990). In addition, Samoan caregivers' disinclination to simplify for young children was consistent with their belief that higher status persons do not accommodate down and that displays of attention and respect to older persons are key to children's social development (Ochs 1988).

Paradoxically, these observations about baby talk register at once support a rigorous biological capacity for children's acquisition of phonology and grammar, flourishing independent of extensive grammatical simplification and clarification in the communicative environment, and an equally rigorous requirement for children's sociocultural attunement to language-mediated acts, activities, genres, stances, meanings, roles, relationships, and ideologies through the process of language socialization. That Kaluli and Samoan infants become competent speakers without being constantly addressed with simplified input indicates that such input is neither universal nor necessary for acquisition of linguistic structures. Indeed, the situation-centric orientation observed in the development of Kaluli and Samoan young children may serve as an alternative form of input that selectively attunes children's attention to linguistic and sociocultural structures and practices (see Brown (2012), De León (2012), Takada (2012)). In situation-centered communication, higher comprehension demands are imposed on developing children in that the language they hear is not simplified, but infants and young children are usually positioned as overhearers rather than addressees; their attentional skills are highly scaffolded from birth; and when positioned as speakers, they are often prompted (Moore 2012). In child-centered communication involving a simplified register, comparatively low comprehension demands on children are coupled with relatively high demands on their communicative involvement as addressees; and when positioned as speakers, their utterances are often rendered intelligible through the efforts of generous, accommodating interlocutors or are prompted.

Arguing for a language socialization-enriched approach to language acquisition, Ochs and Schieffelin (1995) proposed a culturally organized means-ends model of grammatical development. This model suggests that communities differ in the communicative goals they establish in relation to small children and once these goals are established, they consistently organize the linguistic environment of the developing child. For example, in communities where caregivers routinely set the goal of communicating with infants and very young children as full addressees expected to comprehend and respond, they consistently use extensively simplified speech and other accommodations. Alternatively, in communities where caregivers generally wait until children are more mature to communicate intentions, they immerse infants and very young children as overhearers in a linguistic environment of nonsimplified conversations among others.

Ochs et al. (2005) questioned the efficacy of using Euro-American baby talk and other default sociocultural practices to communicate with children diagnosed with neurodevelopmental disorders such as autism. Certain features of Euro-American child-directed communication – slowed pace, exaggerated intonation, heightened affect, face-to-face interactional alignment, and an insistence on speech as the medium of communication for the child – may be ill-attuned to, for example, the needs of autistic children. Severely impacted children are distracted and lose attention in the course of slowed down communication. They easily become overloaded by sensory stimuli such as facial expressions, exaggerated pitch contours, excessive praises, endearments, and other affect displays. And speaking is exceedingly difficult for many of these children. Alternatively, the children appear more

communicative, social, and at ease when exposed to a radically different form of language socialization practice, introduced by an educator from Bangalore (Iversen 2006). In this practice, the caregiver uses rapid, rhythmic speech, frequent prompts, and moderate affect displays, and the autistic child points to a grid of letters or numbers to respond to the caregiver, who sits alongside the child (rather than face-to-face). The lesson here is rather than facilitating the human potential for language, Euro-American baby talk may impede this outcome, with parents, teachers, and clinicians witlessly caught in the inertia of a communicative habitus (Sterponi and Shankey 2014).

Language Socialization and Linguistic Anthropology

While one face of language socialization research orients towards language acquisition, the other orients towards linguistic anthropology.

One tenet of the language socialization paradigm is that the social, emotional, and intellectual trajectories of children and other novices are complexly structured by webs of social and economic institutions, public and domestic systems of control, practices, identities, settings, beliefs, meanings, and other forces (Heath 1983; Paugh 2012a, b). The inverse is also the case, in that immature members are agentive in the shaping of their development and have the capacity to resist and transform facets of the social order into which they are socialized (Goodwin and Kyratzis 2012; Kulick and Schieffelin 2004; Rogoff et al. 2003, 2014). That is, language socialization is inherently bidirectional, despite the obvious asymmetries in power and knowledge, and therein lies the seeds of intergenerational, historical continuity, and change within social groups (Pontecorvo et al. 2001). The active role of the child/novice in generating social order is compatible with social theories that promote members' reflexivity, agency, and contingency in the constitution of everyday social life (Bourdieu 1977, 1990; Garfinkel 1967; Giddens 1979, 1984). These approaches favor the study of social actions as at once structured and structuring in time and space, bound by historically durable social orders of power and symbolic systems yet creative, variable, responsive to situational exigencies and capable of producing novel consequences. Even in the maintenance of social regularities, "the familiar is created and recreated through human agency itself" (Giddens 1979, p. 128).

No principle is more fundamental to linguistic anthropology than the notion that a language is more than a formal code, more than a medium of communication, and more than a repository of meanings. Language is a powerful semiotic tool for evoking social and moral sentiments, collective and personal identities tied to place and situation, and bodies of knowledge and belief (Duranti 1997, 2003, 2004, 2011; Hymes 1964b; Sapir 1921). When children acquire the languages of their speech communities, the languages come packaged with these evocations (Riley 2012). And not just languages: particular dialects, registers, styles, genres, conversational moves and sequences, grammatical and lexical forms, as well as written,

spoken, and other communicative modes are saturated with sociocultural contextual significance (Baquedano-López and Figueroa 2012; Duff 2012; Loyd 2012).

This relation between linguistic structures and sociocultural information is indexical, in the sense that the use of certain structures points to and constitutes certain social contexts and certain cultural frameworks for thinking and feeling (Gumperz 1982; Hanks 1999; Ochs 1990; Peirce 1955; Silverstein 1996). A key enterprise of linguistic anthropology is analysis of the indexical relations critical to interpretations of social scenes and events. What transpires in the course of language socialization is that normally developing children become increasingly adept at constituting and interpreting sociocultural contexts from linguistic cues. In some cases, caregivers and other mature members may make the indexical meanings explicit, as when, for example, a child uses a linguistic form inappropriately and others provide the appropriate form (Berman 2014; Fader 2009; He 2001, 2004; Howard 2012; Michaels 1981; Paugh 2012a; Scollon 1982; Shohet 2013) or when someone recounts a narrative centering around a social violation of language expectations (Baquedano-López 2001; Goodwin 1990; Miller et al. 1996). In other cases, children may be prompted to perform linguistic acts that attempt to establish particular sociocultural contexts (Demuth 1986; Moore 2012; Ochs 1988; Schieffelin 1990; Watson-Gegeo and Gegeo 1986). For example, Kaluli caregivers prompt small children to use a loud voice, distinct intonation, and particular morphemes that define the speech act performed (calling out) and to refer to names, kinship terms, and place names where a shared past experience transpired to establish a special closeness with an addressee (Schieffelin 2003). Even when the children are prompted, most language socialization of the relation of semiotic forms to context takes place implicitly; children and other novices infer and appropriate indexical meanings through repeated participation in language-mediated practices and events that establish routine associations between certain forms and certain settings, relationships, practices, emotions, and thought-worlds. Speaking of the indexical relation of place names to the establishment of social ties, Schieffelin (2003) concludes: “In other words, these mundane socializing activities mattered because they were critical to children’s acquisition of cultural practices and knowledge, namely, building productive sociality in a society where obligation, reciprocity and access were already inscribed onto the space of place.” (p. 163).

Literacy has been a key object of study and contention in anthropology ever since Lévy-Bruhl and Clare (1923) associated “primitive mentality” with “prelinguistic” societies, and Goody and Watt (1962) proposed that the historical adoption of literacy in societies led to significant social structural and psychological transformations. Subsequently, linguistic anthropological and language socialization studies established that rather than being a monolithic practice, literacy comprises a range of activities, each entailing a set of concomitant intellectual and social skills, which are organized by and constitutive of situations and communities (Ahearn 2001; Besnier 1995; Collins 1995, 1996; Fader 2001; Heath 1982, 1983, 1988; Schieffelin and Gilmore 1986; Scollon and Scollon 1981). The most influential study of literacy practices is Heath’s (1983) *Ways with Words*, a ground-breaking language

socialization analysis of the sociocultural organization of children's literacy practices across socioeconomically and racially diverse US communities. Heath's ethnographic research delineated the sociocultural universes of literacy expectations, values, and practices for children growing up in white (Roadville) and black (Trackton) working class homes and communities in the Piedmont Carolinas and their consequences for children's success in school settings. As Heath notes, the literacy socialization process is a deep, powerful, and complex factor in organizing how Roadville and Trackton children will fare in the classroom. This analysis lays bare Bourdieu's (1985) claim that the habitus of the home perpetuates the power differential in children's attainment of educational and cultural capital. For a contemporary discussion of socialization into language inequality resulting in the "language gap," see Avineri and Johnson (2015).

In addition to literacy variation, a major contribution of language socialization research has been towards understanding the dynamics of language variation at the register and code level (see Garrett and Baquedano-López (2002), Howard (2014), Riley (2010)). Ochs' (1985, 1988) study in Western Samoa was the first to point out the centrality of examining systematic register variation with regard to children's acquisition of communicative competence. Many linguistic structures in Samoan are variable and context-sensitive, indexing social distance, formality of setting and gender of speaker. Ochs demonstrated that very small children are sensitive to and acquire knowledge of the socially relevant features of particular phonological, grammatical, and lexical forms that mark salient features of social hierarchy and contextual differentiation. These forms include children's alternation between two phonological registers, affect-marked and neutral first person pronouns, presence/ellipsis of ergative case marking, and the production of deictic verbs as contingent upon addressee and speech act being performed.

Indexicality and socialization into code and register choice are critical to understanding processes of language and culture maintenance and change as illustrated in several lines of inquiry in bilingual or multilingual communities undergoing language shift through processes of globalization in indigenous societies. Language socialization research points out that the coexistence of two or more codes within a particular community, whatever the sociohistorical and political circumstances that have given rise to them or brought them into contact, is rarely neutral in relation to children's developing linguistic and sociocultural competence. A dramatic example is Kulick's (1992) study in Gapun, a small, relatively isolated village on the northern coast of Papua New Guinea, where the vernacular, Taiap, was spoken alongside of the lingua franca Tok Pisin. In spite of parents' desire that their children speak the vernacular, children were only acquiring Tok Pisin. Kulick accounted for these processes of language shift and loss by examining everyday socialization practices and the ideologies that shaped them, finding that ideological transformations since contact with Europeans and their institutions, most prominently Christianity, have profoundly changed how villagers think about personhood, language, children, and modernity, all of which are central to understanding how and why children are no

longer speaking their language. The interface of language socialization and language and culture shift has been analyzed in Caribbean (Garrett 2005, 2011; Minks 2013; Paugh 2012a; Snow 2004), Native North American (Field 2001; Meek 2010), African (Moore 2012), Asian (Howard 2012), and Slavic (Friedman 2012) communities, as well as in societies in Oceania (Kulick 1992; Makihara 2005; Riley 2007). Nonaka (2004, 2012) addresses the interface of language socialization and the emergence, maintenance, and shift of a spontaneous, indigenous sign language community in Thailand, where a disposition towards multilingualism sustains the sign language as a medium of socialization and communication for both hearing and deaf children and adults of the community, even as the language is being encroached by promotional efforts to get deaf children to acquire the national Thai sign language at residential deaf schools.

A related line of language socialization inquiry focuses on language and culture maintenance and shift within diasporic groups in industrialized nations, such as Puerto Rican (Zentella 1997), Hasidic Jewish (Fader 2009), Mexican (Baquedano-López and Figueroa 2012), and Chinese (He 2004, 2012) communities in the USA. These studies offer a language socialization perspective on language choice and religious identity, gender, and ways of delimiting or defusing community boundaries and limits (see Garrett and Baquedano-López (2002)). Analyses illuminate how religious and heritage language institutions, along with familial units, support and amplify sociohistorically rooted language and cultural practices, attempting to draw children into an identification with a community of speakers (García-Sánchez 2014). These studies examine how teachers and other members of the community attempt to socialize diaspora children into affiliating with not only a community-relevant code repertoire but also moral dispositions and social entitlements implicitly indexed through language socialization practices.

The language socialization paradigm offers a socioculturally informed analysis of life course and historical continuity and transformation. This overview has focused on the socialization into and through language in childhood, yet language socialization transpires whenever there is an asymmetry in knowledge and power and characterizes our human interactions throughout adulthood as we become socialized into novel activities, identities, and objects relevant to work, family, recreation, civic, religious, and other environments in increasingly globalized communities.

Related Articles in the Encyclopedia of Language and Education

Paul Garrett: [Researching language socialization](#). In Volume: Research Methods in Language and Education

Amy Ohta: [Sociocultural theory and second/foreign language education](#). In Volume: Second and foreign language education

Angela Creese & Fiona Copland: [Linguistic ethnography](#). In Volume: Research Methods in Language and Education

References

- Ahearn, L. M. (2001). *Invitations to love: Literacy, love letters, and social change in Nepal*. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press.
- Avineri, N., & Johnson, E. (2015). Invited forum: Bridging the “language gap”. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology*, 25(1), 66–86.
- Baquedano-López, P. (2001). Creating social identities through Doctrina narratives. In A. Duranti (Ed.), *Linguistic anthropology: A reader* (pp. 343–358). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Baquedano-López, P., & Figueroa, A. M. (2012). Language socialization and immigration. In A. Duranti, E. Ochs, & B. B. Schieffelin (Eds.), *The handbook of language socialization* (pp. 536–563). Malden: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Besnier, N. (1995). *Literacy, emotion, and authority: Reading and writing on a Polynesian atoll*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Berman, E. (2014). Negotiating age: Direct speech and the sociolinguistic production of childhood in the Marshall Islands. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology*, 24(2), 109–132.
- Bloom, L. M. (1970). *Language development: Form and function in emerging grammars*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Blount, B. G. (1969). Acquisition of language by Luo children. Unpublished PhD dissertation, University of California, Berkeley.
- Bourdieu, P. (1977). *Outline of a theory of practice* (translated by Richard Nice). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bourdieu, P. (1985). *Distinction: A social critique of the judgement of taste*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Bourdieu, P. (1990). *The logic of practice*. Palo Alto: Stanford University Press.
- Brown, P. (2012). The cultural organization of attention. In A. Duranti, E. Ochs, & B. B. Schieffelin (Eds.), *The handbook of language socialization* (pp. 29–55). Malden: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Brown, R., Cazden, C., & Bellugi, U. (1968). The child’s grammar from I to III. In C. N. Cofer & B. S. Musgrave (Eds.), *Verbal behavior and learning: Problems and processes* (pp. 158–197). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Cazden, C., John, V., & Hymes, D. (Eds.). (1972). *The functions of language in the classroom*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Chomsky, N. (1965). *Aspects of the theory of syntax*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Collins, J. (1995). Literacy and literacies. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 24, 75–93.
- Collins, J. (1996). Socialization to text: Structure and contradiction in schooled literacy. In M. Silverstein & G. Urban (Eds.), *Natural histories of discourse* (pp. 203–228). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- De León, L. (2012). Language socialization and multiparty participation frameworks. In A. Duranti, E. Ochs, & B. B. Schieffelin (Eds.), *The handbook of language socialization* (pp. 81–111). Malden: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Demuth, C. (1986). Prompting routines in the language socialization of Basotho children. In B. B. Schieffelin & E. Ochs (Eds.), *Language socialization across cultures* (pp. 51–79). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Duff, P. A. (2012). Second language socialization. In A. Duranti, E. Ochs, & B. B. Schieffelin (Eds.), *The handbook of language socialization* (pp. 564–586). Malden: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Duranti, A. (1985). Sociocultural dimensions of discourse. In T. A. V. Dijk (Ed.), *Handbook of discourse analysis, Disciplines of discourse* (Vol. 1, pp. 193–230). New York: Academic.
- Duranti, A. (1997). *Linguistic anthropology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Duranti, A. (2003). Language as culture in U.S. anthropology: Three paradigms. *Current Anthropology*, 44(3), 323–347.
- Duranti, A. (Ed.). (2004). *A companion to linguistic anthropology*. Oxford: Blackwell.

- Duranti, A. (2011). Linguistic anthropology: Language as a non-neutral medium. In R. Mesthrie (Ed.), *The Cambridge handbook of sociolinguistics* (pp. 28–46). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ervin-Tripp, S., & Mitchell-Kernan, C. (Eds.). (1977). *Child discourse*. New York: Academic.
- Fader, A. (2001). Literacy, bilingualism, and gender in a Hasidic community. *Linguistics and Education*, 12(3), 261–283.
- Fader, A. (2009). *Mitzvah girls: Bringing up the next generation of Hasidic Jews in Brooklyn*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Field, M. (2001). Triadic directives in Navajo language socialization. *Language in Society*, 30(2), 249–263.
- Friedman, D. (2012). Language socialization and language revitalization. In A. Duranti, E. Ochs, & B. B. Schieffelin (Eds.), *The handbook of language socialization* (pp. 631–647). Malden: Wiley-Blackwell.
- García-Sánchez, I. (2014). *Language and Muslim immigrant childhoods: The politics of belonging*. Malden: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Garfinkel, H. (1967). *Studies in ethnomethodology*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall.
- Garrett, P. (2005). What a language is good for: Language socialization, language shift, and the persistence of code-specific genres in St. Lucia. *Language in Society*, 34(3), 327–361.
- Garrett, P. B. (2011). Language socialization and language shift. In A. Duranti, E. Ochs, & B. B. Schieffelin (Eds.), *The handbook of language socialization* (pp. 515–535). Malden: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Garrett, P., & Baquedano-López, P. (2002). Language socialization: Reproduction and continuity, transformation and change. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 31, 339–361.
- Giddens, A. (1979). *Central problems in social theory: Action, structure and contradiction in social analysis*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Giddens, A. (1984). *The constitution of society: Outline of the theory of structuration*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Goodwin, M. H. (1990). *He-said-she-said: Talk as social organization among Black children*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Goodwin, M. H., & Kyratzis, A. (2012). Peer language socialization. In A. Duranti, E. Ochs, & B. B. Schieffelin (Eds.), *The handbook of language socialization* (pp. 365–390). Malden: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Goody, J., & Watt, I. (1962). The consequences of literacy. *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, 5, 304–326.
- Gumperz, J. J. (1968). The speech community. In D. L. Sils & R. K. Merton (Eds.), *International encyclopedia of the social sciences* (pp. 381–386). New York: Macmillan.
- Gumperz, J. J. (1982). *Discourse strategies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gumperz, J. J., & Hymes, D. (Eds.). (1972). *Directions in sociolinguistics: The ethnography of communication*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Hanks, W. F. (1999). Indexicality. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology*, 9, 124–126.
- He, A. W. (2001). The language of ambiguity. Practices in Chinese heritage language classes. *Discourse Studies*, 3(1), 75–96.
- He, A. W. (2004). Identity construction in Chinese heritage language classes. *Pragmatics*, 14(2/3), 199–216.
- He, A. W. (2012). Heritage language socialization. In A. Duranti, E. Ochs, & B. B. Schieffelin (Eds.), *The handbook of language socialization* (pp. 587–609). Malden: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Heath, S. B. (1978). *Teacher talk: Language in the classroom*. Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics.
- Heath, S. B. (1982). What no bedtime story means. Narrative skills at home and school. *Language in Society*, 11(1), 49–76.

- Heath, S. B. (1983). *Ways with words: Language, life and work in communities and classrooms*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Heath, S. B. (1988). Protean shapes in literacy event: Ever-shifting oral and literate traditions. In E. Kintgen, B. M. Kroll, & M. Rose (Eds.), *Perspectives on literacy* (pp. 348–370). Carbondale and Edwardsville: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Heath, S. B. (1990). The children of Trackton's children: Spoken and written language in social change. In J. Stigler, R. Shweder, & G. Herdt (Eds.), *Cultural psychology: Essays on comparative human development* (pp. 496–519). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Howard, K. (2012). Language socialization and hierarchy. In A. Duranti, E. Ochs, & B. B. Schieffelin (Eds.), *The handbook of language socialization* (pp. 341–365). Malden: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Howard, K. 2014. Language socialization. Oxford Bibliographies, Anthropology. doi:[10.1093/OBO/9780199766567-0111](https://doi.org/10.1093/OBO/9780199766567-0111).
- Hymes, D. (1964a). Introduction: Toward ethnographies of communication. *American Anthropologist*, 66(6), Part 2:1–34.
- Hymes, D. (Ed.). (1964b). *Language in culture and society: A reader in linguistics and anthropology*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Hymes, D. (1972a). On communicative competence. In J. B. Pride & J. Holmes (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics* (pp. 269–285). Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Hymes, D. (1972b). Models of the interaction of language and social life. In J. J. Gumperz & D. Hymes (Eds.), *Directions in sociolinguistics: The ethnography of communication* (pp. 35–71). New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Hymes, D. (1974). *Foundations in sociolinguistics*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Iversen, P. (2006). *Strange son: Two mothers, two sons, and the quest to unlock the hidden world of autism*. New York: Riverhead Books.
- Kernan, K. (1969). *The acquisition of language by Samoan children*. Unpublished PhD dissertation, University of California, Berkeley, California.
- Kulick, D. (1992). *Language shift and cultural reproduction: Socialization, self, and syncretism in a Papua New Guinean village*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kulick, D., & Schieffelin, B. B. (2004). Language socialization. In A. Duranti (Ed.), *A companion to linguistic anthropology* (pp. 349–368). Oxford: Blackwell.
- LeVine, R. A., Dixon, S., LeVine, S., Richman, A., Leiderman, P. H., Keefer, C. H., & Brazelton, T. B. (1994). *Childcare and culture: Lessons from Africa*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lévy-Bruhl, L., & Clare, L. A. (1923). *Primitive mentality*. London/New York: George Allen & Unwin/Macmillan.
- Loyd, H. (2012). The logic of conflict: Practices of social control among inner city Neapolitan girls. In S. Danby & M. Theobald (Eds.), *Disputes in everyday life: Social and moral orders of children and young people, Sociological studies of children and youth* (Vol. 15, pp. 325–352). Bingley: Emerald Group Publishing Ltd.
- Makihara, M. (2005). Being Rapa Nui, speaking Spanish: Children's voices on Easter Island. *Anthropological Theory*, 5(2), 117–134.
- Mead, G. H. (1934). *Mind, self, and society*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Mead, M. (1928). *Coming of age in Samoa*. New York: William Morrow.
- Meek, B. (2010). *We are our language: An ethnography of language revitalization in a Northern Athabaskan Community*. Tucson: The University of Arizona Press.
- Michaels, S. (1981). "Sharing time": Children's narrative styles and differential access to literacy. *Language in Society*, 10, 423–442.
- Miller, P., Fung, H., & Mintz, J. (1996). Self-construction through narrative practices: A Chinese and American comparison of socialization. *Ethos*, 24, 1–44.
- Minks, A. (2013). *Voices of play: Miskitu children's speech and song on the Atlantic coast of Nicaragua*. Tucson: The University of Arizona Press.

- Moore, L. (2012). Language socialization and repetition. In A. Duranti, E. Ochs, & B. B. Schieffelin (Eds.), *The handbook of language socialization* (pp. 209–226). Malden: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Nonaka, A. (2004). The forgotten endangered languages: Lessons on the importance of remembering from Thailand's Ban Khor sign language. *Language in Society*, 33(5), 737–767.
- Nonaka, A. (2012). Language socialization and language endangerment. In A. Duranti, E. Ochs, & B. B. Schieffelin (Eds.), *The handbook of language socialization* (pp. 610–630). Malden: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Ochs, E. (1982). Talking to children in Western Samoa. *Language in Society*, 11, 77–104.
- Ochs, E. (1985). Variation and error: A sociolinguistic study of language acquisition in Samoa. In D. Slobin (Ed.), *The cross-linguistic study of language acquisition* (Vol. 1, pp. 783–838). Hillsdale: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Ochs, E. (1988). *Culture and language development: Language acquisition and language socialization in a Samoan village*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ochs, E. (1990). Indexicality and socialization. In J. W. Stigler, R. Shweder, & G. Herdt (Eds.), *Cultural psychology: Essays on comparative human development* (pp. 287–308). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ochs, E., & Schieffelin, B. B. (Eds.). (1979). *Developmental pragmatics*. New York: Academic.
- Ochs, E., & Schieffelin, B. B. (1984). Language acquisition and socialization: Three developmental stories. In R. A. Shweder & R. A. LeVine (Eds.), *Culture theory: Essays on mind, self, and emotion* (pp. 276–320). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ochs, E., & Schieffelin, B. B. (1995). The impact of language socialization on grammatical development. In P. Fletcher & B. MacWhinney (Eds.), *The handbook of child language* (pp. 73–94). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Ochs, E., Solomon, O., & Sterponi, L. (2005). Limitations and transformations of habitus in child-directed communication. *Discourse Studies*, 7, 547–583.
- Parsons, T. (1951). *The social system*. New York: Free Press.
- Paugh, A. (2012a). *Playing with languages: Children and change in a Caribbean village*. New York: Berghahn.
- Paugh, A. (2012b). Local theories of children rearing. In A. Duranti, E. Ochs, & B. B. Schieffelin (Eds.), *The handbook of language socialization* (pp. 150–168). Malden: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Peirce, C. S. (1955). *Philosophical writings of Peirce*. New York: Dover Publishers.
- Pinker, S. (1994). *The language instinct: How the mind creates language*. New York: William Morrow & Company.
- Pontecorvo, C., Fasulo, A., & Sterponi, L. (2001). Mutual apprentices: The making of parenthood and childhood in family dinner conversations. *Human Development*, 44, 340–361.
- Riley, K. C. (2007). To tangle or not to tangle: Shifting language ideologies and the socialization of Charabia in the Marquesas, French Polynesia. In M. Makihara & B. B. Schieffelin (Eds.), *Consequences of contact: Language ideologies and sociocultural transformations in Pacific societies*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Riley, K. C. (2010). Language socialization. In B. Spolsky & F. M. Hult (Eds.), *The handbook of educational linguistics* (pp. 398–410). Malden: Wiley-Blackwell.
- 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). Malden: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Rogoff, B., Paradise, R., Arauz, R. M., Correa-Chavez, M., & Agelillo, C. (2003). Firsthand learning through intent participation. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 54, 175–203.
- Rogoff, B., Alcalá, L., Coppens, A. D., López, A., Ruvacaba, O., & Silva, K. G. (Eds.). (2014). Learning by observing and pitching in to family and community endeavors. *Human Development*, 57(2–3), 150–161. [Special issue].
- Sapir, E. (1921). *Language*. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World.
- Sapir, E. (1933). Language. In E. R. Seligman & A. Johnson (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of the social sciences* (Vol. 9, pp. 155–169). New York: Macmillan.

- Schieffelin, B. B. (1985). The acquisition of Kaluli. In D. Slobin (Ed.), *The cross-linguistic study of language acquisition* (Vol. 1, pp. 525–593). Hillsdale: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Schieffelin, B. B. (1990). *The give and take of everyday life: Language socialization of Kaluli children*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Schieffelin, B. B. (2003). Language and place in children's worlds. In I. Mey, G. Piter, H.-Y. Su, & S. Szamania (Eds.), *Tenth annual symposium about language and society (SALSA)* (pp. 152–166). Austin: Department of Linguistics, University of Texas.
- Schieffelin, B. B., & Gilmore, P. (Eds.). (1986). *The acquisition of literacy*. Norwood: Ablex.
- Schieffelin, B. B., & Ochs, E. (Eds.). (1986a). *Language socialization across cultures*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Schieffelin, B. B., & Ochs, E. (1986b). Language socialization. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 15, 163–246.
- Scollon, S. (1982). Reality set, socialization and linguistic convergence. Unpublished PhD dissertation, University of Hawaii, Honolulu.
- Scollon, R., & Scollon, S. B. K. (1981). *Narrative, literacy, and face in interethnic communication*. Norwood: Ablex.
- Shohet, M. (2013). Everyday sacrifice and language socialization in Vietnam: The power of a respect particle. *American Anthropologist*, 115(2), 203–217.
- Silverstein, M. (1996). Indexical order and the dialectics of sociolinguistic life. In R. Ide, R. Parker, & Y. Sunaoshi (Eds.), *Third annual symposium about language and society (SALSA)* (pp. 266–295). Austin: Department of Linguistics, University of Texas.
- Slobin, D. I. (Ed.). (1967). *A field manual for cross-cultural study of the acquisition of communicative competence*. Language Behavior Research Laboratory. Berkeley: University of California, Berkeley.
- Slobin, D. I. (1969). *Universals of grammatical development in children*. Language Behavior Research Laboratory. Berkeley: University of California, Berkeley.
- Snow, C. E. (1972). Mothers' speech to children learning language. *Child Development*, 43, 539–565.
- Snow, C. E. (1995). Issues in the study of input: Fine-tuning, universality, individual and developmental differences, and necessary causes. In P. Fletcher & B. MacWhinney (Eds.), *The handbook of child language* (pp. 180–193). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Snow, P. (2004). What happen: Language socialization and language persistence in a Panamanian Creole village. Unpublished PhD dissertation, University of California, Berkeley.
- Solomon, O. (2012). Rethinking baby talk. In A. Duranti, E. Ochs, & B. B. Schieffelin (Eds.), *The handbook of language socialization* (pp. 121–149). Wiley-Blackwell: Malden.
- Sterponi, L., & Shankey, J. (2014). Rethinking echolalia: Repetition as interactional resource in the communication of a child with autism. *Journal of Child Language*, 41(2), 275–304.
- Stross, B. (1969). *Language acquisition by Tenejapa Tzeltal children*. Unpublished PhD dissertation, University of California, Berkeley.
- Takada, A. (2012). Preverbal infant-caregiver interaction. In A. Duranti, E. Ochs, & B. B. Schieffelin (Eds.), *The handbook of language socialization* (pp. 56–80). Malden: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Watson-Gegeo, K., & Gegeo, D. (1986). Calling out and repeating routines in Kwara'ae children's language. In B. B. Schieffelin & E. Ochs (Eds.), *Language socialization across cultures* (pp. 17–50). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Whiting, B. B., Whiting, J. W., & Longabaugh, R. (1975). *Children of six cultures: A psycho-cultural analysis*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Zentella, A. C. (1997). *Growing up bilingual: Puerto Rican children in New York*. Oxford: Blackwell.

The Ecology of Second Language Acquisition and Socialization

Sune Vork Steffensen and Claire Kramsch

Abstract

Various theories of second language acquisition (SLA) and socialization (SLS) have adopted ecology as a convenient metaphor to promote sociocultural (van Lier 2004) or sociocognitive (Atkinson 2011) approaches to the study of SLA, and socioethnographic approaches (Duff 2011; Duff and Talmy 2011) to the study of SLS. The main tenets of an ecological approach are: (1) the emergent nature of language learning and use, (2) the crucial role of affordances in the environment, (3) the mediating function of language in the educational enterprise, and (4) the historicity and subjectivity of the language learning experience, as well as its inherent conflictuality. These tenets have been in one form or another adopted by virtually all mainstream theories of SLA and SLS to the point that SLA is increasingly conceived as a form of second language socialization (Douglas Fir Group 2016). While such a development is to be welcomed, it also raises serious concerns about the autonomy of the language learner, the collective pressure on individuals to align with the expectations of the community, alternative theories of knowledge and of knowledge acquisition, and the socializing dominance of English around the world. This chapter discusses the history of the relationship between acquisition and socialization with regard to foreign/second language learning and use, and the role played by ecological theory in that relationship.

S.V. Steffensen (✉)

Department of Language and Communication, University of Southern Denmark, Odense M, Denmark

e-mail: s.v.steffensen@sdu.dk

C. Kramsch

Graduate School of Education, University of California, Berkeley, Berkeley, CA, USA

e-mail: ckramsch@berkeley.edu

Keywords

Language ecology • Ecological linguistics • Emergentism • Affordance • Meditation • Historicity

Contents

Introduction	18
Early Developments	19
Major Contributions: Ecological Theories of Second Language Acquisition and Socialization	21
Work in Progress: Recent Undertakings in the Ecology of Second Language Research	23
The Development of an Agent-Environment Systems View	23
The Development of Materiality-Based and Virtuality-Based Views	24
The Development of Identity-Based Views	25
The Development of Value-Based Approaches	26
Problems, Difficulties, and Future Directions	26
Cross-References	29
Related Articles in the Encyclopedia of Language and Education	29
References	30

Introduction

Language ecology was originally defined in 1972 by Einar Haugen as “the study of interactions between any given language and its environment” (Haugen 1972, p. 325). The definition echoes the German biologist Ernst Haeckel’s 1866 definition of ecology within the life sciences as “the total science of the organism’s relations to the surrounding environment, to which we can count in a wider sense all ‘conditions of existence’” (Haeckel 1866, p. 286; our translation). The rise of language ecology in the 1970s was paralleled by a similar development in psychology. In this area, Gibson, Bronfenbrenner, and Neisser, amongst others, placed the study of human cognition in a wider context, trying “to understand how organisms make their way in the world, not how a world is made inside of [i.e., represented in] organisms” (Reed 1996, p. 11)

The ecological approaches in biology, psychology, and linguistics share an emphasis on the dynamic and historically constrained relations between elements (organisms, agents, languages) in an environment. This emphasis differs from foci on internal factors in any single element. In biology, ecologists trace anatomical and physiological facts to the animal’s needs in its environment; ecological psychologists explain cognition from the interface between agent and environment; and ecological linguists seek to show how, over time, linguistic patterns are shaped by complex natural and sociocultural factors, and how linguistic facts in turn impact on nature and society. However, ecological linguists face a larger challenge than their colleagues in psychology and biology: while one can easily identify the ecology of an animal or a species, it is far from clear exactly what the ecology of (a) language is. As argued by Steffensen and Fill (2014), four different ecologies have been identified in the literature on ecological linguistics: a *symbolic* ecology (the coexistence of

languages as “symbol systems”), a *natural* ecology (language in relation to its ecosystemic surroundings: topography, climate, fauna, flora, etc.), a *sociocultural* ecology (language in relation to the social and cultural forces that shape the conditions of speakers and speech communities, which is the focus of this chapter), and a *cognitive* ecology (language as factor in how agents orient to their ecosocial environment). It is against this terminological background that one needs to understand the development of ecological perspectives on second language acquisition and socialization.

In this chapter we consider how such perspectives have over the years slowly brought second language acquisition (SLA) research closer to second language socialization (SLS) research, and what the benefits and the risks have been for second language research.

Early Developments

In early second language acquisition (SLA) research, the dominant model of second language development was that of individual learners who use their individual cognitive capacities to acquire a new linguistic system. This model is inherently unecological in multiple ways: it assumes that language is a structural entity *sui generis*; it traces cognition to an inner, mental realm; and it separates learners from their sociocultural and autobiographic contexts. In the eighties, SLA researchers started turning their attention to the influence of the social context in the development of language use or communicative competence. The early immersion programs in Canada and the study of immigrant language learners in natural (i.e., non-instructional) environments in the USA triggered a host of studies that confirmed that the ability to use language to communicate with others, by contrast with merely learning rules, is acquired through the exposure to comprehensible input as well as in and through interaction with others. One could say that SLA thus started becoming interested in the social aspects of acquisition. Some sociolinguists such as Leslie Beebe and Elaine Tarone pushed the field into the study of how speakers interacted with one another through words, i.e., interlanguage pragmatics. Nonnative speakers (NNSs) were encouraged to “express, interpret and negotiate meanings” (Breen and Candlin 1980, p. 92) in communication with native speakers (NSs), and to become socialized into the host society by approximating the NS. However, what was being approximated was less the diversity and variability of NS social and cultural meanings than a rather standard grammatical, sociolinguistic, discursive, and strategic competence (Canale and Swain 1980). That is, until the 1990s, SLA’s interest in the social context was an extension of its interest in the acquisition of standardized forms and meanings for the purposes of communication as an exchange of information. Hence, SLA research did not really attend to emergent socialization because it was constrained by its linear, reductionist, structuralist view of communication – and because it took it for granted that language could have no other function than for communication.

Since the 1990s, the social has come into its own (Block 2003). Global migrations, the advent of the internet, and the global spread of English have raised concerns about the appropriateness of imposing one NS model or linguistic variety for all. Social and cultural variability in form and meaning have become a source of concern for psycholinguists anxious to have reliable data to analyze, and from which to make claims regarding learners' levels of language competence. But sociolinguists and sociocultural SLA theorists have pointed out that a language is not just a mode of communication, but a symbolic statement of social and cultural identity, especially in the increasingly multilingual environments in which L2 learners now find themselves. For example, Rampton's (1995) study of multiethnic and multilingual adolescents in a British high school showed the dazzling linguistic and social abilities of NNSs to temporarily "cross" over into peers' languages and play with various roles and personae. A renewed interest in the work of Dell Hymes has led proponents of communicative competence in SLA to revisit his understanding of the term and suggest that maybe the computer metaphor in SLA, with its focus on input, output, and interaction, had prevented researchers from doing justice to the complexity of the "ethnography of speaking" (Firth and Wagner 1997).

The growing influence of cultural psychology (Stigler et al. 1990) and of Soviet theories of language (Vološinov 1973) and cognition (Vygotsky 1962) on scholars from anthropology, education, and other disciplines have legitimized the study of the social and the cultural in SLA. Sociocognitive and sociocultural theories have become particularly popular in explaining the relationship between language acquisition and language socialization. The major contribution made to the social aspects of SLA since the early 1990s has been Vygotsky's cognitive theory and its reinterpretation through Leontiev's activity theory, applied to SLA by Jim Lantolf (2000) under the name of sociocultural theory (SCT). SCT reverses the notion that language acquisition takes place in the head and language use merely applies this acquired knowledge to the social world. Cognition, according to SCT, occurs first on the social plane and only later gets internalized on the psychological plane in the form of inner speech in interaction with more capable peers. For Vygotsky, therefore, socialization predates acquisition. SCT is having a substantial impact on SLA theory, as it responds to the need to account for social and cultural phenomena in a field that was originally mainly psycholinguistic. The notions of symbolic mediation, collaborative learning, participation, and the achievement of common activities around real-world tasks all show a desire to adopt a more ecological approach to SLA by moving it in the direction of SLS (Duff and Talmy 2011).

The continued interest in pragmatic and ethnographic dimensions of SLA also shows a desire to bridge the gap between acquisition, socialization, and the social realities of interaction within and across NS and NNS groupings. In this development, a crucial contribution came from Conversation Analysis (CA), which entered the SLA scene in the late 1990s (Firth and Wagner 1997). CA, originating in the 1970s from ethnomethodology and the sociology of language, offers a highly elaborate tool to analyze the way conversational partners orient themselves to the

ongoing interactional situation and position themselves vis-à-vis the turns-at-talk, the topic, and the cognitive tasks that participants set up for one another.

Major Contributions: Ecological Theories of Second Language Acquisition and Socialization

Ecological theories of second language acquisition and socialization gained momentum in the early 2000s with Kramsch (2002), Leather and van Dam (2003), and van Lier (2004) as the three main representatives. From an ecological point of view, the concept of language socialization differs when it comes to adolescents and adults learning a second language from when a child is socialized through his/her mother tongue into a given cultural setting. The L2 socialization processes of adolescents and adults who are already socialized in their primary community are saturated with reflexivity regarding identity, social relations, and their political implications. Their language acquisition is inseparable from the secondary socialization that follows from being transplanted into a nonnative culture, or into the culture of the educational system.

The ecological approach opposes the view that SLA research is about individuals who “learn,” “acquire,” or “develop” a language. In line with ecological psychology, SLA is seen as an emergent phenomenon, triggered by the availability of symbolic and nonsymbolic affordances in the environment. Learning emerges as ecologically embedded agents perceive these affordances, participate in ecosocial processes, and adapt to a nonnative language. Cowley (2012) explains the ecological view when he redefines SLA as follows: “learning is taken to emerge in experience-enriched encounters with the world. The language practitioners’ general project becomes that of developing potential for skilled linguistic action” (p. 21).

The ecological view on SLA is dynamic, as it is preoccupied with temporal processes and changes. However, it rejects the simplistic view that SLA can be reduced to a change from Time 1 (e.g., beginning of class) to Time 2 (e.g., end of class). Rather, as Lemke (2002) has argued, an ecological perspective on SLA acknowledges that linguistic processes are multiscale: they do not just play out on the microsocial timescale of the interaction, but also on biographical timescales of the child, macrosociological timescales of the institution, and ideological timescales of society. Such an ecological model of multiple timescales was later developed by Uryu et al. (2014) and elaborated by Steffensen and Pedersen (2014). According to this line of thought, teachers do not only teach to the actual adolescent in the classroom, but also to the former child and the future adult; they must judge not only the actual capacity and performance but a complex set of perceptions, expectations, and potentialities. For Lemke (2002), the “learner” includes not only the here-and-now of his/her learning but also memories of previous learnings, projections of future scenarios, as well as subjective appraisals and fantasies, and identifications with remembered, relived, and potential selves. Accordingly, SLA

takes place not only in educational settings but also in nurseries, community centers, and on the internet, as documented in the collection of papers in Leather and Van Dam (2003). In fact, in a world of globalization, learning emerges wherever people engage across societal, mental, and personal borders. Ecological theories of learning thus prompt us to rethink the relationship of individuals and various learning environments beyond the classroom, including computer-mediated learning environments.

So far we have mainly focused on SLA in the cognitive ecology of the language learners (cf. Steffensen and Fill 2014), but by invoking globalization, learners' "micro-ecological orbits" (Goffman 1964) mesh with the sociocultural ecology in which cultural and geopolitical forces shape the conditions of speakers and speech communities. Accordingly, the ecological view espoused here implies that language researchers and teachers are prompted to develop a sense of educational responsibility and social justice. As Kramsch (2002) argues, researchers within an ecological framework can do so by adopting a phenomenological stance, ranging from the sociological to the philosophical. Phenomenology is important in this context because our behavior is influenced by how we sense and experience the world. Given the multiscale nature of human linguistic behavior, an ecological approach insists on embedding the phenomenological angle in a larger inter-individual network beyond what is, and can be, experienced. Likewise, the interactional dynamics of SLA exceed what the agents orient to and account for. Hence, even when focusing on the microscopic details of L2 interaction, an ecological approach interprets such data on an ecosystemic and sociocultural level too.

The interest in SLA as an ecological phenomenon has been accompanied by a veritable passion for Bakhtin (1981) and the notion of dialogism that has been associated with his work and that of Vygotsky (Ball and Freedman 2004). What language educators find attractive in Bakhtin is the collaborative, participatory, dialogic aspect of his stylistic theory that converges with the interactional theories of learning reviewed above and with the holistic conceptions of learning advocated by language ecology. While some scholars fear that the notion of dialogic pedagogy is becoming trivialized, thus concealing the truly ecological complexity of Bakhtinian thought (e.g. Cazden 2004), others develop the Bakhtinian stance and use it for developing neodialogical versions of the ecological approach to SLA. In this view, "language learning can be reimagined as appropriation of shared linguistic resources" (Dufva et al. 2014, p. 20).

Likewise, the ecological approach is related to the Chaos/Complexity Theoretical (C/CT) approach, which was introduced by Larsen-Freeman (1997), and later firmly established by Larsen-Freeman and Cameron (2008) and Verspoor et al. (2011). Comparing the acquisition of a foreign language to the complex, nonlinear processes of dynamic systems, Larsen-Freeman (1997) urged the field to eschew the array of well-established dichotomies (e.g., langue/parole, competence/performance, synchronic/diachronic, and innate/constructed), as well as the idea that SLA can be described as neat, plannable cause-effect processes. In a C/CT view, learning is a global change that emerges from numerous planned and unplanned activities. Thus,

C/CT offers a broader lens to view the development of language as one among many semiotic systems through which we make meaning of the life around us.

Work in Progress: Recent Undertakings in the Ecology of Second Language Research

In the past decade, a number of important developments have taken place within the ecological enterprise. In what follows, we discuss four such developments, in a list that is in no way comprehensive:

1. The development of an agent-environment systems view
2. The development of materiality-based and virtuality-based views
3. The development of identity-based views
4. The development of value-based views

The Development of an Agent-Environment Systems View

First, while second language research has for decades defined its object of study as the individual learner of a specific language, the ecological position (following Gibson 1979) maintains that an agent is not a self-containing structure *sui generis* but an agent-environment system (Steffensen 2015). Accordingly, it is less preoccupied with what an individual learns or knows, and more focused on the ecosystemic dynamics where agents pick up on the affordances and pressures of the environment, and where the environment in turn changes as a result of agents' behavior. For instance, though widely ignored in SLA research, NSs also change when they meet NNSs, both individually and collectively.

According to this agent-environment view, "a language" is a theoretical construct. It is not an entity that we can know or use; it is not a competence that precedes actual utterance behavior. Rather language is an act of languaging; it is a whole-bodied achievement (Thibault 2011), and what we come to recognize as words, grammar, lexicon, etc. are second-order constructs (Love 1990). These may scaffold activities in the language classroom, but reifying them is perilous because we come to believe that human coordination is a purely symbolic achievement. From an ecological viewpoint, languaging depends not just on multisemiotic exchanges but also on extra-semiotic activities. Therefore the ecological enterprise forces practitioners to cross boundaries and supplement their linguistic and sociocultural expertise with input from psychology, cognitive science, and the life sciences (in particular ecosystem ecology).

Inspired by van Lier (2004), Hannele Dufva (2012, 2013) and colleagues combine this viewpoint with a dialogical-Bakhtinian view. While many SLA researchers (see, e.g., Ortega 2011) oppose the idea of a monolithic language system that can be learnt or acquired in toto, Dufva takes us one step further than recent notions of

multilingualism as “many voices” and “many languages.” Dismissing both the narrow focus on “the language system” and the semiocentric notion of “the language user,” she places the dynamic, interactive relations between agents and their environments center stage. This ecodialogical line of thought invokes living agents who, in order to make their way in the world, “appropriate situated usages that differ in their modality, register, genre, purpose, and so on. Instead of learning a language in its (supposed) entirety, each learner develops individual competences that vary across purposes, modalities, and situations and that are, by definition, always partial” (Dufva 2012, pp. 4–5).

This approach transcends the dichotomous opposition between “cognitive approaches” and “social approaches” – replacing both with what Dufva (2013) calls a *social-cum-cognitive* turn. Taken to its logical conclusion, it ceases to take language learning as its object of study. Rather, second language research becomes preoccupied with developmental processes of appropriation in which “skilled linguistic action” (Cowley 2012) plays a crucial part. In this way, the ecological approach blurs the boundary between language acquisition as a distinct field and language socialization with its neighboring fields in sociology, psychology, etc. (Duff and Talmy 2011).

The Development of Materiality-Based and Virtuality-Based Views

The notion that learning does not take place in individuals, but in complex agent-environment systems has prompted scholars to explore how the material world facilitates learning through processes of virtual socialization. While this aspect was traditionally neglected in the SLA field, a growing number of SLA researchers focus on how virtual environments mediate learners’ acquisition of a second language. One example is Kristi Newgarden and Dongping Zheng’s work on World of Warcraft and Second Life (Newgarden et al. 2015; Zheng 2012). In these virtual environments, players must coordinate across languages to achieve results, and the outcome is a rich texture of social relations where acting together takes precedence over “learning the language” as a reified goal of learning.

Another example of language acquisition as language socialization is a project led by Steve Thorne (2013). It examines how mobile, digital technologies allow users to navigate in Augmented Reality. By equipping the environment with rich affordances for integrating (first or second) language resources with the agents’ behavior, these technologies create novel learning paths through the interaction with others and with the physical and symbolic surroundings. In this way, Augmented Reality “games represent a shift away from models of learning based on information delivery and toward theories of human development rooted in experiential and situated problem solving” (p. 18). In ecological terms, Augmented Reality creates an ecological niche that affords interindividual action and coaction that foster learning of nonnative linguistic resources. These initiatives showcase that learning does not take place in an immaterial, albeit social, room, but in a material reality where semiotic and nonsemiotic entities impact on behavior and on learning. The classroom is not just

a social space in the educational system, but a concrete (and often impoverished) physical setting that facilitates some kinds of behavior and hinders others. Given a starting point in agent-environment systems, learning is the cultivation of prospective agent-environment dynamics, and what is learnt in that agent-environment system (e.g., the pupil in class) may have no impact on another agent-environment system (e.g., the child at home) – even if the agent is the same. Along similar lines, Gardner and Wagner (2015) take their “ethnography of speaking” into the real-world, as they explore the sociomaterial dynamics of language learners’ conversations in everyday life.

The Development of Identity-Based Views

In his work on digital technologies, explored above, Steve Thorne (2013) evokes the notion of “superdiversity” (cf. Blommaert and Rampton 2011). At root, diversity is a characteristic of ecological systems, and it implies not just the copresence of multiple cultural backgrounds (“multiculturalism”), but a multitude of interdependent individual and collective life trajectories, aspirations, and motives. Through this emphasis, the notion of identity comes to the fore, because identity dynamics are one of the forces that shape learning trajectories. The pioneering work on this topic was Bonny Norton’s (2013) book, *Identity and Language Learning*. Norton revisits notions such as motivation and learning in a feminist, social activist theoretical light. By doing so, she constructs a view of identity as multiple, changing, and a site of conflict. As an example, Norton argues that immigrants to Anglophone countries can capitalize on their various identities, e.g., immigrant, woman, mother, employee, to stand up to their landlords or employers and redress the power imbalance they encounter in social life. Through the work of Norton, the SLA concept of “motivation” in language learning has now been supplemented by that of “investment” – a more participatory metaphor than that of motivation. However, Norton has been criticized for holding still too structuralist a view of identity. Instead of seeing one’s multiple social identities as given by one’s position in the social world, an ecological paradigm would see them as emerging in the interplay between local interaction and large-scale sociocultural and natural dynamics.

In a recent article, Uryu et al. (2014) relate the question of identity in navigating a superdiverse social setting to an ecological model of multiple timescales. They show how real-time social interaction is influenced by social, cultural, and national identity on much slower timescales. Using a conversation among four women – two Japanese, one German, and one Russian – as their example, they demonstrate how “six decades of postwar trauma and cultural accusation and guilt has accumulated into a high-energetic symbol [‘nazi’],” and how “the full energy of this symbol is released in a short moment, exploding in strong emotional and cultural cascades in the entire dialogical system” (p. 53). In their view, “identity is neither *stable* nor *constructed*, but *emergent*, and the emergence of identity is determined by identity attractors on many timescales” (ibidem).

The Development of Value-Based Approaches

The fourth development to be mentioned here also builds on van Lier's work. Van Lier (2004, p. 19) introduced the notion of *value* to SLA, where it denotes ethics and morality, and he concludes that, in this sense, there is no value-free language (van Lier 2004, p. 185). However, Kristi Newgarden and Dongping Zheng (Newgarden et al. 2015; Zheng 2012) point to a richer tradition of researching values in linguistics. They do so by exploring the work of Bert Hodges (Hodges and Baron 1992), and James Gibson's late insight that he had "been moving toward a psychology of values instead of a psychology of stimulus" (Gibson quoted in Hodges and Baron 1992, p. 263). For 25 years Hodges has developed a *values-realizing theory* that shows how agents balance multiple, at times contradictory, constraints on behavior, constraints that derive from the specific ecosystemic circumstances. Hodges' ecological pragmatics (Hodges 2011, 2014) has inspired Newgarden, Zheng, and colleagues to investigate how second language learners navigate in a 3D virtual world (Second Life and World of Warcraft). Zheng (2012, p. 557) shows that her learners "realized values demanded by the ecosystem by drawing on second-order, sociocultural, and linguistic norms" and that learning a language is not an end in itself, but is interwoven with such values as collaboration, sharing, and caring for one another in a virtual environment.

Problems, Difficulties, and Future Directions

As shown in this overview, there are multiple connections between the ecological approach and the many theoretical approaches in second language research. Perhaps the most striking observation is that some sort of ecological framework is being claimed by virtually all second language research theories to date (see Douglas Fir Group 2016, p. 20), especially by scholars in second language socialization proper. This widespread use of the ecological metaphor is evidence of both its strength and its weakness, its timeliness and its vulnerability. The idea that language learning is not a purely cognitive or linguistic activity but a lived, participatory social activity within communities of practice, subject to the multiple, changing, and conflictual forces of everyday life, is an accepted tenet of current theories of second language acquisition and socialization (see Douglas Fir Group 2016; Duff 2011; Duff and Talmy 2011). In fact, language acquisition and language socialization converge in the recent statement by the Douglas Fir Group that "language use and learning are seen as emergent, dynamic, unpredictable, open ended, and intersubjectively negotiated" (p. 19). But this large scale adoption makes second language acquisition *as* an ecological socialization process also vulnerable to criticism.

First, from the perspective of educational practice, language ecology has always had its critics from within applied linguistics. For instance, Pennycook (2004), while admitting that the strength of an ecological approach to SLA lies in its relationality, reflexivity, and decenteredness, accused it of losing the capacity to take a critical stance toward certain (nefarious) forms of socialization. This critique should

function as a reminder to ecologically oriented linguists never to lose sight of the power struggles inherent in cultural ecosystems.

Furthermore, while second language research has in the past been keen on maintaining its credibility by aiming to produce findings that are as reliable, generalizable, and predictable as those of the natural sciences, its ecological turn puts it at odds with the demand for standardized tests and institutional controls in language education. It is therefore at odds with the criteria of educational success recognizable and acceptable by a general public that does not necessarily espouse ecological views of education.

In general, a way forward for an ecological educational practice is to embrace practices that take their starting point in concrete learners' microecological orbits, rather than in institutional curricula in isolation. While these define a frame for educational practice, the real-life encounters between instructors and learners open up new possibilities for scaffolding the learners' appropriation of a second language. One way of doing so is presented in the work of Heath (2000) who, inspired by Bakhtin, highlights the educationally beneficial role of literary narratives in providing NNSs with alternative models of socialization, which she calls "scenarios of possibility." A similar approach is presented in Kramsch's (2009) work on how multilingual subjects entertain a personal reflexivity and social relationality based on the linguistic diversity of their own autobiography. The challenge for ecologically oriented research in language acquisition and socialization is to realize that institutional demands for public accountability and efficiency cannot be met if these demands are not also personally relevant and meaningful to the persons involved.

From a theoretical perspective, we see four major challenges for an ecological approach to second language research. The first challenge concerns the subjectivity and integrity of the language learner, and what we may term the ethics of identity. Individuals learning a second language in late childhood, adolescence, or adulthood have already been fully socialized into one language and culture in their families, schools, and workplaces. The memory of this first language socialization lingers when they attempt to adopt the verbal and nonverbal behaviors of another speech community. Applying the paradigm of first language socialization to already socialized individuals raises ethical issues that are currently anguishing many English teachers and researchers of English as a Second Language (ESL) around the world. Many have problematized the idealized NS as the linguistic and cultural model to be emulated in second language acquisition/socialization, especially as the availability of large-scale electronic corpora of NS English is making it easy to socialize NNSs into the ways with words of authentic native speakers on the streets of London or New York. But should NNSs be socialized into NS forms of discourse? And if in a globalized perspective, the very distinction NS/NNS no longer holds, which target should be used as a model? After all, the resistance of learners to reproduction through ESL is well documented (e.g., Lin 1999), and it is crucial to support the processes in which learners establish their personhood as a third place that is neither native nor nonnative (Kramsch 2009). If SLA necessarily entails socialization processes, if only in the institutional culture of the classroom, how do such processes relate to the power structures of the community in which both practitioners and learners reside?

The second challenge concerns the theoretical and methodological difficulty of approaching SLA from a socialization perspective. In line with the assumption that it is illusory to think of ‘language’ as a countable entity (Makoni and Pennycook 2007), ecological researchers in SLA need to engage with theoretical approaches that focus on languaging as a whole-bodied achievement (Larsen-Freeman 2003; Thibault 2011) but they must not forget that the code itself is a source of symbolic power that can be manipulated for propaganda and other deleterious or beneficial purposes (Kramsch 2016). It is fine for second language researchers to acknowledge that their object of study is not what learners say and write (or hear and read), but how they “appropriate sociocultural resources” and “navigate diversity” in an ecological environment. Language socialization offers ample methodological models of qualitative, longitudinal data analyses based on learners’ microecological orbits on multiple timescales. But as Kramsch has shown (2009, Chap. 1; 2016) the symbolic power of the code to impact on memories, perceptions, projections, and fantasies cannot be overestimated. Language socialization research must be supplemented by research in semiotics, literature, mythology, and translation to understand these code-related aspects of learning and using a language other than one’s own.

The third challenge is of a political nature. Massive globalization, new waves of migration, and the uninhibited growth of neoliberalism are a challenge to second language acquisition as socialization. Many constructs in the field, such as the reifications of “the” language, “the” culture, and “the” speech community, may have lost their theoretical value, but they all too easily become part of a neoliberal agenda for controlling and containing social change, such as when language assessments are exploited for purposes of social selection and exclusion. There is a real risk that language practitioners and researchers – in the name of whole-bodied meaning-making, multimodal communication, learning-through-gaming – play ostrich while English monocode bulldozes speech communities all over the world.

Finally, we address second language research from a sociology of science point of view: Has the ecological approach to language acquisition/socialization benefited or suffered from being incorporated in current second language research theories? Its main tenets – (1) the emergent nature of languaging and learning; (2) the crucial role of affordances in the environment; (3) the mediating function of language in the educational enterprise; and (4) the historicity and the subjectivity of the language learning experience, as well as its inherent conflictuality – seem to have found their place in mainstream theories. For instance, The Douglas Fir Group’s (2016) call for a transdisciplinary approach to SLA claims to offer an ecological framework that “assumes the embedding, at all levels, of social, sociocultural, sociocognitive, sociomaterial, ecosocial, ideological and emotional dimensions [of SLA]” (p. 24). But in this view the term “ecological” has only become a more sexy metaphor for “sociocultural context.” It does not put into question the very epistemic categories we use to construct our object of inquiry. A truly ecological model ushers in a paradigm change to research in SLA/SLS. It does not consist of an eclectic list of various “dimensions of SLA,” but seeks theoretical coherence in redefining SLA and SLS. It does not take categories like *immigrant*, *refugee*, *mother*, *learner*, *community*,

and dichotomies like *global vs. local* for natural, universal categories, but puts these categories into question (see Kramsch 2013). Indeed, it problematizes the very notion of “level” (micro-, meso-, and macrolevels) and questions the ideological base of Anglo-American research itself. By reinstating historicity and subjectivity into our theories, the ecological approach reminds us that a transdisciplinary SLA, coming as it does from the “global North,” does not have universal validity. A transdisciplinary theory of knowledge can easily become a tool in the service of a global economy that benefits some and leaves others behind. Theories, like researchers themselves, are embedded in webs of historical relations of power and in specific natural environments (Steffensen and Fill 2014). An ecological approach itself is not necessarily shared by all those who have a stake in second language learning and use, even though they claim to think ecologically. Among these, described by the Douglas Fir Group as “learners, and other stakeholders, including teachers, administrators, appointed and elected officials, parents, community members, business leaders and educational, business, and health organizations” (Douglas Fir Group 2016, p. 39), many would not subscribe to an ecological approach to language education, yet they too are part of language ecology. It would be a pity if the ecological stance in second language research became so trivialized as to serve to reinforce the very inequalities it purports to fight against.

Cross-References

- ▶ [Language Socialization in Digital Contexts](#)
- ▶ [Language Socialization: An Historical Overview](#)

Related Articles in the Encyclopedia of Language and Education

- Alan Rogers: [Learning: Embedded, Situated and Unconscious](#). In Volume: Literacies and Language Education
- Claire Kramsch: [Applied Linguistic Theory and Second/Foreign Language Education](#). In Volume: Second and Foreign Language Education
- Amy Ohta: [Sociocultural Theory and Second/Foreign Language Education](#). In Volume: Second and Foreign Language Education
- Karin Tusting: [Ecologies of Digital Literacies: Implications for Education](#). In Volume: Language, Education and Technology
- Randall Sadler: [Virtual Worlds and Language Education](#). In Volume: Language, Education and Technology
- Eva Lam: [Identity in Mediated Contexts of Transnationalism and Mobility](#). In Volume: Language, Education and Technology
- Ron Darvin and Bonny Norton: [Language, Identity and Investment in the 21st Century](#). In Volume: Language Policy and Political Issues in Education

References

- Atkinson, D. (2011). A sociocognitive approach to second language acquisition. In D. Atkinson (Ed.), *Alternative approaches to second language acquisition* (pp. 143–166). London: Routledge.
- Bakhtin, M. (1981). In M. Holquist (Ed.), *The dialogic imagination: Four essays*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Ball, A. F., & Freedman, S. W. (Eds.). (2004). *Bakhtinian perspectives on language, literacy, and learning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Block, D. (2003). *The social turn in second language acquisition*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.
- Blommaert, J., & Rampton, B. (2011). Language and superdiversity: A position paper. *Working Papers in Urban Language and Literacies*, 63, 2–22.
- Breen, M. P., & Candlin, C. N. (1980). The essentials of a communicative curriculum in language teaching. *Applied Linguistics*, 1(2), 89–112.
- Canale, M., & Swain, M. (1980). Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing. *Applied Linguistics*, 1(1), 1–47.
- Cazden, C. B. (2004). An appreciation and two questions. *Journal of Russian & East European Psychology*, 42(6), 76–78.
- Cowley, S. J. (2012). Cognitive dynamics: Language as values realizing activity. In A. Kravchenko (Ed.), *Cognitive dynamics in linguistic interactions* (pp. 1–32). Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Douglas Fir Group. (2016). A transdisciplinary framework for SLA in a multilingual world. *The Modern Language Journal*, 100(Suppl. 2016), 19–47.
- Duff, P. (2011). Second language socialization. In A. Duranti, E. Ochs, & B. Schieffelin (Eds.), *The handbook of language socialization* (pp. 564–585). Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Duff, P., & Talmy, S. (2011). Language socialization approaches to second language acquisition: Social, cultural and linguistic development in additional languages. In D. Atkinson (Ed.), *Alternative approaches to second language acquisition* (pp. 95–116). London: Routledge.
- Dufva, H. (2012). Bakhtin and second language acquisition. In A. Ohta (Section Ed.), *Social, dynamic, and complexity theory approaches to second language development*. In C. Chapelle (Ed.), *The encyclopedia of applied linguistics*. London: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Dufva, H. (2013). Language learning as dialogue and participation. In E. Christiansen, L. Kuure, A. Mørch, & B. Lindström (Eds.), *Problem-based learning for the 21st century: New practices and learning environments* (pp. 51–72). Aalborg: Aalborg University Press.
- Dufva, H., Aro, M., & Suni, M. (2014). Language learning as appropriation: How linguistic resources are recycled and regenerated. *AFinLA-e: Soveltavan kielitieteen tutkimuksia*, 6, 20–31.
- Firth, A., & Wagner, J. (1997). On discourse, communication, and (some) fundamental concepts in SLA research. *Modern Language Journal*, 81(3), 285–300.
- Gardner, R., & Wagner, J. (Eds.). (2015). *Second language conversations*. London: Continuum.
- Gibson, J. J. (1979). *The ecological approach to visual perception*. Hillsdale: Erlbaum.
- Goffman, E. (1964). The neglected situation. *American Anthropologist*, 66(6 PART2), 133–136. doi:10.1525/aa.1964.66.suppl_3.02a00090.
- Haeckel, E. H. (1866). *Generelle morphologie der organismen – Allgemeine grundzüge der organischen formen-wissenschaft, mechanisch begründet durch die von Charles Darwin reformierte descendenz-theorie, Vol. 2: Allgemeine entwicklungsgeschichte der organismen*. Berlin: Verlag von Georg Reimer.
- Haugen, E. I. (1972). *The ecology of language: Essays. Selected and introduced by Anwar S. Dil*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Heath, S. B. (2000). Seeing our way into learning. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 30(1), 121–132.

- Hodges, B. (2011). Ecological pragmatics. In S. J. Cowley (Ed.), *Distributed language* (Vol. 34, pp. 135–159).
- Hodges, B. H. (2014). Righting language: a view from ecological psychology. *Language Sciences*, 41, Part A(0), 93–103. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.langsci.2013.08.010>.
- Hodges, B. H., & Baron, R. M. (1992). Values as constraints on affordances: Perceiving and acting properly. *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour*, 22(3), 263–294. doi:[10.1111/j.1468-5914.1992.tb00220.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-5914.1992.tb00220.x).
- Kramsch, C. (2002). *Language acquisition and language socialization: Ecological perspectives*. London: Continuum.
- Kramsch, C. (2009). *The multilingual subject: What foreign language learners say about their experience and why it matters*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kramsch, C. (2013). Afterword. In B. Norton (Ed.), *Identity and language learning: Extending the conversation* (2nd ed., pp. 192–201). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Kramsch, C. (2016). The multiple faces of symbolic power: Epilogue. In H. Zhu & C. Kramsch (Eds.) *Symbolic power and conversational inequality. Applied Linguistics Review [Special issue]*, 7(4), 517–537.
- Lantolf, J. P. (Ed.). (2000). *Sociocultural theory and second language learning*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Larsen-Freeman, D. (1997). Chaos/complexity theory for second language acquisition. *Applied Linguistics*, 18(2), 141–165.
- Larsen-Freeman, D. (2003). *Teaching language: From grammar to grammaring*. Boston: Thomson Heinle.
- Larsen-Freeman, D., & Cameron, L. (2008). *Complex systems and applied linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Leather, J., & Van Dam, J. (Eds.). (2003). *Ecology of language acquisition*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic.
- Lemke, J. (2002). Language development and identity: Multiple timescales in the social ecology of learning. In C. Kramsch (Ed.), *Language acquisition and language socialization: Ecological perspectives* (pp. 68–87). London: Continuum.
- Lin, A. (1999). Doing-English-lessons in the reproduction or transformation of social worlds? *TESOL Quarterly*, 33(3), 393–412.
- Love, N. (1990). The locus of languages in a redefined linguistics. In H. G. Davis & T. J. Taylor (Eds.), *Redefining linguistics* (pp. 53–117). London: Routledge.
- Makoni, S., & Pennycook, A. (Eds.). (2007). *Disinventing and reconstituting languages*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Newgarden, K., Zheng, D., & Liu, M. (2015). An eco-dialogical study of second language learners' World of Warcraft (WoW) gameplay. *Language Sciences*, 48, 22–41.
- Norton, B. (2000). *Identity and language learning*. London: Longman.
- Ortega, L. (2011). SLA after the social turn: Where cognitivism and its alternatives stand. In D. Atkinson (Ed.), *Alternative approaches to second language acquisition* (pp. 167–180). London: Routledge.
- Pennycook, A. (2004). Language policy and the ecological turn. *Language Policy*, 3(3), 213–239.
- Rampton, B. (1995). *Crossing: Language and ethnicity among adolescents*. London: Longman.
- Reed, E. S. (1996). *Encountering the world: Toward an ecological psychology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Steffensen, S. V. (2015). Distributed language and dialogism: Notes on non-locality, sense-making and interactivity. *Language Sciences*, 50, 105–119. doi:[10.1016/j.langsci.2015.01.004](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.langsci.2015.01.004).
- Steffensen, S. V., & Fill, A. (2014). Ecolinguistics: The state of the art and future horizons. *Language Sciences*, 41(Part A), 6–25. doi:[10.1016/j.langsci.2013.08.003](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.langsci.2013.08.003).
- Steffensen, S. V., & Pedersen, S. B. (2014). Temporal dynamics in human interaction. *Cybernetics & Human Knowing*, 21(1–2), 80–97.
- Stigler, J. W., Shweder, R. A., & Herdt, G. (Eds.). (1990). *Cultural psychology: Essays on comparative human development*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Thibault, P. J. (2011). First-order languaging dynamics and second-order language: The distributed language view. *Ecological Psychology*, 23(3), 210–245. doi:[10.1080/10407413.2011.591274](https://doi.org/10.1080/10407413.2011.591274).
- Thorne, S. L. (2013). Language learning, ecological validity, and innovation under conditions of superdiversity. *Bellaterra Journal of Teaching & Learning Language & Literature*, 6(2), 1–27.
- Uryu, M., Steffensen, S. V., & Kramsch, C. (2014). The ecology of intercultural interaction: Timescales, temporal ranges and identity dynamics. *Language Sciences*, 41(Part A), 41–59. doi:[10.1016/j.langsci.2013.08.006](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.langsci.2013.08.006).
- Van Lier, L. (2004). *The ecology and semiotics of language learning: A sociocultural perspective*. Boston/Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic.
- Verspoor, M., De Bot, K., & Lowie, W. (2011). *A dynamic approach to second language development: Methods and techniques*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Pub. Company.
- Vološinov, V. N. (1973). *Marxism and the philosophy of language*. New York/London: Seminar Press.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1962). *Thought and language*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Zheng, D. (2012). Caring in the dynamics of design and languaging: Exploring second language learning in 3D virtual spaces. *Language Sciences*, 34(5), 543–558. doi:[10.1016/j.langsci.2012.03.010](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.langsci.2012.03.010).

Language Socialization: A Systemic Functional Perspective

Geoff Williams

Abstract

Since systemic functional linguistics (SFL) is a theory of language as social semiotic, its account of language development argues that virtually all language development results from language socialization. The chapter illustrates this argument through two complementary examples from early ontogenesis, a child's development of protolanguage prior to entry to the mother tongue, and children's development of different coding orientations as a result of semantic variation associated with different family social positioning. The examples are chosen to illustrate SFL's differentiation between *function* and *use*, and how *function* and *system* are key concepts for understanding language socialization in ontogenesis. They also illustrate SFL's argument that language does not develop first as a representational system but rather in the service of interpersonal meanings (as understood using a metafunctional model of language resources). The account of semantic variation, which is unique to SFL and crucial to language socialization, is shown to depend on a specific methodological development, semantic network descriptions. The chapter discusses the evolution of semantic networks from an early form developed by Halliday to describe contexts of control of children, but extended by Hasan for research into a wide range of early ontogenetic contexts. Finally, the discussion of function and system is extended to note recent work in academic literacy development which implicates an account of differential language socialization, particularly work on use and misuse of grammatical metaphor, as metafunctionally described by Halliday. This work is argued to hold interesting potential for addressing differences in language socialization that impact on academic literacy development.

G. Williams (✉)

Department of Language and Literacy Education, The University of British Columbia, Vancouver, BC, Canada

Faculty of Education and Social Work, University of Sydney, Sydney, NSW, Australia

e-mail: geoff.williams@sydney.edu.au

Keywords

Function • Genre-based • Register • Ontogenesis • Semantic variation • Social semiotics • System

Contents

Introduction	34
Early Developments	36
Major Contributions	38
Problems, Difficulties, and Future Developments	44
Cross-References	45
Related Articles in the Encyclopedia of Language and Education	45
References	45

Introduction

The point-of-departure for a systemic functional linguistic (SFL) account of language socialization must necessarily be its claim to be a theory of language as social semiotic (Halliday 1978; Hasan 2015b), broadly the theory that language is “a resource for meaning” in the complex socially constituted contexts within cultures. In Halliday’s (1978) words:

A “sociosemiotic” perspective implies an interpretation of the shifts, the irregularities, the disharmonies and the tensions that characterize human interaction and social processes. It attempts to explain the semiotic of the social structure, in its aspects of both persistence and change, including the semantics of social class, of the power system, of hierarchy and of social conflict. It attempts also to explain the linguistic processes whereby the members construct the social semiotic, whereby social reality is shaped, constrained and modified – processes which, far from tending towards an ideal construction, admit and even institutionalize myopia, prejudice and misunderstanding . . . (p. 127).

From this claim it follows that accounts of linguistic phenomena – meaning, lexicogrammar, ontogenesis, literacy, and so on – all are viewed as a result of the social.

Another way of representing this position is to say that it is a logical impossibility within the model for language to originate asocially, so language socialization is, in a sense, the process of language development itself (Williams and Lukin 2004). However, this orientation also entails a complex set of claims about relations between social context, the nature of language, and consequently language development. In producing an account of language socialization, SFL, as a theory of language, does not attempt to describe social structure directly but engages in “metadialogue” with sociological and social psychological theory that accords language a significant role in its account of social transmission and reproduction (Hasan 1999, 2005).

To present an SFL perspective together with some aspects of its relations with sociological and psychological theory, I will focus principally on two specific topics:

relations between a child's meaning-making prior to language and children's initial socialization into language use per se, and intracultural variation in meaning-making in everyday language use. The issue of intracultural variation, which is so much less researched than intercultural variation, has come to be called "semantic variation" in relation to speakers' social positioning, primarily through the work of Hasan (2009) and her students. These two questions have been chosen specifically to illustrate the status of the concepts of language *function* and language *system* in SFL accounts of language socialization. These two concepts, inter alia, are crucial to understanding SFL's approach to language variation, on which the account of socialization depends. "Function" is crucial to the theory, but does it mean anything more than "use" in this framework? Similarly, does "system" mean anything more than the general dimensions of a language?

From an educational perspective on language socialization, it might seem surprising that this SFL account of language socialization does not begin with genre-based pedagogy since it is by far the best-known SFL work, especially in North America. I should briefly describe genre-based pedagogy and explain this decision. The specific focus of SFL genre-based pedagogy is the problem of differential learner access to institutionally privileged genres as a result of differential language socialization. The approach was initially developed by James R. Martin, working with Joan Rothery, Frances Christie, and later colleagues, and has come to be self-titled the Sydney School. Its initial primary aims were to provide learners with explicit accounts of stages of the key genres required in school writing, and to learn to write them, but over the last two decades the scope has expanded considerably. One particularly interesting field is academic writing development, through which genre-based pedagogy has been given distinctive orientations (e.g., the work of Jones (2013) and her colleagues, and extensions particularly in the work of North American scholars such as Schleppegrell (2004a, b) and Byrnes (2009)). I will briefly discuss the significance of this work in the final section of the chapter.

One obvious reason for not using genre-based pedagogy as a point-of-departure, even though it is such a major contribution, is that a comprehensive overview of work in the "Sydney School" has been produced by Rose and Martin (2012). Additionally, there is an extensive descriptive and critical literature, including, for example, works by Christie and Martin (2005), Christie and Unsworth (2005), Hasan (1995, 2011), Martin (1985) and Hasan and Williams (1996).

However, beyond this simple, practical reason there is a more serious theoretical one. To orient the discussion of language socialization initially from genre-based pedagogy would risk giving a reductive account of how language variation is understood in SFL, specifically to risk giving a mistaken impression of *function* as equivalent to *use* in social practices through language. There is obviously a close link between the two terms, given especially that one of the primary interests of SFL is in how people actually use language in the living of life, but researching that use requires a theoretically elaborated description of function, in the SFL view.

Early Developments

In building an account of language use early in a child's life, SFL scholars have explored relations between the first systematic uses of sound and gesture to make meaning (in Halliday's term, *protolanguage*), and entry into language itself. This work has subsequently proved to be important to SFL descriptions of the functional nature of the language system per se and to processes of language socialization. Work on protolanguage is perhaps better known for its portrayal of a child's meaning-making development prior to language than as presenting a key theoretical proposition about relations between language development and social context, but nevertheless it is also theoretically crucial. (For a very lucid account of the development of SFL modelling of these and other theoretical relations, see Hasan 2015b.)

Halliday first introduced the concept of protolanguage in the early 1970s (Halliday 1975) to describe phenomena he had been observing in a case study of Nigel's meaning-making during the first 2 years of his life. For our purposes, there were two key elements in Halliday's proposal. The first was the suggestion that there was an evolutionary relationship between "functions" of protolanguage and "functions" in the language itself, in contrast with the idea that protolanguage is a pre-language form of communication that disappears as language proper is "acquired," or a reduced language form, which would eventually be assimilated into the first language. In this sense his work on protolanguage both precedes, and is qualitatively different from, Bickerton's (1990) proposal, which also uses the term protolanguage (for extended discussion of this point, see Painter 2005). The second was that, even in protolanguage there are important interpersonal, and hence social, functions enacted and it is these, rather than representational functions, which provide the major dynamic for entry into the first language.

In protolanguage, a child means through simple content-expression pairs, typically an expression such as an idiosyncratic sound and/or gesture that is interpreted over time by both child and caregiver to mean some specific content. While a child obviously develops many meaningful, generalized sounds – crying, gurgling, and the like – the sounds (signifiers) to which Halliday drew attention signify much more specific meanings. These sounds, typically combined with gestures, work in the restricted context of the family to enact a range of functions, now called micro-functions, such as to enact interpersonal relations, regulate the behavior of those around, make demands to get specific things done, find out new information, and so on. They are identifiable as categorically different from generalized sounds for the following reason: whenever the child means the specific meaning, she uses the specific sound-gesture signifier, and whenever she uses that signifier she means that content.

The origin of these signs is social since they arise through interaction with the local interpersonal context, but their meaning is idiosyncratic to the child, interpretable only by those in closest relation to her. Halliday further argues that it is (social) contextual pressure that eventually results in a move from protolanguage to language since, as the child's interpersonal range widens from the immediate family, she experiences the need to develop ways of meaning that function in new contexts,

and increasingly, over time. The introduction of lexis achieves that goal to some extent, but it is actually grammar that makes the crucial, qualitative change in meaning-making (Halliday 2004). However, as I will attempt to show in the next section, this does not mean that there are two processes, the acquisition of grammar and language socialization. Since in the SFL account, grammar is itself defined as functional, originating historically from meaning-making in social interaction, it is the relation between functionality in protolanguage and the functionality of the language system that enables the child to learn “how to mean” through language. In this sense, language socialization is the pathway to knowing a first language, in contrast with the proposal that language preexists social practice and is formed by it.

In parallel with Halliday’s early work on the first phases of individual ontogenesis, a different perspective relevant to SFL was being developed by the British sociologist Basil Bernstein (1971). He and his colleagues had begun exploring the question of variation in the ontogenesis of language use intraculturally, particularly in relation to social class. Significantly, in the initial phases of this work there was no well-theorized sense of language as system and this was to create major impediments to an account of language socialization until it was resolved. Unfortunately, the developments that have helped to resolve it are much less widely known than the early impediments.

In this work the defining question again was: How do people use language in the living of life? But the perspective here was from the social context towards the individual once the individual has begun to use language. From this orientation the question becomes: How do people use language in the living of life in different social positions within a culture? In asking this question Bernstein was directly influenced by Vygotsky’s (1978, 1986) and Luria’s (1976) research on the social origins of forms of consciousness, but to their theoretical work on semiotic mediation he added the question of effects of social structure on the nature of that semiotic mediation. He notes that “from Vygotsky and Luria, I absorbed the notion of speech as an orientating and regulative system” (Bernstein 1971, p. 6. For further discussion of this historical relation, see Hasan 2015a [1996], and Williams 2005).

In one sense the answer to this question is obvious, if complex to describe: in SFL terms, people use varieties of social dialect, and they use different registers that enable them to get things done, more or less successfully, in the various contexts of situation of their culture. However, Bernstein’s theoretical and descriptive work raised another possibility that language might function in systematically different ways to result in different “codes” or orientations to meaning practices across both dialects and registers. Codes are tacit principles regulating social interaction in contexts through three crucial aspects of meaning-making: recognition of contexts, relevance of meanings in contexts, and appropriate forms of the realization of meanings in those contexts. Different coding orientations, he argued, would be likely to result in implicit, invidious effects on children’s access to the privileged and privileging texts used in school since they would not be equally selected into educational discourse, resulting in misunderstanding of the nature of pedagogic contexts and the relevance of meanings to those contexts.

... if we look at education (school), the positioning of the child as pupil, the crucial control on such positioning, with respect to 'privileging text', is essentially a matter of class, race, gender, and age ... It is the *local* pedagogic practice within the family, peer group and community which initially positions the child or the parents with respect to the 'privileging text'. (Bernstein 1990, p. 176, original emphasis)

Those practices, he argued, are crucially mediated by language, though his discussion has also always included other types of semiotic modality (Bernstein 1971). His work was soon rejected as deriving from a deficit model of language development, most famously by Labov (1969) in "The Logic of Non-Standard English." These claims were examined in some detail and rebutted by Bernstein (e.g., 1990), but regrettably they are still frequently repeated in pedagogic handbooks and, even, research citations.

In fact, Bernstein's first attempts to theorize the problem and to describe "language correlates" were flawed, as he himself freely acknowledged (Bernstein 1971, 1990). Initially the linguistic correlates of code were couched in terms of the concepts of competence and performance, so the account was more or less located in syntax. However, in the latter part of the 1960s he abandoned that approach and instead began to think in terms of meanings being selected variably in general types of context of use. For example, his work in the Sociological Research Unit at the University of London explored different meanings people selected to control children's behavior through expressions such as "Don't do that!", "If you do that you could hurt yourself", "Stop doing that because it makes me really upset", and so on. The point is not that speakers select these meanings variably over time and across contexts – that is highly likely – but that there might be a systematic variation in the probabilities of meanings being selected within some socially defined categories¹ of families. The specific linguistic problem, which I will take up in the second part of the next section, is to develop an account of the linguistic system at the semantic stratum to describe semantic features in ways that would allow the proposition about different coding orientations to be tested.

The two sets of work apparently suggest a theoretical dilemma: on the one hand, a generalized view of a child's entry to language, including lexicogrammar, through meaning-making in social interaction, to which she or he is oriented from birth; and on the other, a particularized view of children forming differentiated orientations to meaning-making in relation to family social positioning. The process of language socialization is crucial to both views.

Major Contributions

The key moves that allowed an SFL account of socialization to address this apparent dilemma came through development of the concept of function alongside an account of system. "System" is defined multistratally to include semantics, lexicogrammar,

¹The social categories were defined in terms of relative position in the social division of labor, not by level of family income or socioeconomic status, both of which Bernstein regarded as too crude and indirect as measures of social positioning.

and phonology/graphology, and the general metaphor through which the description of the system is developed is that of “resource” for meaning. The key claim in SFL is that the system itself is functionally organized to address the highly complex social need to make and exchange meaning. That is, in this perspective, the linguistic system realizes culture because it is a social semiotic modality that functions in and through social processes to enable socially constituted subjects to exchange meanings.

What SFL studies of protolanguage have been able to demonstrate is that a child moves into use of the language system precisely because its functional qualities enable her to mean in ways that become significant as her range of social contexts and experiences expands over time and with increasing physical maturity. There is thus no sense of language developing and then being acted on by socializing processes, but rather of language as a system evolving into greater functional complexity for the individual through her engagement in shared social processes.

During the protolinguistic phase, each content-meaning pair means one thing only. There can be quite elaborate development of meanings for a particular micro-function – lots of specific greetings for members of a large family, for example – but nevertheless each sign means just the one meaning. But as a child’s experience broadens she typically uncouples two meaning-making resources in protolinguistic sounds – prosody from articulation, for example – and begins to extend the range of simultaneous meanings each utterance can realize. In Nigel’s case this uncoupling allowed him to “say” personal names (glossing, these were, “mother,” “father,” and “Anna”) and, at the same time, either “ask” for information (“where are you?”) or “declare” someone’s presence (“There you are!”) (Halliday 2004, pp. 30–31). At this early stage there are just two simple functions (“interact” and “representation”) in each instance of use, but this change represents a qualitatively different level of semiotic practice since, now, two generalized functions are deployed in each instance of use. In Halliday’s own study, and those subsequently conducted by Painter (2015 [1984]) and Torr (1997), some such uncoupling has been observed to lead to initial generalization of microfunctions into two broad, temporary, functional resources, or macrofunctions, that, on the one hand, allow children to act on the world (“pragmatic” functions in Halliday’s terms) and resources to find out about the world (“mathetic” functions).

Crucially, Halliday was able to develop a detailed account of how these temporary macrofunctions eventually evolve into the functionally defined, abstract resources of the language system itself, resources he describes in terms of three generalized functions of language: to represent experience, to enable interpersonal interaction, and to organize coherent text (Halliday 1978, 2002). His term for the idea of “function” generalized in this way is “metafunction.” Halliday makes the distinctive claim that the qualities of these metafunctionally organized resources are as they are because of the social needs and processes that a language must address. It is these qualities that enable a child to learn how to mean through language with such facility from such a simple meaning-resource as comprised by a protolanguage. The claim about interaction between social processes and the metafunctional “nature” of language systems is, in turn, the basis on which SFL scholars argue that language

“socialization” is, in an important sense, the key process for the evolution of language in both ontogenesis and phylogenesis (For extended discussion, see especially Halliday 1973; Matthiessen 2004). A detailed case study by Painter (2005 [1999]) of the dialectic process between emerging knowledge of the language system and social context has considerably extended evidence available from the earlier studies of protolanguage.

More recent work has begun to explore a stronger claim for the significance of social interaction in language development. The claim, again originally from Halliday, is that interpersonal meanings develop first, and typically provide the basis for the development of representational ones. This claim contrasts sharply with a more usual idea that a child learns representational meanings first, then learns the grammar that allows her to interact about them. However, Painter (2004), for example, claims:

the first semiotic system of the individual emerges to enable the infant to share reactions to experience with the other, and it is upon this personal and interpersonal foundation that language proper is built ... the impetus to share emotional experience that appears to underlie the development of protolanguage is similarly responsible for the transition into language itself (p. 139).

Painter (2004) provides examples of her son Stephen’s development of generalizations to illustrate: Stephens’s first occasions for using generic categories were only in relation to aspects of experiences that were emotionally highly charged. In his case it was almost exclusively the domain of age, since he was very conscious of being the “little boy” in the household, always wishing to achieve the status of his older brother, but he also attended a preschool where there were babies and younger “little” children. It would seem that reflection on this affectively salient domain provided Stephen with the way “in” to this new linguistic development, after which, in his fourth year, it became routine to talk about generic categories and their relationships.

This, then, is a broad sketch of the way language socialization is described in very early ontogenesis from the perspective of individual development, and of how individual development is understood in terms of the functionality of various stages of linguistic semiosis in relation to the functional qualities of the system itself. However, as discussed in the preceding section, there is a complementary interest in ontogenesis from the perspective of social structure and processes, and this too has relied on an elaborated description of function and system to explore language socialization.

As I noted in the initial discussion above, Bernstein’s first sociological attempts to describe differences in coding orientation in terms of syntax were flawed, and he abandoned that approach in favor of meaning-oriented descriptions (Turner 1973). Interested by the significance Bernstein attributed to language in social transmission and reproduction, SFL researchers began working to develop systematic semantic descriptions which would allow mapping of the selections of features of meaning people made in everyday contexts, and hence examination of possible systematic

variation in these selections in relation to social positioning. As Halliday (see, e.g., Halliday 1978) was quick to point out, from a linguistic viewpoint there can be no question of linguistic “deficit” – language develops ontogenetically because of its functional relevance to the living of life, so almost all language users develop a “functional” knowledge of language as a system, unless there is some impairment to brain function. And this knowledge is always partial, for all users. No one can know a whole language. However, it might be possible that people will typically and habitually select some meanings rather than others across contexts of use and over time because of some general features of social structure – gender, age, and class, for example – and that these typical meaning selections form what Bernstein called the “linguistic correlates” of coding orientations. The SFL way of framing this claim to make it linguistically researchable is to say that different coding orientations, should they exist, would be realized through the systematically differentiated selection of different configurations of semantic features, resulting in semantic variation.

It was a development in description of the semantic system that provided the required breakthrough to understanding “linguistic correlates” and why they might be functionally differentiated in different social class contexts. Halliday suggested that it might be possible to map specific fractions of the semantic potential of a language, and illustrated by writing a small, intricate map, or semantic network, of all the possible meanings people make in controlling the behavior of young children. (He was responding to Bernstein’s (1971) interest in the significance of this context, along with others as “critical socializing contexts” for the development of coding orientations.) It was then possible to closely analyze what people habitually did in control contexts by plotting their linguistic “doings” against the potential of the system, as described by the semantic map, and then to examine the selections statistically to determine whether there might be consistently different patterns of choice from the system associated with speakers in different social positions. A further crucial feature of Halliday’s proposal was that each semantic option was specified in terms of the lexicogrammatical features through which it was realized. This distinguished the system description from either impressionistic interpretations or from content-based descriptions, which would necessarily have been tied just to representational meanings.

However, while the general concept proved to be fruitful for empirical research in language socialization, its range of application was limited since it mapped only one general type of context, control of children’s behavior. For this research initiative to be extended, a more general mapping of the system potential was required, most importantly across a range of everyday contexts of casual conversation in families, given Bernstein’s argument about the significance of local pedagogic practices.

Such a map was developed by Hasan, initially in 1983, and became available in an expanded form in Hasan (2009). To illustrate this approach very briefly, interaction between caregivers and children is analyzed through multiple (metafunctional) perspectives on linguistic messages. The perspectives are organized as a general, integrated map of the meanings typically exchanged at the level of message in everyday contexts in families. A message is formally defined as the smallest semantic unit that is capable of realizing an element in the structure of texts and is

typically realized through clauses. This orientation to the study of semantics is rather different from more typical lexically oriented semantic research, though it does not at all preclude such parallel study. Message semantics has been developed, though, to support the study of features of language use in context, including particularly the negotiation of meanings interactively, hence the orientation of message semantics to studying elements of texts. In all, about 70 variables are available for the description of each message (clause), described as systems and subsystems of the semantic network.

Hasan and her colleagues have found clear, extensive evidence of semantic variation associated with speakers' social class positioning and interpret this as evidence of differences in coding orientation as predicted by Bernstein. The data for these studies have been audio recordings of naturally occurring conversations in families, made by caregivers, and similar recordings in kindergarten classrooms. The advantage of a system-based semantic description is that it enables researchers to describe sets of features from different metafunctions that contribute to the principal components accounting for variance. However, it is not possible to illustrate details from these findings with brief excerpts without creating a reductive account of the nature of the variation. And great caution is required since partial accounts lead directly to the appearance of linguistic deficit. Coding orientation is not realized either by single semantic features or by simple aggregations of them, but rather by configurations that are intricately interrelated, resulting in delicate habitual meaning differences. Hasan (1989, 1992, 2004), Hasan and Cloran (1994), and Williams (1995, 1999, 2001) present sets of these findings, and the first book-length presentation of them is found in Hasan (2009).

These results raise an obvious question: What is the relationship between the different meaning configurations and the typical meaning orientation used in school discourse, if there is one? From a simultaneous study of school discourse in the first few months of schooling, in the same locations as the families participating in his contrasted cohorts, Williams (1995) found substantial, metafunctionally distributed evidence that one type of family configuration was closely associated with school discourse and the other was not. The finding accords with Bernstein's (1990) prediction about the differential institutional distribution of coding orientations and the invidious positioning of many families in relation to school discourse.

In SFL, semantic variation of this kind, which is interpreted as the realization of differences in coding orientation, is distinguished from two other general types of language variation, dialectal and register variation, as noted above (For detailed discussion, see Hasan 2009, Chap. 6). Dialectal variation is viewed, in Halliday's (1978) words, as "variation according to user," by which he means the socio-demographic positioning of a speaker. There has been little original work on dialectal variation within SFL, though there is intense interest in the findings of scholars working on dialect within other traditions, especially in effects of dialectal difference on socialization. However, work on dialectal variation is not a major contribution from SFL. In contrast, register variation is.

Register variation is viewed as "variation according to use" (rather than "user," as with dialect). By this, Halliday means the selection of language features from the

resources of the system that typify use in a context type. In the SFL model, features of a context are understood to activate meanings, which in turn activate lexicogrammatical and phonological patterns. In the reverse direction, from the phonological, lexicogrammatical, and semantic patterns a language user construes the type of context. It is the configuration of language features that is crucial, rather than the occurrence of instances from sets of features. To illustrate this briefly from the “construal” perspective, here is a sample of interaction, selected after several minutes of a discussion between two people. For the moment I withhold any further information about the setting. It has been deliberately chosen as different from the context referred to in the preceding discussion and, fortunately, one that most readers are unlikely to have experienced, to illustrate how strongly language socialization affects construal.

- | | |
|------------|---|
| SPEAKER 1: | The the thing with the melanoma so the I'll just go through the pathology because the pathology was originally reported by the lab um where Dr [NAME] sent it off to, and then we had a a secondary ah opinion by our pathologist here at |
| SPEAKER 2: | Yes |
| SPEAKER 1: | [NAME OF HOSPITAL] because they we're a tertiary referral centre so they see a lot of melanoma, which is why we get them to report it. |

Most speakers of English will recognize this language as from a medical register of clinician – patient spoken interaction in cancer care. How do we do so? The most immediately visible feature is the technical lexis – *melanoma*, *pathology*, and *tertiary*. But nontechnical lexis also has specific meaning effects in this environment – *reported*, *secondary*, *lab*, and *sent off*. Less immediately visible, but equally significant, are the transitivity features (i.e., Who does what to whom/what?) in clauses such as “we had a secondary opinion *by our pathologist* here . . .” and “which is why *we* get *them* to report it,” together with interpersonal features such as Speaker 1’s agency in leading the interaction, the length of his utterances, the minimal use of modality (no use of *perhaps* or *might* or similar resources), and so on. So it is not just the technical lexis that results in the construal and contextual recognition but the *configuration* of many features selected from the metafunctional resources of the system. They together form a pattern of meaning relatively distinctive to this context, but nevertheless sufficiently closely related to other healthcare communication contexts and registers to enable a reader of this chapter to use the patterning to construe the context.

But recognizing a register is quite a different matter from being competent to produce it, or even to interact in it meaningfully. In SFL’s point-of-view this gap

often results from differences in language socialization. The patient interacting in this particular example eventually had no evident choice but to accept the clinician's treatment recommendation because he was so unfamiliar with the ways of meaning employed by the clinician. However, the same clinician interacting with other patients with different language socialization is addressed with many questions, which he answers comprehensively. From an SFL perspective, the crucial issue is the effects of differences in patient language socialization on the *co-construction* of meaning.

Using this explanation of the significance of register and the process of construal, I turn briefly to recent SFL work on academic literacy development, where register is a key enabling concept. This work extends beyond description of stages of texts in different genres, and illustrations of grammatical features associated with them, to teaching students to use detailed semantic and lexicogrammatical descriptions in interpreting, critiquing, and writing texts within academic registers and the types of context of situation with which they are associated. Of particular significance is work on the use and misuse of grammatical metaphor in academic registers. Research by Schleppegrell (2004a, b) and Byrnes (2009) provides cogent examples.

Grammatical metaphor was first systematically described by Halliday (1985). Nominalization is one very familiar type of grammatical metaphor, but Halliday's distinctive contribution was to identify many other types that are crucial to the language of specific registers. One example is logical grammatical metaphor, through which grammatical items as diverse as conjunctions and auxiliary verbs are shifted into "main verbs," with significant consequences for other discourse features. For example, in "To avoid excessive wear, the wheel *must* be properly aligned," the modality of obligation encoded through *must* is shifted through grammatical metaphor to *requires* in "Avoidance of excessive wear *requires* proper wheel alignment," or by even more metaphorical moves to "Improper wheel alignment causes excessive wear."

This work is promising because it holds some potential to address two types of variation, both registerial and semantic variation. If a learner's habitual ways of meaning developed through her language socialization have not typically included use of grammatical metaphor, then it is likely that explicit instruction of the registerial functionality of grammatical metaphor will assist her both to write it and to critique it where it is dysfunctional. Explicitly taught information about the functionally organized resources of the language system, and how grammatical metaphor reconfigures those resources, might help to provide the kind of robust understanding that is needed for independent writing of registers. SFL work on this topic has begun only relatively recently but it is expanding rapidly.

Problems, Difficulties, and Future Developments

Each of the facets of SFL work selected for discussion here involves complex practical issues to resolve in order for research to be expanded. One general issue is cost. SFL research is typically very detailed, and therefore time-intensive. Attracting sufficient research funding to enable detailed exploration of discourse is

difficult, though it is becoming easier than a decade or so ago as the corpus of SFL research is built and the international range of work increases. Work on academic literacy development is a clear example of this expansion.

Developing appropriate forms of statistical analysis for the results of SFL discourse analysis is a major issue to be solved. While both qualitative and quantitative methodologies have been used in this field for different purposes (see, for example, Williams 2001), statistical analyses of patterns of interaction have been important for analyzing variation in general meaning-making tendencies across groups of participants in the contrasted social locations. Hasan's (2009) research used a principal components approach fruitfully, but to enable statistical comparisons she was obliged to compare fairly general semantic features across metafunctions. In contrast, Williams' (1995) research used comparisons of median frequencies of much more specific features, but had to cede the possibility of a statistically based comparison of a large range of multiple features. Interrelations between features had to be explored on the basis of indicative findings from Hasan's (2009) parallel study. Finding robust statistical tests is an outstanding problem.

The chapter began with ontogenesis, and it is in this field that one of the most urgent problems persists. How can educators address the consequences of semantic variation in discourse in relation to family social positioning? As Hasan (2011) so cogently notes:

While it is true that the major thrust of the educational system is towards imparting specialized knowledge to all, the fact is that nothing can be imparted where there is lack of readiness to receive (p. 91).

In SFL's perspective, differential readiness is seen to be, to a very large extent, the outcome of differential language socialization involving semantic variation.

Cross-References

► [Academic Discourse Socialization](#)

Related Articles in the Encyclopedia of Language and Education

Francis Christie. Genres and Institutions: Functional Perspectives on Educational Discourse. In Volume: Discourse and Education

References

- Bernstein, B. (1971). *Class, codes and control, Theoretical studies towards a sociology of language* (Vol. 1). London: Routledge/Kegan Paul.
- Bernstein, B. (1990). *Class, codes and control, The structuring of pedagogic discourse* (Vol. 4). London: Routledge/Kegan Paul.

- Bernstein, B. (2000 [1996]). *Pedagogy, symbolic control and identity: Theory, research, critique*. London: Rowan and Littlefield.
- Bickerton, D. (1990). *Language and species*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Bymes, H. (2009). Emergent L2 German writing ability in a curricular context: A longitudinal study of grammatical metaphor. *Linguistics and Education*, 20, 50–66.
- Christie, F., & Martin, J. R. (2005). *Genre and institutions*. Sydney: Allen and Unwin.
- Christie, F., & Unsworth, L. (2005). Developing dimensions of an educational linguistics. In J. J. Webster, C. M. I. M. Matthiessen, & R. Hasan (Eds.), *Continuing discourse on language* (Vol. 1, pp. 217–250). London: Equinox.
- Cloran, C. (1994). *Rhetorical units and decontextualization: An enquiry into some relations of context, meaning and grammar, Monographs in systemic functional linguistics* (Vol. 6). Nottingham: Department of English Studies, University of Nottingham.
- Halliday, M. A. K. (1973). *Explorations in the functions of language*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Halliday, M. A. K. (1975). *Learning how to mean: Explorations in the development of language*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Halliday, M. A. K. (1978). *Language as social semiotic: The social interpretation of language and meaning*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Halliday, M. A. K. (1985). *An introduction to functional grammar*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Halliday, M. A. K. (2002). *On grammar* (Ed.: Webster, J. J., The collected works of M.A.K. Halliday, Vol. 1). London: Continuum.
- Halliday, M. A. K. (2004). On grammar as the driving force from primary to higher-order consciousness. In G. Williams & A. Lukin (Eds.), *The development of language: Functional perspectives on species and individuals* (pp. 15–44). London: Continuum.
- Hasan, R. (1989). Semantic variation and sociolinguistics. *Australian Journal of Linguistics*, 9, 221–275.
- Hasan, R. (1992). Meaning in sociolinguistic theory. In K. Bolton & H. Kwok (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics today: International perspectives* (pp. 80–119). London/New York: Routledge.
- Hasan, R. (1995). The conception of context in text. In P. H. Fries & M. Gregory (Eds.), *Discourse in society: Functional perspectives. Meaning and choice in language: Studies for Michael Halliday* (pp. 183–283). Norwood: Ablex.
- Hasan, R. (1999). Society, language and the mind: The meta-dialogism of Basil Bernstein's theory. In F. Christie (Ed.), *Pedagogy and the shaping of consciousness: Linguistic and social processes* (pp. 10–30). London: Cassell.
- Hasan, R. (2004). The world in words: Semiotic mediation, tenor and ideology. In G. Williams & A. Lukin (Eds.), *The development of language: Functional perspectives on species and individuals* (pp. 158–181). London: Continuum.
- Hasan, R. (2005). *Language, society and consciousness: Learning and teaching in society* (Ed.: Webster, J. J., The collected works of Ruqaiya Hasan, Vol. 1). London: Equinox.
- Hasan, R. (2009). *Semantic variation: Meaning in society and in sociolinguistics* (Ed.: Webster, J. J., The collected works of Ruqaiya Hasan, Vol. 2). London: Equinox.
- Hasan, R. (2011). *Language and education: Learning and teaching in society* (Ed.: Webster, J. J., The collected works of Ruqaiya Hasan, Vol. 3). London: Equinox.
- Hasan, R. (2015a [1996]) Semantic networks: A tool for the analysis of meaning. In C. Cloran, D. Butt, & G. Williams (Eds.), *Ways of saying: ways of meaning: Selected papers of Ruqaiya Hasan* (pp. 104–131). London: Cassell.
- Hasan, R. (2015b). Systemic functional linguistics: Halliday and the evolution of a social semiotic. In J. J. Webster (Ed.), *The Bloomsbury companion to M.A.K. Halliday* (pp. 101–133). London: Bloomsbury.
- Hasan, R., & Cloran, C. (1990). A sociolinguistic interpretation of everyday talk between mothers and children. In M. A. K. Halliday, J. Gibbons, & H. Nicholas (Eds.), *Learning, keeping and using language* (Vol. 1, pp. 67–99). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Hasan, R., & Williams, G. (Eds.). (1996). *Literacy in society*. London: Longman.

- Jones, J. (2013). *Functional grammar for academic writing* (Vols. 1, 2, 3). Sydney: The Learning Centre, University of Sydney.
- Labov, W. (1969). The logic of non-standard English. In J. Alatis (Ed.), *Linguistics and the teaching of standard English to speakers of other languages or dialects*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.
- Luria, A.R. (1976). *Cognitive development: Its cultural and social foundations* (trans: Lopez-Morillas, M. & Solotaroff, L.; Ed.: Cole, M.). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Martin, J. R. (1985). *Factual writing*. Geelong: Deakin University Press.
- Matthiessen, C. M. I. M. (2004). The evolution of language: A systemic functional exploration of phylogenetic phases. In G. Williams & A. Lukin (Eds.), *The development of language: Functional perspectives on species and individuals* (pp. 45–90). London: Continuum.
- Painter, C. (2004). The “interpersonal first” principle in child language development. In G. Williams & A. Lukin (Eds.), *The development of language: Functional perspectives on species and individuals* (pp. 137–157). London: Continuum.
- Painter, C. (2005). The concept of protolanguage in language development. *Linguistics and the Human Sciences*, 1(2), 177–196.
- Painter, C. (2005 [1999]). *Learning through language in early childhood*. London: Continuum.
- Painter, C. (2015 [1984]). *Into the mother tongue: A case study in early language development*. London: Bloomsbury Academic.
- Rose, D., & Martin, J. R. (2012). *Learning to write, reading to learn: Genre, knowledge and pedagogy in the Sydney School*. Sheffield: Equinox.
- Schleppegrell, M. (2004a). *The language of schooling: A functional linguistics perspective*. Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Schleppegrell, M. J. (2004b). Technical writing in a second language: The role of grammatical metaphor. In L. J. Ravelli & R. A. Ellis (Eds.), *Analysing academic writing: contextualised frameworks* (pp. 172–189). London: Continuum.
- Torr, J. (1997). *From child tongue to mother tongue: A case study of language development in the first two and a half years, Monographs in systemic functional linguistics* (Vol. 9). Nottingham: Department of English Studies, University of Nottingham.
- Turner, G. J. (1973). Social class and children’s language of control at age five and seven. In B. Bernstein (Ed.), *Class, codes and control, Applied studies towards a sociology of language* (Vol. 2). London: Routledge/Kegan Paul.
- Vygotsky, L.S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes* (Eds.: M. Cole, V. John-Steiner, S. Scribner, & E. Souberman). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Vygotsky, L.S. (1986 [1962]). *Thought and language* (trans: Kozulin, A.). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Williams, G. (1995). *Joint book-reading and literacy pedagogy: A socio-semantic examination* (Vols. 1 and 2). Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Macquarie University. <http://minerva.mq.edu.au:8080/vital/access/manager/Repository/mq:7594>
- Williams, G. (1999). The pedagogic device and the production of pedagogic discourse: A case example in early literacy education. In F. Christie (Ed.), *Pedagogy and the shaping of consciousness: Linguistic and social processes* (pp. 88–122). London: Cassell Academic.
- Williams, G. (2001). Literacy pedagogy prior to schooling: Relations between social positioning and semantic variation. In A. Morais, I. Neves, B. Davies, & H. Baillie (Eds.), *Towards a sociology of pedagogy: The contribution of Basil Bernstein to research* (pp. 17–45). New York/Oxford: Peter Lang.
- Williams, G. (2005). Semantic variation. In J. Webster, C. Matthiessen, & R. Hasan (Eds.), *Continuing discourse on language* (Vol. 1, pp. 457–480). London: Equinox.
- Williams, G., & Lukin, A. (Eds.). (2004). *The development of language: Functional perspectives on species and individuals*. London: Continuum.

Pragmatic Socialization

Duanduan Li

Abstract

This chapter reviews literature in both first language (L1) pragmatic socialization and the pragmatic (re)socialization or ongoing socialization of learners in various learning contexts in bilingual and multilingual societies. The studies reveal aspects of the acquisition of language and sociocultural competence as developmentally intertwined processes occurring within daily routine activities. In these settings, children and other novices learn to interpret, negotiate, and index meaning while (co-)constructing different types of social/cultural identities and relationships. Research done within the framework of pragmatic socialization demonstrates a more social and contextual orientation than traditional interlanguage pragmatics, offering researchers opportunities to look at the interactive nature and the social functions of pragmatic behaviors and linguistic forms that are deeply embedded in the rapidly changing, multilingual world in new and illuminating ways.

Keywords

Pragmatics, pragmatic socialization • Metapragmatic • Language learning • Language socialization • Intercultural communication • Learner agency • Identity • Sociolinguistics • Multilingualism • Qualitative research methodology

D. Li (✉)

The University of British Columbia, Vancouver, BC, Canada

e-mail: duanduan.li@ubc.ca

Contents

Introduction	50
Early Developments	51
Major Contributions	52
Recent Studies and Work in Progress	55
Issues and Problems	58
Learner Agency/Subjectivity	58
Criteria for Exemplary Pragmatic Socialization Research	58
Practical Problems (“Observer’s Paradox”)	59
Future Directions	59
Cross-References	60
Related Articles in the Encyclopedia of Language and Education	60
References	60

Introduction

As linguistic anthropologists have long recognized, cultural values, beliefs, ideologies, expectations, and preferences are indexed and inculcated in everyday discourse and social interactions. A powerful contribution that language socialization theory makes to an understanding of language development is its close attention to the linguistic forms and interactions that are used to socialize children and other novices into expected roles and behaviors in their cultural contexts. As Ochs (1996) explains, language socialization entails “socialization to use language *meaningfully, appropriately, and effectively*” (p. 408, italics added). In this sense, much language socialization research entails aspects of the acquisition or development of pragmatics (i.e., features of optimal language use in discursive, textual, and social context) and, thus, pragmatic competence (Kasper 2001).

Pragmatic socialization, according to Blum-Kulka (1997), mirroring Ochs’ (1996) statement above, refers to “the ways in which children are socialized to use language in context in socially and culturally appropriate ways” (p. 3). In the intervening years since these definitions were generated, a growing amount of research has looked not only at children’s pragmatic development (in either their first or additional languages) but also at the pragmatic socialization and development of adults.

In this chapter, I review literature in both first language (L1) pragmatic socialization and the pragmatic (re)socialization or ongoing socialization of learners in various learning contexts in bilingual and multilingual societies (e.g., Becker 1982; Clancy 1986; Duff 2003; Li 2000; Schieffelin and Ochs 1986; Taguchi 2014; Zhu 2010). The studies reveal aspects of the acquisition of language and sociocultural competence as developmentally intertwined processes occurring within daily routine activities. In these settings, children and other novices learn to interpret, negotiate, and index meaning while (co-)constructing different types of social/cultural identities and relationships. Research done within the framework of pragmatic socialization reflects a more social and contextual orientation than the “cognitive/mentalistic” orientation of earlier pragmatics studies (Firth and Wagner 1997).

Early Developments

The majority of earlier pragmatic socialization research was carried out by L1 researchers who built upon the work of child developmental pragmatics in the late 1970s and early 1980s (see Ochs and Schieffelin 2008, 2011) and extended the traditional microanalysis of interactions between children and their parents/caregivers by linking these processes to more general ethnographic accounts of cultural values and beliefs. The pragmatic behaviors of children, their peers, and caregivers were compared with interactional patterns within the wider community. For instance, Samoan children's speech act of clarification was tied to comparable routines in legal, school, and work settings (Ochs 1988). Rhetorical questions asked by and directed to Kaluli children were compared with cultural preferences for an indirect speech style or for "turned over" language (Schieffelin 1985). The structure of Kware'ae children's disagreement and conflict resolution was, similarly, guided by norms governing these activities in Kware'ae adults' communication (Watson-Gegeo and Gegeo 1986). The main focus of these studies was children's acquisition of the complex set of culturally specific rules such as the effective performance of interactional routines (events and acts), appropriate conversational strategies, and expressions of politeness, which are required to participate in social communication in a pragmatically competent manner. In addition, they examined the kind of metapragmatic input parents provided to socialize their children into and through such routines (Becker 1994; Gleason et al. 1984; Goldfield and Snow 1992; Ochs 1988; Schieffelin 1990; Schieffelin and Ochs 1986).

Pragmatic socialization processes may be either explicit or implicit (Ochs 1986, 1990). Explicit socialization is the process used when caregivers clearly teach social and linguistic norms shared by members of society. In Ochs' (1990) terms, this is "socialization to *use* language" appropriately (p. 291). Eliciting politeness routines (e.g., "Say 'Thanks!'" or "What's the magic word?" [=Please]) or offering conversational rules (e.g., "It's your brother's turn to speak!") are examples of how language is used explicitly as both a medium and object of socialization. However, even though explicit socialization is the most salient to observe, "the greatest part of sociocultural information is keyed implicitly" (Ochs 1990, p. 291), a case of socialization *through* the use of language – not only to language norms but to other kinds of knowledge and ideologies as well. By observing and interacting with more expert members in language practices, novices develop a tacit understanding of sociocultural phenomena and (normally) become competent members of a community. For example, Gleason et al. (1984) found that young children learn how boys and girls (like men and women) are supposed to speak and behave by hearing gender-differentiated language at home or in other contexts.

One domain that has received considerable attention in pragmatic studies is the notion of politeness. Indeed, "politeness is embedded in all aspects of human social interaction and as such is central to pragmatic socialization" (Blum-Kulka 1997, p. 142). Researchers in North America have described how middle-class mothers put great efforts into socializing children into expected polite behavior, such as using the routines and expressions *please, excuse me, thank you*, and following turn-taking

rules in contexts ranging from “trick or treat” requests on Halloween, to dinner table conversations, and other daily occurring interactions (Becker 1994; Gleason et al. 1984).

Researchers have noted, however, that even though children are often labeled as “novices” in the pragmatic socialization process, they are not merely passive receivers but are active participants in constructing metapragmatic knowledge and also have the potential and agency to socialize their caregivers (Becker 1994; Gleason et al. 1984; Ochs and Schieffelin 2011; Schieffelin and Ochs 1986).

Major Contributions

In the decades since the earliest formulation of language socialization as a productive theoretical framework, Ochs’ (1988) groundbreaking research in Western Samoa remains among the most often cited work in pragmatic socialization studies. Particular attention is given to the socializing role of indexicals, that is, linguistic resources that derive their meaning from conventional associations with the sociocultural dimensions of context. Ochs (1996) states that “a basic tenet of language socialization research is that *socialization is in part a process of assigning situational, i.e., indexical meanings* (e.g., temporal, spatial, social identity, social act, social activity, affective or epistemic meaning) to particular forms (e.g., interrogative forms, diminutive affixes, raised pitch and the like)” (p. 411, italics in original). Indexical knowledge, according to Ochs, is “the core of linguistic and cultural competence and is the locus where language acquisition and socialization interface” (p. 414).

One important element of social competence investigated in Ochs’ (1996) study is the linguistic indexing of affective stance – culturally appropriate ways to express feelings and to recognize the moods and emotions displayed by others. Caregiver-child verbal interactions were recorded and analyzed to demonstrate how Samoan children acquire affective expressions of love, fear, sympathy, and shame through adults’ and older siblings’ use of affectively loaded linguistic forms (e.g., particles such as affective specifiers and affective intensifiers) in speech acts such as teasing, shaming, challenging, and asserting. For example, the particle “e” in Samoan can index anger, disappointment, displeasure, or irritation. Children learn at a very early age that adding this particle to an imperative sentence can signal a threat or a warning. In addition, before children acquire the neutral (unmarked) personal pronoun “a’u”, they have already mastered the special first personal pronoun “ita” (indexing sympathy) to make their imperatives sound like “pleading” or “begging,” which is a culturally preferred way of requesting in Samoan society.

Similar work done by Schieffelin (1985) examined how mothers in the Kaluli community of Papua New Guinea socialized their young children to understand and eventually respond to two routine speech acts: teasing and shaming. These routines are pervasive in everyday social interactions in Kaluli culture, taken as important means of persuasion and crucial skills in the public management of others. Kaluli mothers try to socialize their children (from as young as 6 months old) with verbal manipulation of teasing and shaming to demonstrate the necessary linguistic and

pragmatic knowledge of the conventionalized strategies. In Kaluli society, only when people acquire these culturally specific routines and affective displays can they participate appropriately in social interactions and achieve social control in the community.

Observations of children growing up in Japan also offer rich data about how children are shaped in particular culturally constrained ways through the language of their caregivers (e.g., Clancy 1986, 1999; Cook 1999). In Japanese, appropriate speech and certain kinds of stances and relationships are indexed by specific linguistic features, such as honorific terms and affective sentence-final particles, as well as by appropriate interaction routines, which index conformity, attentive listening, and indirectness.

Clancy (1986) investigated how Japanese mothers teach their children to “read the minds” of other people so as to be sensitive to their needs because people may not express themselves directly. For example, children are taught to offer food again after a refusal, or taught to stop making requests of the visitor even if the requests are complied with willingly. In another study, Clancy (1999) investigated how affect was socialized through interaction between Japanese mothers and their 2-year-old children. She found that Japanese children experience the socializing potential of affect talk in three ways: modeling of the affect lexicon by caregivers, direct instruction in the use of certain words, and participation in negotiations in which caregivers react to children’s use of affect words.

Researchers have also documented how Japanese teachers socialize children to display appropriate interactional behavior as attentive listeners in classroom routines. In comparison to the dyadic (teacher-student) participation structure which is often seen in schools in the United States, Cook (1999) investigated specific multiparty interactional routines in Japanese elementary school classrooms in which students are required to provide initial reactions to and comments on their classmates’ discourse. Cook proposes that such a participation structure helps socialize Japanese children to the culturally important skill of *attentive listening* and contributes to shaping children to be other-oriented and empathetic. In a group-oriented society such as Japan, attentive listening skills help children acquire culturally valued communicative competence as good, cooperative group members.

It is argued that people not only experience their primary pragmatic socialization during childhood but that they also continue to experience pragmatic socialization throughout their lives as they enter new sociocultural contexts and take up new roles in society (Duff 2003; Li 2000; Schieffelin and Ochs 1986). Language socialization research, with its (typically) strong ethnographic orientation and its close attention to contextual dynamics of language behavior and human dilemmas and agency, has provided researchers of second language (L2) pragmatics, a rigorous approach that is very different from and complementary to traditional L2 pragmatics research (also called “interlanguage pragmatics”). The latter has relied on data primarily drawn from experimental or otherwise controlled situations to look for non-native speakers’ “deviation” from native speakers’ norms (Kasper 2001).

Blum-Kulka (1997) was a forerunner in adopting a pragmatic socialization approach in L2 and cross-cultural pragmatic research of dinner table conversations

recorded in Jewish American, American Israeli, and Israeli families. Family meals, as “an intergenerationally shared social conversational event” (p. 9), represent culture-specific ways of talking and therefore allow studies of pragmatic socialization into those “ways” and their underlying values. During family dinner conversations, metapragmatic comments play a significant role in the process of language acquisition and the development of pragmatic and other skills and sensibilities, such as the choice of suitable topics, rules of turn taking, modes of storytelling, rules of politeness, and, in a pluralistic society, negotiating bilingual or multilingual practices. For example, Jewish American mothers in her study paid considerably more attention to following conversational norms and turn-taking than did mothers from Israel. The latter, however, made more comments about language – metalinguistic comments – and about behavior during dinners. As Blum-Kulka pointed out, “Fair turn allocation and the censure of untimely interruptions seem to represent the discourse corollary of American ideals of individual rights and equal opportunity for all” (p. 184).

De Geer et al. (2002) also conducted cross-cultural research on pragmatic and other aspects of socialization during family mealtime conversation. One hundred middle-class families with early adolescent children participated. They included Estonian, Finnish, and Swedish monocultural families in their countries of origin, as well as bilingual/bicultural Estonian and Finnish families living in Sweden. The researchers examined metapragmatic and other “regulatory” comments (e.g., regarding table manners, dress, or hair styles) as common forms of socialization. They discovered that all of the families produced some regulatory comments and “most of the comments made at meals were about perceived violations (that is, transgressions) of certain social or conversational rules [based, e.g., on Gricean maxims]. More infrequently, a behavior that was expected was under discussion.” (p. 675). However, there was some reported variation in the content, the amount, and the way that metapragmatic comments were used in these closely related cultures. Other differences also surfaced, such as the extent to which moral issues were broached, with much more of this occurring in Swedish monocultural families compared to others and also more active participation by their Swedish children in dinnertime talk, in general, than in other families. The researchers attributed this finding to Swedish ideologies of egalitarianism and democratic socialization, demonstrated by the Swedish mothers who placed a high value on their children’s independent and assertive behavior (p. 675).

Second/foreign language classrooms, like meal times at home, can also operate as a socializing space in which the target language culture is made available to the learners. Similar to the aforementioned Japanese L1 socialization to “attentive listening” identified by Cook (1999), Ohta (1999) demonstrated how adult learners of Japanese are socialized to display “attentive listening” through modeling by the teacher, peripheral and guided participation, direct instruction, and peer interaction.

The workplace is also gaining researchers’ attention as a significant sociocultural context where novices, like immigrants, are socialized into new discourse systems and cultures involving particular pragmatics (Duff 2008; Roberts 2010). Li (2000) examined the pragmatic socialization of a Chinese immigrant woman in a

job-training center and later in her American workplace. Focusing on requesting behavior, the study dealt with the important issue of pragmatics in genuine, high-stakes social communications. The ethnographic case study illustrated how the immigrant woman learned to make requests more directly than she has been accustomed to, by adopting certain sociolinguistic strategies and expressions (e.g., “I learned the American way – direct, truthful, and things a little bit sweet,” p. 75). She had learned these pragmatic strategies through exposure to and participation in social interactions with other more competent members in the community. However, her socialization was not merely an imitation or reproduction of the practices of “native speakers” of English. As a mature, educated individual and thus “expert” in her own culture and language, she also contributed to the socialization of her American (English L1) conversational partners’ communication skills and styles, when the latter seemed too impolite, particularly in their shared workplace.

Recent Studies and Work in Progress

More recent and ongoing studies have upheld the major areas of concern identified in the first generation of pragmatic socialization research but also extended the research scope to a wider range of communities.

In the L1 socialization field, Huang (2011), following Ochs (1988) and Clancy (1999), investigated L1 pragmatic socialization of affect in Mandarin parent–child interactions in Taiwan. Focusing on the parents’ modeling of lexical affect words (e.g., the equivalent of *scary*, *happy*, or *like*) and formulaic expressions of gratitude, apology, and regret (e.g., *sorry*, *thank you*), the research found that the children (both between 2 and 3 years old) not only observed and practiced the use of these affect words and expressions but also experienced socialization into appropriate behavior and empathy.

Another more recent study, by Shohet (2013), analyzed naturally occurring video-recorded examples of adults’ explicit socialization of a young girl in Vietnam. From around the age of 8 months, the infant was constantly prompted to perform routine displays of respect to her sociocultural superiors by bowing, while vocalizing the simplified, baby-talk respect particle “*a*”. This routine indexed particular moral values (e.g., devotion and respect, sacrifice) and general patterns of embodied hierarchy or asymmetrical reciprocity cultivated in Vietnamese society. Shohet referred to this practice as a “grammar of respect” (p. 213), which would eventually become almost as invisible as the rules of grammar themselves that underpin the language and local habitus.

In the contemporary period characterized by massive globalization and transnational migration, mobility and communication, more studies have focused on the particularities of pragmatic socialization processes as they unfold within sociolinguistically and culturally heterogeneous settings characterized by bilingualism and multilingualism.

Kasanga (2009), for example, looked at forms of address as social indexing, an indicator of the user’s cultural ecology. The data included 17 years of real-life usage

of address terms by African children in Africa, Europe, and Asia. These children, no matter where they lived, were socialized by their parents to address non-kin adults appropriately with fictive use of kinship terms (e.g., uncle, aunt, etc.). Furthermore, such naming seemed to apply only to African non-kin adults, resulting from the African parents' efforts to transmit appropriate use of address forms as a way of claiming and maintaining their Africanness.

Another study, this time on the use of address terms in Chinese diasporic families in the UK, by Zhu (2010), insightfully demonstrated that pragmatic socialization is not simply about passing on social and cultural values from one generation to another but is also concerned with bringing about changes in social and cultural values. That is, through language socialization, the younger generation (two teenage boys) in diasporic communities not only internalize the social, cultural, and linguistic norms of their community but also play an active role in constructing and creating their own social and cultural identities as well as bringing about changes to the existing community and family norms by selecting, or avoiding, the use of particular address terms (e.g., whether to address someone by their Chinese or English name, or a kinship term).

In a very different context, Shi (2010) looked into influential factors involved in a Chinese MBA student's intercultural pragmatic socialization in a business negotiation class at an American university. The study explored the discursive process of Cai, a business woman who had, according to Shi, internalized the collectivistic ideology from her primary socialization in China, and then her secondary (professional) socialization into a profit-driven and "aggressive" business style (aiming for a one-time deal) in the current, competitive Chinese market, and then her gradual incorporation of a more measured style reflecting a "win-win principle" (care about future cooperation), which was the locally practiced style taught in her American business class.

In a larger study of L2 pragmatic socialization, Taguchi (2014) used an innovative approach combining quantitative and qualitative methodologies to examine the socialization of 48 Japanese-L1 students learning English at an English-medium college in Japan. Quantitatively, the students' ability to "express opinions appropriately" in English was measured linguistically (three times during an academic year), while qualitative data were collected to probe into contextual factors that affected the reported changes. The study revealed that exposure to the target language alone did not help learners acquire knowledge of politeness and appropriateness in English speech acts. Rather, unbalanced pragmatic development was explained by the intricate interactions between the students and teachers in the process of socialization and cultural adjustment in this English-medium educational context in a non-English speaking country.

Study-abroad contexts have been investigated by researchers to explore the advantage of certain sociocultural environments for pragmatic socialization, which complement classroom foreign language learning. For example, Cook's (2008) study of American study-abroad students in Japan investigated their pragmatic socialization in the use of the addressee honorific form *masu*. Both explicit and implicit socialization occurred during the interactions between the learners and their

host families, through the host family members' modeling, feedback, and spontaneous teaching about polite speech or by learners' observations of host families' routinized shifting to the polite style to index authority and playfulness and to quote others' speech. A similar study was conducted by Brown (2013) with learners of Korean acquiring the honorific systems in a study abroad program in Korea. Although the participants in the latter study demonstrated advanced proficiency and a strong command of Korean honorifics in the fictional situations of a preliminary Discourse Completion Task¹ (DCT), they rarely used the honorifics in interactions outside the classroom. According to Brown, native speakers might have regarded learners as outsiders for whom the usual pragmatic rules did not apply. As for the learners themselves, they might have reacted negatively to the enforced application of honorifics based on age or seniority, which was against their preference for more egalitarian language use.

Using naturalistic data recorded by the learners in service encounter exchanges, complemented by learners' weekly journals and research interviews, Shively (2011) examined the pragmatic socialization of L2 learners of Spanish while studying abroad in Spain. The data revealed that some learners acquired the knowledge of appropriate request-making forms in service exchanges by observing other customers' request-making forms and then adapting them. Others learned the request forms through feedback from their host families.

Everyday communication and the construction of identity and social relations are increasingly taking place in virtual environments as well as in face-to-face encounters. The worldwide use of computer and mobile phone technology has created a new contact zone in language learning and practice. Whereas earlier research (e.g., Belz and Kinginger 2002) described the affordances of "telecollaborative" language learning (using global computer networks) for pragmatic development (e.g., address forms), studies into the sociolinguistics of globalization (e.g., Blommaert 2010) reveal how radically intercultural communication has changed in the interim, as have pedagogies mediated by popular culture and gaming.

Palmer (2010), for example, examined L2 pragmatic socialization in online communities: L2 learners of Spanish interacting with L1-Spanish gamers in a multiplayer video game (World of Warcraft). Ethnographic participant observation was used to examine the learners' pragmatic development from general speech acts (e.g., greetings, requests, and refusals) to more challenging pragmatic moves that are important in the gaming context (e.g., mass invitations or negotiating the allocation of "loot" and resources). The data therefore revealed that videogames can offer

¹A Discourse-Completion Task (DCT) is a tool used in linguistics and especially pragmatics research to elicit particular speech acts. A DCT consists, typically, of a series of written situational prompts (utterances) that a research subject reads, each of which prompts elicits a pragmatic response (speech act) appropriate to the situation. For example, the prompt might indicate that someone is offended about something that the DCT completer has said or done (Prompt: "I am offended by what you just said!"); the research subject is then prompted to produce a suitable response, in the form of a short written apology (e.g., "I'm sorry I offended you; I didn't mean to do so. . .").

learners a valuable immersive virtual community for L2 pragmatic socialization that is filled with engaged native (and non-native) speakers.

Issues and Problems

Learner Agency/Subjectivity

Even though earlier pragmatic socialization researchers mentioned the agency of novices (e.g., Schieffelin and Ochs 1986), some studies continue to perpetuate the notions that (1) novices will aim to internalize and reproduce experts' pragmatic behaviors and norms; (2) those conventional norms are always, indeed, "appropriate" and static; and (3) cultures and languages are discrete and fixed. Recent work in language socialization (e.g., Duranti et al. 2012) demonstrates the degree to which agency, contingency, and hybridity are in fact the norm; earlier, Kulick and Schieffelin (2004) argued that resistance by some members of society to mainstream norms in pragmatics and other spheres is to be expected. Furthermore, the extension of pragmatic socialization to L2 and multilingual contexts has contributed to the reconceptualization of language socialization as a very dynamic, unpredictable, and nonlinear process (Duff 2012).

Indeed, research has indicated that not all language learners wish to behave pragmatically exactly like native speakers of the target language (e.g., Duff and Doherty 2014; Brown 2013; Li 2000; Siegal 1996), nor do all their interlocutors expect that either. As mentioned earlier, Chinese immigrant women in one study (Li 2000) sometimes resisted more "expert" peers' pragmatic socialization based on their personal values and cultural beliefs. They also counter-socialized what they perceived to be rude native speakers into less offensive pragmatic behavior in their workplaces. In Siegal (1996) and Brown (2013), as well, the Japanese and Korean language learners constantly exercised agency during their interactions with native speakers, using status-incongruent linguistic choices (which are inappropriate pragmatic behaviors in the target languages and communities), seemingly not because of linguistic deficiency but due to an ideological belief in egalitarian society and relationships. These studies therefore call for a reconsideration of, and greater sensitivity toward, issues of learner agency among second/foreign language educators and researchers. It is recommended that learners be informed of the various options offered by the pragmatic system of the target language without being coerced into making particular choices regarding those options.

Criteria for Exemplary Pragmatic Socialization Research

Language socialization theory is being employed by increasing numbers of researchers in an attempt to foreground social factors and contexts in L1 and L2 pragmatics research. Kulick and Schieffelin (2004) listed three criteria for standard language socialization studies: that they "should be ethnographic in design,

longitudinal in perspective,” and should examine linguistic and cultural practices “over time and across contexts” (p. 350). Furthermore, they make the strong claim that “any study of socialization that does not document the role of language in the acquisition of cultural practices is not only incomplete, it is fundamentally flawed” (p. 350). However, some researchers are challenging these methodological principles or are using a combination of approaches (e.g., Duff and Talmy 2011). For example, Matsumura (2001) used a completely quantitative approach to investigate the pragmatic competence development of university level Japanese learners of English in study abroad programs. Using multiple-choice written questionnaires, he found that living and studying in the target language community contributed to increased pragmatic competence due to pragmatic socialization. The study stressed the importance of “incorporating a diachronic and comparative perspective into language socialization research” (p. 670). However, it provided little insight into actual community language use. Other studies, described earlier, have employed a combination of qualitative and quantitative methods or qualitative methods involving interviews but with relatively little direct observation.

Practical Problems (“Observer’s Paradox”)

Pragmatic socialization research generally takes a longitudinal approach, documenting natural communicative processes and learning over the course of developmental time and relates these individual developmental processes to the sociocultural contexts and interactions in which they are embedded. The conflict between the necessity to observe and collect natural data and the impossibility of collecting “natural” data with the observer’s intrusive presence was well captured by what Labov (1972) famously called the “observer’s paradox.” Some researchers have tried to get around this by having the research participants take a much larger role in documenting and recording their own practices without the immediate presence of researchers. There are, nonetheless, serious methodological and ethical issues related to privacy, intrusiveness, and power asymmetries between researchers and those researched in many research sites that affect the data that are produced.

Future Directions

Kasper (2001) suggested that “language socialization theory has a particularly rich potential for [L2 acquisition] because it is inherently developmental and requires (rather than just allows) establishing links between culture, cognition, and language, between the macro-levels of sociocultural and institutional contexts and the micro-level of discourse” (p. 311).

Recent and current pragmatic socialization research has demonstrated a radical departure from the methods used traditionally in (interlanguage) pragmatics studies, where data were primarily drawn from experimental, contrived, and controlled situations and usually with single-sentence production, mostly in written form.

Pragmatic socialization research can offer researchers opportunities to look at the interactive nature and the social functions of pragmatic behaviors and linguistic forms that are deeply embedded within particular social and cultural contexts. By examining pragmatic behaviors in their authentic contexts of use – with their own historical antecedents, interpersonal negotiations, and personal and societal significance, as well as indexicality – researchers can contextualize pragmatic behavior and learning in our rapidly changing, multilingual world in new and illuminating ways.

Cross-References

- ▶ [Bi- and Multilingual Family Language Socialization](#)
- ▶ [Heritage Language Learning and Socialization](#)
- ▶ [Language Socialization: An Historical Overview](#)
- ▶ [Language Socialization and Family Dinnertime Discourse](#)
- ▶ [Language Socialization and Immigration in Europe](#)
- ▶ [Language Socialization and Schooling](#)
- ▶ [Language Socialization in Study Abroad](#)

Related Articles in the Encyclopedia of Language and Education

- Diane Boxer: [Discourse and Second Language Learning](#). In Volume: [Discourse and Education](#)
- Hayo Reinders: [Digital Games and Second Language Learning](#). In Volume: [Language, Education and Technology](#)
- Brendan H. O'Connor and Norma Gonzalez: [Language Education and Culture](#). In Volume: [Language Policy and Political Issues in Education](#)

References

- Becker, A. (1982). Children's strategic use of requests to mark and manipulate social status. In S. Kuczaj (Ed.), *Language development: Language, thought, and culture* (pp. 1–35). Hillsdale: Erlbaum.
- Becker, J. (1994). Pragmatic socialization: Parental input to preschoolers. *Discourse Processes*, 17, 131–148.
- Belz, J., & Kinginger, C. (2002). The cross-linguistic development of address form use in telecollaborative language learning: Two case studies. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 59(2), 189–214.
- Blommaert, J. (2010). *The sociolinguistics of globalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Blum-Kulka, S. (1997). *Dinner talk*. Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Brown, L. (2013). Identity and honorifics use in Korean study abroad. In C. Kinginger (Ed.), *Social and cultural dimensions of language learning in study abroad* (pp. 269–298). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

- Clancy, P. (1986). The acquisition of communicative style in Japanese. In B. Schieffelin & E. Ochs (Eds.), *Language socialization across cultures* (pp. 213–250). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Clancy, P. (1999). The socialization of affect in Japanese mother-child conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 31, 1397–1421.
- Cook, H. (1999). Language socialization in Japanese elementary schools: Attentive listening and reaction turns. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 31, 1443–1465.
- Cook, H. (2008). *Socializing identities through speech style*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- De Geer, B., Tulvisteb, T., Mizerab, L., & Tryggvasona, M. (2002). Socialization in communication: Pragmatic socialization during dinnertime in Estonian, Finnish and Swedish families. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 3, 1757–1786.
- Duff, P. (2003). New directions in second language socialization research. *Korean Journal of English Language and Linguistics*, 3, 309–339.
- Duff, P. (2008). Language socialization, higher education, and work. In P. Duff & N. Hornberger (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of language and education. Vol.8: Language socialization* (pp. 257–270). New York: Springer.
- Duff, P. (2012). Second language socialization. In A. Duranti, E. Ochs, & B. Schieffelin (Eds.), *Handbook of language socialization* (pp. 564–586). Malden: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Duff, P., & Doherty, L. (2014). Examining agency in (second) language socialization research. In P. Deters, X. Gao, E. R. Miller, & G. Vitanova (Eds.), *Interdisciplinary approaches to theorizing and analyzing agency and second language learning* (pp. 54–72). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Duff, P., & Talmy, S. (2011). Language socialization approaches to second language acquisition: Social, cultural, and linguistic development in additional languages. In D. Atkinson (Ed.), *Alternative approaches to SLA* (pp. 95–116). London: Routledge.
- Duranti, A., Ochs, E., & Schieffelin, B. (Eds.). (2012). *Handbook of language socialization*. Malden: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Firth, A., & Wagner, J. (1997). On discourse, communication, and (some) fundamental concepts in SLA research. *Modern Language Journal*, 81, 285–300.
- Gleason, J., Perlmann, R., & Greif, E. (1984). What's the magic word: Learning language through politeness routines. *Discourse Processes*, 7, 493–902.
- Goldfield, B., & Snow, C. (1992). What's cousin Arthur's daddy's name? The acquisition of knowledge about kinship. *First Language*, 12, 187–205.
- Huang, C. (2011). Language socialization of affect in Mandarin parent-child conversation. *Pragmatics*, 21, 593–618.
- Kasanga, L. (2009). Language socialization: The naming of non-kin adults by African children and preadolescents in intercultural encounters. *Intercultural Pragmatics*, 6, 85–114.
- Kasper, G. (2001). Four perspectives on L2 pragmatic development. *Applied Linguistics*, 22, 502–530.
- Kulick, D., & Schieffelin, B. (2004). Language socialization. In A. Duranti (Ed.), *A companion to linguistic anthropology* (pp. 349–368). Malden: Blackwell.
- Labov, W. (1972). *Sociolinguistic patterns*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Li, D. (2000). The pragmatics of making requests in the L2 workplace: A case study of language socialization. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 57, 58–87.
- Matsumura, S. (2001). Learning the rules for offering advice: A quantitative approach to second language socialization. *Language Learning*, 51, 635–679.
- Ochs, E. (1986). Introduction. In B. Schieffelin & E. Ochs (Eds.), *Language socialization across cultures*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ochs, E. (1988). *Culture and language development: Language acquisition and socialization in a Samoan village*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Ochs, E. (1990). Indexicality and socialization. In J. Stigler, R. Shweder, & G. Herdt (Eds.), *Cultural psychology* (pp. 287–308). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Ochs, E. (1996). Linguistic resources for socializing humanity. In J. Gumperz & S. Levinson (Eds.), *Rethinking linguistic relativity* (pp. 407–437). New York: Cambridge University Press.

- Ochs, E., & Schieffelin, B. (2008). Language socialization: An historical overview. In P. A. Duff & N. H. Hornberger (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of language education* (2nd Edn., Vol. 8, pp. 3–15). New York: Springer.
- Ochs, E., & Schieffelin, B. (2011). The theory of language socialization. In A. Duranti, E. Ochs, & B. Schieffelin (Eds.), *The handbook of language socialization* (pp. 1–21). Malden: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Ohta, A. S. (1999). Interactional routines and the socialization of interactional style in adult learners of Japanese. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 31, 1493–1512.
- Palmer, D. S. (2010). *Second language pragmatic socialization in World of Warcraft*. PhD thesis, University of California.
- Roberts, C. (2010). Language socialization in the workplace. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 30, 211–227.
- Schieffelin, B. (1985). The acquisition of Kaluli. In D. Slobin (Ed.), *The crosslinguistic study of language acquisition* (Vol. 1, pp. 525–593). Hillsdale: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Schieffelin, B. (1990). *The give and take of everyday life: Language socialization of Kaluli children*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Schieffelin, B., & Ochs, E. (1986). Language socialization. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 15, 163–191.
- Shi, X. (2010). Intercultural language socialization of a Chinese MBA student in an American negotiation class. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 42, 2475–2486.
- Shively, R. (2011). L2 pragmatic development in study abroad: A longitudinal study of Spanish service encounters. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 43, 1818–1835.
- Shohet, M. (2013). Everyday sacrifice and language socialization in Vietnam: The power of a respect particle. *American Anthropologist*, 115(2), 203–217.
- Siegal, M. (1996). The role of learner subjectivity in second language sociolinguistic competency: Western women learning Japanese. *Applied Linguistics*, 17, 356–382.
- Taguchi, N. (2014). Pragmatic socialization in an English-medium university in Japan. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, 52, 157–181.
- Watson-Gegeo, K., & Gegeo, D. (1986). Calling out and repeating routines in Kwara'ae children's language socialization. In B. Schieffelin & E. Ochs (Eds.), *Language socialization across cultures* (pp. 17–50). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Zhu, H. (2010). Language socialization and interculturality: Address terms in intergenerational talk in Chinese diasporic families. *Language and Intercultural Communication*, 10, 189–205.

Part II

Children's Language Socialization at Home and in the Community

Language Socialization and Family Dinnertime Discourse

Shoshana Blum-Kulka

Abstract

From the outset, language socialization (LS, including first and second language) has been concerned with the ways in which social and cultural contexts provide opportunity spaces for the sociocultural learning of language and in how such contexts vary from culture to culture. The basic tenet of language socialization theory is that children learn language and culture through active engagement in meaningful social interactions with adults and peers. Language learning and enculturation form part of the same process; language is always learned in social and cultural contexts that provide cues for the social and cultural meanings of the forms used, and learners are active agents in their own socialization. Differing from psychological studies of language acquisition, with their focus on dyadic, adult-child interaction in both laboratory and natural settings, LS, being grounded in anthropological and sociolinguistic theories, eschews structured or nonnatural contexts for ethnographic observations of natural, both dyadic and multiparty, interactions. The anthropological approach is exemplified in the work of researchers such as Shirley Brice Heath, Bambi Schieffelin, Elinor Ochs, and others, who have collected ethnographic data in naturalistic settings, focusing as much on the participation structures into which children can enter as ratified participants as on the exact nature of the language used when talking to children. The focus of this chapter is family dinnertime conversation, in particular, which

Shoshana Blum-Kulka: deceased.

This chapter was produced for the second edition of this Encyclopedia (2008) in Vol. 8, *Language Socialization*. Sadly, the author has since passed away. However, her scholarship on language socialization within homes, and particularly in the context of family dinners, remains very important. Therefore, this chapter has been reprinted for this third edition of the encyclopedia to recognize her seminal contribution to that literature.

S. Blum-Kulka (✉)

Hebrew University of Jerusalem, Jerusalem, Israel

e-mail: deceased.user@language.socialization.com

serves as a natural, pervasive, and powerful locus of language socialization within and across ethnolinguistically diverse homes around the world.

Keywords

Dinner time discourse • Language socialization • Multiparty interaction • Participation roles • Morality • Politeness • Speech genres • Explanations

Contents

Introduction: Dinnertime and Socialization	66
Early Developments	67
Major Contributions	68
Participation Roles and Social Roles	69
Cultural Ways of Speaking: Modes of Arguing, Politeness, Irony, and Humor	70
The Social Construction of Knowledge and Morality	71
Language Varieties, Genres, Extended Discourse, Bilingualism, and Minority Language Maintenance	72
Problems and Difficulties	74
Future Directions	74
Cross-References	75
References	75

Introduction: Dinnertime and Socialization

From the outset, language socialization (LS, including first and second language) has been concerned with the ways in which social and cultural contexts provide opportunity spaces for the sociocultural learning of language and in how such contexts vary from culture to culture. The basic tenet of language socialization theory is that children learn language and culture through active engagement in meaningful social interactions with adults and peers. Language learning and enculturation form part of the same process; language is always learned in social and cultural contexts that provide cues for the social and cultural meanings of the forms used, and learners are active agents in their own socialization. Differing from psychological studies of language acquisition, with their focus on dyadic, adult–child interaction in both laboratory and natural settings, LS, being grounded in anthropological and sociolinguistic theories, eschews structured or nonnatural contexts for ethnographic observations of natural, both dyadic and multiparty, interactions. The anthropological approach is exemplified in the work of researchers such as Shirley Brice Heath, Bambi Schieffelin, Elinor Ochs, and others, who have collected ethnographic data in naturalistic settings, focusing as much on the participation structures into which children can enter as ratified participants as on the exact nature of the language used when talking to children.

Family dinners may vary across culture and social group – for some, mealtime is an activity dominated by focused talk; for others, talk is dispersed and mingled with television watching; and in still others, it is conducted in silence. Yet at least in most Western societies, dinners are speech events bounded in time and space, delimited by their participants and governed by local rules of interaction. As a unique case of face-

to-face encounter, they carry certain replicable organizational features which set them apart from other activities. Talk at dinner is affected by the nature of the activity: the business of having dinner (food brought to the table and accessed by the participants) generates minimally the instrumental food focused talk, which in turn may or may not be superimposed by other, more open-ended conversation.

Family discourse is the most natural of settings for following the interaction between children and adults and its effects on socialization. Family discourse offers unique opportunities to learn about the ways in which children's participation in familial multiparty interactions enhances their chances of achieving linguistically competent cultural membership in their society. Viewing language as a cultural practice invites attention to issues such as who may talk to whom, what language performances are highly valued, and how children acquire rights of membership in a group through language use. The goal of this chapter is to discuss these and other issues representing some of the major facets of the rich repertoire of discursive opportunities offered to children through participation in family discourse.

Early Developments

The beginning of interest in dinner-table talk can be traced to the mid-1970s of the twentieth century, when psychologists interested in language acquisition began to include mealtime conversations in their language corpora. For example, in Berko Gleason's (1975) project on the Acquisition of Communicative Competence, children were observed systematically in dyadic contexts with mother and father and then at a family mealtime with both parents. In this project, the transcripts of middle-class mealtime recordings served as an additional source of information for the study of gender differences in parental input to children, with a focus on socialization for politeness (Berko Gleason et al. 1984). Subsequently, Perlman (1984) analyzed the Berko Gleason corpus from the perspective of the content of dinner-table conversations, showing a wide range of individual variability in the degree to which parents talked about abstract matters with their children, and Snow et al. (1990), using additional corpora, looked at the use of politeness forms in the speech of fathers and mothers in middle-class families, working class families, and families with Down syndrome children. They found that the speech addressed to children with Down syndrome was more conventionally polite but did not find social class or gender differences. Another large-scale longitudinal study in which yearly collected dinner-table conversations were included as a major source of information is the Home-School Study of Language and Literacy Development focusing initially on 81 working class families (Snow 1991). Analyses of the Home-School Study dinner-table conversations, motivated by an interest in exposure to extended discourse as a predictor of later language and literacy development, focused on issues such as the incidence and nature of narrative and explanatory talk (Beals 1993) and the use of rare vocabulary at mealtimes and other adult-child interactive occasions (Weizman and Snow 2001). Many of the transcripts of dinner-table conversations based on data collected in this tradition are now part of the CHILDES archives (see Pan et al. 2000, for a review).

A distinct, micro-discourse-analytical approach to the analysis of dinner-table conversations is represented by Erickson's (1982) early study of the social co-construction of coherence at the dinner of an Italian family as a multiparty and multigenerational speech event.

The study of dinner conversations specifically motivated by language socialization theory was initiated by the work of Ochs and her colleagues on 12 American families across a range of social backgrounds (Ochs and Shohet 2006; Ochs et al. 1989, 1992; Ochs and Taylor 1992) and subsequently extended to cross-cultural comparisons of American versus Italian families (Ochs et al. 1996).

Major Contributions

Family dinners are familial "we" events shared with children; as such, they may carry various overt and covert socialization functions, ranging from table manners to cultural ways of narration (Blum-Kulka 1997), the shaping of political views (Gordon 2004), learning about work norms in the adult world (Paugh 2005), the socialization of taste (Ochs et al. 1996; Pontecorvo and Fasulo 1999), the cultivation of a prayerful attitude (Capps and Ochs 2002), and the development of scientific ways of thinking and theories about the world (Ochs et al. 1992). For example, Ochs et al.'s comparative study of Italian and American families revealed differences in the way food is approached and talked about, showing that socialization for taste (food as pleasure for Italians, food as reward for Americans) is intimately related to social positioning and construction of childhood identity (Ochs et al. 1996). Dinnertime may offer unique affordances for socialization through language and for the appropriate use of language; yet for language socialization to emerge, dinnertime needs to be jointly constructed by adults and children as shared talking time, one in which children are accepted as ratified participants (Blum-Kulka 1997; Ochs et al. 1989).

Revealing cross-cultural differences in patterns of language socialization and ways of speaking at large is one of the major achievements of this field. The cultural range of family dinners studied from a language socialization perspective includes American families of varied social backgrounds (Becker 1990; Ely et al. 1995; Ochs and Taylor 1992; Paugh 2005; Perlman 1984; Tannen 2004), Jewish-American versus Israeli families (Blum-Kulka 1997), American versus Norwegian (Aukrust and Snow 1998), American versus Japanese American in Hawaii (Martini 1996), Americans versus Italians (Ochs et al. 1996); Cypriot-Australian (Petraiki 2001), Estonian versus Finnish and Swedish (De Geer et al. 2002), German (Keppler and Luckman 1991), Greek (Georgakopoulou 2002), Italian (Erickson 1982; Pontecorvo and Fasulo 1997, 1999; Pontecorvo et al. 2001), and Japanese (Kasuya 2002). The number of families studied in each case ranges from 5 (Becker 1990) to 60 (De Geer et al. 2002). In all cases, the verbal data were collected through direct observation and carefully transcribed later; studies vary in type of recording used (audio vs. video or some combination of both), number of meals recorded for each family, attention paid to nonverbal aspects of the activity, system of transcription used, and

presence or absence of an observer and the degree of his or her involvement in family interaction. Thus, procedures used include asking families to record themselves (Vuchinich 1990), setting up the recording equipment and then leaving the scene (Ochs et al. 1989), and active participant observation plus recording (Blum-Kulka 1997). Since recording by itself can be considered a type of intrusion, the issue raised by these different procedures is whether the ways people deal with being observed by a camera (or tape recorder) are essentially different from the ways in which they deal with being observed by a co-participant observer.

As elaborated below, dinnertime emerges from these studies as a major site for the negotiation of linguistic, cognitive, cultural, social, political, and emotive concerns; in reviewing the research in this area, the focus here will be on the discursive aspects of socialization unique to dinner talk, namely, on the role of dinners, as multiparty and intergenerational occasions, in providing children an apprenticeship in cultural ways of speaking and seeing, thereby paving their way to becoming full-fledged members of their culture.

Participation Roles and Social Roles

The joint engagement of adults and children in verbal interaction during dinner is a necessary condition for language socialization; children need to be considered ratified participants to have access to the talk, yet their mode of participation may still vary immensely culturally, allowing for different socialization gains. For instance, Jewish-American children talk more at dinner (relative to other members of the family) than do Israeli children, often around “today rituals” of telling their day (Blum-Kulka 1997). Occupying the stage for extended time allows for gaining experience in conversational skills, including help received for constructing coherent discourse; on the other hand, acting as active audience to the talk of adults, as do Israeli children, provides opportunities for overhearing discussions on a wide range of concrete and abstract topics and issues. Variation in the amount and type of talk by different members in the family may index gender asymmetries, such as the practice of setting up the father as the all-knowing figure in White middle-class families in the USA (Ochs and Taylor 1992). Narrative events in the family are particularly rich sites for enhancing children’s rights and responsibilities as storytellers, creating alliances, socializing children into adult culturally unique notions of tellability, and reinforcing familial roles (Aukrust and Snow 1998; Blum-Kulka 1997; Georgakopoulou 2002).

A more subtle facet of participation is expressed through family members’ entitlements for and shifts in various speaker and listener roles. By definition, participation in multiparty talk requires juggling between a host of speaker and listener role possibilities; speakers can shift for instance between the role of author (responsible for the wording) and animator (voicing others) as in all talk, but with more than one listener in the audience, possibilities open up for framing others (notably children) alternatively as addressees, just side-participants or even as eavesdroppers. Dinner talk provides children with ample opportunities for gaining

practice in the full diversity of roles available, yet concurrently the practices used can be implicative of power asymmetries. In middle-class dinner-table conversations in the USA and Israel (Blum-Kulka 1997), and Greece (Georgakopoulou 2002), children act as coauthors to stories about their own experience, as animators of the words of others, as addressees in direct conversational engagement with adults and siblings, as side-participants for all family talk acknowledging their presence as ratified participants, and occasionally also have the less pleasant experience of being positioned by the adults as eavesdroppers. Fatigante et al. (1998) show, for example, in Italian dinner conversations, how in some exchanges at dinner children are marginalized from participation, both linguistically and pragmatically, while they are the topic of the ongoing talk. Thus, shifts of participation roles and frameworks offer rich apprenticeship opportunities for children learning to engage conversationally with others, affecting their understanding of what it means to be a member of a given cultural environment.

Cultural Ways of Speaking: Modes of Arguing, Politeness, Irony, and Humor

Though, on the face of it, talk concerned with the business of having dinner does not seem to invite much attention to politeness, close inspection of dinner talk reveals a rich array of overt and covert ways of socializing for politeness. Though direct instruction of politeness forms, at least in American families, is quite rare, children receive at dinner ample information about the rules governing the use of both negative and positive politeness in their culture (Snow et al. 1990). One of the resources drawn on by parents is metapragmatic comments – critical comments concerning behavior, language, and discourse (Becker 1990), which index cultural norms by drawing attention to their infringement. Preferences for types of comments may be culture specific. For example, Swedish parents comment more on moral and ethical behavior than do Estonian and Finnish parents (De Geer et al. 2002), and Israelis are foremost occupied with correct language use (metalinguistic comments) while Americans pay more attention to discourse management (turn-taking) (Blum-Kulka 1997). In some rare cases, a direct link can be shown between parental discourse practices and children's behavior – thus, Ely et al. (2001) found a positive correlation between mothers' and children's use of language focused terms. The culturally different styles of politeness children engage in with their families at dinner carry messages at two levels – as situated practice, they “teach” culturally appropriate modes of verbal and nonverbal behavior; concurrently, they also carry value-laden messages, which provide the deeper cultural motivation for the same practice. Thus, for example, the contrast between the frequent use of conventional indirectness (such as “can you...?”) in American families, against the salience of mitigated directness for making requests in Israeli families can be interpreted as indicative of the values of respect for individual space in American culture, versus the importance of showing affective involvement in the family in Israeli culture (Blum-Kulka 1997).

Dinnertime creates occasions not only for learning culturally appropriate levels of (in)directness for directive and expressive speech acting but also for learning to interpret cues (metacommunicative markers) for subtle shifts in keying redefining the situation. Keying devices – such as sound modification and figurative language – act as local rules of interpretation, suggesting alternative readings of an utterance, as in pretend play, humor, sarcasm, and irony. Fasulo et al.'s (2002) careful analysis of keying shifts in the family discourse of Italian families shows how socialization to keying is achieved through children's active participation in speech play and poetic language at dinner, as well as through hearing keyed talk (sometimes even when not well understood) not directly addressed to them. From a different perspective, Nevat-Gal (2002) stresses the creativity associated with humor and argues that the use of humorous phrases, as well as cognitive expressions at dinner (in her case, in Israeli families), act as reflectors and cultivators of cognition, socializing for distant and sophisticated thinking.

The Social Construction of Knowledge and Morality

The use of language rich in stance markers (like cognitive expressions) is one facet of socialization for thinking; another facet is revealed through problem-solving talk at dinner. Problem solving may concern a joint future activity in the real world (like planning a family trip) or reflections on different interpretations of a past event. Ochs and her colleagues demonstrate in depth how such multiple perspectives offered at story-telling in families enhance theory building, promoting the types of critical thinking necessary in the modern world (Ochs et al. 1989; Ochs et al. 1992). The social construction of knowledge at family gatherings may also take the form of teaching-sequences, where one knowledgeable party is self-appointed or called upon to provide explanations of social and natural phenomena (Beals and Snow 1994; Blum-Kulka 2002; Keppler and Luckman 1991). Explanatory talk at dinner provides children with exposure to rational ways of thinking, represents an elaborated orientation to meaning, and provides practice in juggling perspectives on truth, all potential contributions to children's school success (Blum-Kulka 2002). The multiplicity of perspectives offered for any given topic or issue in multigenerational talk does not necessarily need to be adult generated or represent only adult points of view; during story-telling for instance, children can and do collaborate with adults in the negotiation of the point of the story. Children's contributions to what Varenne (1992) aptly calls "the making of a familial dance" (p. 99) is not only the result of their being active participants talked to and talking to adults but mainly by virtue of being party to the joint production of the social scene called "family." Similarly, though from a somewhat different perspective, Pontecorvo et al. (2001) argue that socialization at dinner should be viewed as a bidirectional process of mutual apprenticeship – one in which parents affect children but are simultaneously affected by the children. Pontecorvo et al.'s analysis illustrates in detail such bidirectionality for moral discourse; they show how the active participation of Italian children in conversations about moral behavior (supplying or inviting accounts from others that

attempt to justify transgressions) affects the structure and content of parental talk that ensues and socializes children to the language of transgression. Sterponi's (2003) sequential analysis of account episodes in Italian families shows that requests for accounts (instead of immediate correction or reproach) promote moral reasoning and the negotiation of norms by virtue of allowing for an inquisitory (rather than condemnatory) perspective on problematic events, and hence serve as a medium for the joint reconstruction of the moral order. Gossip at dinnertime serves as a further source promoting moral reasoning and the negotiation of the moral norms – choice of protagonist (who can be talked about derogatively at dinner – for example, are teachers a legitimate topic for family gossip or not?), subject material (are there taboo topics?), and modes of gossipy discourse all serve to socialize children to cultural ways of judging and talking about the range of acceptable social behavior (Blum-Kulka 2000).

Language Varieties, Genres, Extended Discourse, Bilingualism, and Minority Language Maintenance

Dinnertime can socialize children to a wide range of genres in oral and literate forms as well as into culturally molded modes in the performance in these genres. The dinnertime conversations of families from a number of cultures and social backgrounds reveal a rich array of genres in dinner (Aukrust 2002; Aukrust and Snow 1998; Blum-Kulka 1997, 2002). Shifts in genre were observed to be associated with shifts in thematic frame. Thus, the business of having dinner is dealt with through the discourse of directives and compliments, and talk about family members' news of the day enhances narratives. However, talk about topics of nonimmediate concern may require a variety of genres, including explanatory and argumentative talk (1997, 2002). Children in different cultures may have different discursive genre experiences. For instance, American children take part in more explanatory than narrative talk at dinner, while the reverse is true for Norwegian children (Aukrust and Snow 1998). The difference is indicative of culturally molded notions of tellability and genre performance. Norwegian families promote retelling of shared events from the children's school experience, whereas in American families the focus is more on the telling of unshared events. Furthermore, the two genres were observed to invite differing modes of performance: multiparty, symmetrical co-construction for stories, versus asymmetrical, dyadic performance for explanations (Aukrust 2002). Aukrust interprets these findings as indexing the social, egalitarian, collaborative orientation of Norwegian family discourse in contrast with the more individualistic, rational orientation of the discourse of North American families. Thus, participation in these different discourse modes creates different skills and personas for children growing up in the two cultures. Verbal conflict is yet another genre, which varies with culture. Vuchinich (1990) found five recurrent termination formats used by participants in American middle-class families to accomplish consensus regarding the outcome of episodes of verbal conflict. Among these, there was a high frequency of stand-off terminations, a strategy that allows family members to save face and avoid direct

conflict, while circumventing the difficulties involved in negotiating a compromise. But whereas in American families, children might be socialized into the avoidance of conflict and argumentation, in Italian families they are socialized to discuss and argue, and engage willingly in such activities (Pontecorvo et al. 2001).

Another facet of involvement in different genres of talk at dinner relates to the development of discursive skills. Narratives, explanations, and complex arguments require extended turns for their performance and need to be tuned in the information provided to the expected level of shared knowledge with the audience. These genres of extended discourse are all closely tied to the academic, literate language of schooling. Learning to tell a story well (with an active audience) or develop a logical argument in conversation hence forms part of the development of extended discourse skills. Studies of familial story-telling with children from various social backgrounds and cultures have indeed revealed several ways in which participation in such an event socializes children to autonomy in speakership as well as to the construction of (relatively) autonomous texts. The scaffolding provided to children of all ages in their story-telling efforts at dinner can support both the telling and the tale. Co-participants help children gain the conversational floor needed for the telling, encourage them to go on and tell, and enhance the coherence and clarity of the text by asking supportive questions (Blum-Kulka 1997; Georgakopoulou 2002).

Dinner talk can socialize children not only to different genres but also to different varieties of language, including bilingualism. Different members of a family may speak different varieties – differing in slang, accent, and grammatical acceptability (especially in immigrant countries where the language spoken is not the parents' first language) and register. In the case of bilingualism, the social context will be very different between cases where both parents promote the maintenance of their native language and in cases with a mixed-language scene, where only one of the parents is bilingual. For example, the bilingual practices of American-Israeli families in Israel at dinner present a successful case of mother-tongue maintenance. Though all members of the eight middle-class families studied mixed Hebrew and English to some degree, the children tended to speak English to their parents, cooperating with them in maintaining English (Blum-Kulka 1997). These families succeed in providing support for dual-language development, despite the pressures of the Hebrew environment (and in contrast to other minority languages in Israel) probably because of the high prestige of English and the cultural and practical benefits associated with English proficiency. On the other hand, when input of the minority language comes from only one parent, promoting active bilingualism becomes a much more challenging task. Kasuya's (2002) case study of two Japanese-American families revealed two very different patterns. Although both families spoke two languages, in one Japanese and English were balanced, whereas in the other English was dominant. Yet even in the family where the mother used Japanese most of the time with the child, the child responded in Japanese only a third of the time. Bilingual practices at dinner may also be conducive to learning how and when to code-switch, thus learning to differentiate ways of speaking according to the social situation and the social identity associated with each language (Lanza 1997).

Problems and Difficulties

Although the study of dinner-table conversations yields a rich range of insights into practices of language socialization, observing and analyzing dinner talk poses several challenges. Some are related to the difficult task of observing and documenting family meals, requiring thoughtful decisions about recording equipment and the system of transcription employed. Others have to do with ensuring the ecological validity of the situation for the families observed. How regular are shared family meals for the families studied? Do children always participate? Is the presence of an observer as an adult guest easily acceptable in the given culture? Comparability of dinner-table conversations across social class and culture needs to take into account possible cultural variability in participation structures (nuclear or extended family), keyings (levels of formality) in the symbolic meanings of food and eating, and in attitudes to child participation in the talk.

Future Directions

It follows that language socialization at dinnertime, as discussed here, is predicated on a series of underlying assumptions and practices shared by mainstream families in modern Western societies, but certainly not universally true. The perception of dinner (or other meals) as occasions for familial sociability as well as for children's socialization, as a (relatively) democratic space which allows for the mutual exchange of stories and ideas by adults and children, is an essential condition for language socialization to emerge in this context.

Furthermore, the families considered here, regardless of whether they are American, Italian, or Norwegian, all believe in the power of words. Dinner serves as one of the occasions in which children gain apprenticeship in cultural ways of thinking and talking through their involvement in meaningful verbal interactions, rather or at least more than through guided participation in cultural activities. When these conditions prevail, as we saw, the complex multiparty participation structure of family meals in modern literate societies can serve as a developmental trajectory for several aspects of discursive competence. As we have seen, actively listening to the many voices of co-participants at dinner can contribute to perspective taking on truth and knowledge, expose children to multiple varieties of language, to different registers and languages, as well as to different keyings (such as irony and humor), and cultural preferences of politeness and modes of reasoning. Through their own participation in dinner talk, children gain practice in interpreting nonliteral language uses, learn cultural modes of argumentation and giving accounts, acquire cultural notions of tellability and participate in the co-construction of extended texts in various genres.

With all the richness of language socialization at dinner, we should also consider its limitations; dinnertime socialization through language and for language in the modern family as considered here represents just one trajectory among the situationally and culturally extremely varied language socialization experiences children go through around the world. A full account needs to consider other important

participation structures (like children's peer interaction) as well as the full gamut of cultural variability not only in language socialization but also in human development and socialization at large (e.g., Rogoff 2003).

Cross-References

- ▶ [Bi- and Multilingual Family Language Socialization](#)
- ▶ [Language Socialization: An Historical Overview](#)
- ▶ [Language Socialization in Working Families](#)
- ▶ [Pragmatic Socialization](#)

References

- Aukrust, V. (2002). "What did you do in school today?" Speech genres and tellability in multiparty family mealtime conversations in two cultures. In S. Blum-Kulka & C. Snow (Eds.), *Talking to adults* (pp. 55–85). Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Aukrust, V. G., & Snow, E. C. (1998). Narratives and explanations in Norwegian and American mealtime conversations. *Language in Society*, 27, 221–247.
- Beals, D. (1993). Explanations in low-income families' mealtime conversations. *Applied Psycholinguistics*, 14, 489–513.
- Beals, D. E., & Snow, C. E. (1994). "Thunder is when the angels are upstairs bowling": Narratives and explanations at the dinner table. *Journal of Narrative and Life History*, 4, 331–352.
- Becker, J. A. (1990). Processes in the acquisition of pragmatic competence. In G. Conti-Ramsden & C. Snow (Eds.), *Children's language* (Vol. 7, pp. 7–24). Hillsdale: Erlbaum.
- Berko Gleason, J. (1975). Fathers and other strangers: Men's speech to young children. In *Georgetown University roundtable on language and linguistics* (pp. 289–297). Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.
- Berko Gleason, J., Perlman, R., & Greif, E. (1984). What's the magic word: Learning language through politeness routines. *Discourse Processes*, 7, 493–502.
- Blum-Kulka, S. (1997). *Dinner talk: Cultural patterns of sociability and socialization in family discourse*. Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Blum-Kulka, S. (2000). Gossipy events at family dinners: Negotiating sociability, presence and the moral order. In J. Coupland (Ed.), *Small talk* (pp. 213–241). Harlow: Longman.
- Blum-Kulka, S. (2002). "Do you believe that Lot's wife is blocking the road (to Jericho)?" Co-constructing theories about the world with adults. In S. Blum-Kulka & C. Snow (Eds.), *Talking to adults* (pp. 85–117). Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Brown, P. (2002). Everyone has to lie in Tzeltal. In S. Blum-Kulka & C. Snow (Eds.), *Talking to adults* (pp. 241–277). Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Capps, L., & Ochs, E. (2002). Cultivating prayer. In C. Ford, B. Fox, & S. Thompson (Eds.), *The language of turn and sequence* (pp. 39–55). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- De Geer, B., Tulviste, T., Mizera, L., & Tryggvason, M. T. (2002). Socialization in communication: Pragmatic socialization during dinnertime in Estonian, Finnish and Swedish families. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 34, 1757–1786.
- Ely, R., Berko Gleason, J., Narasimhan, B., & McCabe, A. (1995). Family talk about talk: Mothers lead the way. *Discourse Processes*, 19, 201–218.
- Ely, R., Berko Gleason, J. B., MacGibbon, A., & Zaretsky, E. (2001). Attention to language: Lessons learned at the dinner table. *Social Development*, 10, 355–373.

- Erickson, F. (1982). Money tree, lasagna bush, salt and pepper: Social construction of topical cohesion in a conversation among Italian-Americans. In D. Tannen (Ed.), *Analyzing discourse: Text and talk* (pp. 43–71). Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.
- Fasulo, A., Liberati, V., & Pontecorvo, C. (2002). Language games in the strict sense of the term: Children's poetics and conversation. In S. Blum-Kulka & C. Snow (Eds.), *Talking to adults: The contribution of multi-party talk to language development* (pp. 209–241). Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Fatigante, M., Fasulo, A., & Pontecorvo, C. (1998). Life with the alien: Role casting and face-saving techniques in family conversation with young children. *Issues in Applied Linguistics*, 9(2), 97–121.
- Georgakopoulou, A. (2002). Greek children and familiar narratives in family contexts: En route to cultural performance. In S. Blum-Kulka & C. Snow (Eds.), *Talking to adults* (pp. 33–55). Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Gordon, C. (2004). "Al Gore's our guy": Linguistically constructing a family political identity. *Discourse and Society*, 15, 607–631.
- Kasuya, H. (2002). Bilingual context for language development. In S. Blum-Kulka & C. Snow (Eds.), *Talking to adults* (pp. 295–327). Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Kepler, A., & Luckman, T. (1991). "Teaching": Conversational transmission of knowledge. In I. Markova & K. Foppa (Eds.), *Asymmetries in dialogue* (pp. 143–166). Savage: Barnes and Noble.
- Lanza, E. (1997). *Language mixing in infant bilingualism: A sociolinguistic perspective*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Martini, M. (1996). "What's new?" at the dinner table: Family dynamics during mealtimes in two cultural groups in Hawaii. *Early Development and Parenting*, 5, 23–34.
- Nevat-Gal, R. (2002). Cognitive expressions and humorous phrases in family discourse as reflectors and cultivators of cognition. In S. Blum-Kulka & C. Snow (Eds.), *Talking to adults* (pp. 181–209). Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Ochs, E., & Shohet, M. (2006). The cultural structuring of mealtime socialization. In R. Larson, A. Wiley, & K. Branscomb (Eds.), *Family mealtime as a context of development and socialization, New directions in child and adolescent development series* (Vol. 11, pp. 35–50). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Ochs, E., & Taylor, C. (1992). Family narrative as political activity. *Discourse and Society*, 3, 301–341.
- Ochs, E., Smith, R., & Taylor, C. (1989). Detective stories at dinnertime: Problem solving through co-narration. *Cultural Dynamics*, 2, 238–257.
- Ochs, E., Taylor, C., Rudolph, D., & Smith, R. (1992). Storytelling as a theory-building activity. *Discourse Processes*, 15, 37–72.
- Ochs, E., Pontecorvo, C., & Fasulo, A. (1996). Socializing taste. *Ethnos*, 1–2, 7–46.
- Pan, B. A., Perlman, Y. R., & Snow, E. C. (2000). Food for thought: Dinner table as a context for observing parent-child discourse. In L. Menn & N. Bernstein Ratner (Eds.), *Methods for studying language production* (pp. 181–205). Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Paugh, A. L. (2005). Learning about work at dinnertime: Language socialization in dual-earner American families. *Discourse and Society*, 16, 55–78.
- Perlman, R. (1984). *Variations in socialization styles: Family talk at the dinner table*. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Boston University.
- Petraki, E. (2001). The play of identities in Cypriot-Australian family storytelling. *Narrative Inquiry*, 11, 335–362.
- Pontecorvo, C., & Fasulo, A. (1997). Learning to argue in family shared discourse: The reconstruction of past events. In L. B. Resnick, R. Saljo, C. Pontecorvo, & B. Burge (Eds.), *Discourse, tools, and reasoning: Essays on situated cognition* (pp. 406–442). Berlin: Springer.
- Pontecorvo, C., & Fasulo, A. (1999). Planning a typical Italian meal: A family reflection on culture. *Culture and Psychology*, 5(3), 313–335.
- Pontecorvo, C., Fasulo, A., & Sterponi, L. (2001). Mutual apprentices: The making of parenthood and childhood in family dinner conversations. *Human Development*, 44, 340–361.

- Rogoff, B. (2003). *The cultural nature of human development*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Snow, C. (1991). The theoretical basis for relationships between language and literacy development. *Journal of Research in Childhood Education*, 6(Fall/Winter), 5–10.
- Snow, C. E., Perlman, R., Gleason, J. B., & Hooshyar, N. (1990). Developmental perspectives on politeness: Sources of children's knowledge. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 14, 289–307.
- Sterponi, L. (2003). Account episodes in family discourse: The making of morality in everyday interaction. *Discourse Studies*, 5(1), 79–100.
- Tannen, B. (2004). Talking the dog: Framing pets as interactional resources in family discourse. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 37, 399–420.
- Varenne, H. (1992). *Ambiguous harmony: Family talk in America*. Norwood: Ablex.
- Vuchinich, S. (1990). The sequential organization of closing in verbal family conflict. In A. D. Grimshaw (Ed.), *Conflict talk: Sociolinguistic investigations of arguments in conversation* (pp. 118–139). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Weizman, Z., & Snow, C. E. (2001). Lexical input as related to children's vocabulary acquisition: Effects of sophisticated exposure and support for meaning. *Developmental Psychology*, 37, 265–279.

Bi- and Multilingual Family Language Socialization

Lyn Wright Fogle and Kendall A. King

Abstract

This chapter focuses on language socialization and the ways in which language development and culture are tied in bilingual and multilingual family contexts. A brief overview of language socialization theory and methods is presented. We then examine major contributions to language socialization in contexts of migration, colonization, globalization, and other situations of language contact. While much of the early work in language socialization focused on family language and literacy practices in a single first language to demonstrate the close connections between culture and language learning, by the 1990s researchers began to consider bi- and multilingual language socialization in the family. These studies focused on the ideological and interactional aspects of developing competence in more than one language in childhood and have shed light on the complex processes associated with language maintenance and shift as well as heritage and second language learning. Further, as highlighted below, bi- and multilingual family language socialization emphasizes the processes of hybridity and cultural transformation as well as the agentive role of children and other novices in language socialization processes. We discuss how language socialization has provided alternate ways of understanding bilingual, heritage, and second language development; code-switching; and language shift that highlight the discursive, social, political, and relational aspects of these phenomena. Ongoing scholarship in this area expands on earlier work by taking scalar approaches to better capture language socialization in contexts of mobility, new family formations, and complex negotiations of identity and belonging.

L.W. Fogle (✉)

Department of English, University of Memphis, Memphis, TN, USA

e-mail: ewfogle@memphis.edu

K.A. King

University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, MN, USA

e-mail: kendall@umn.edu

Keywords

Language Policy • Identity • Socialization • Language ideology • Bilingualism • Multilingualism • Family

Contents

Early Developments	80
Major Contributions	82
Work in Progress	87
Problems and Difficulties	90
Future Directions	90
Conclusion	92
Cross-References	92
Related Articles in the Encyclopedia of Language and Education	92
References	93

Early Developments

In the 1980s, Elinor Ochs and Bambi Schieffelin proposed a sociocultural framework for analyzing language development known as language socialization. This approach held as a basic premise that “language is not acquired without culture” (Ochs 1988, p. 38). Language socialization, both a theory and method for investigating language development, sought to fill two gaps: first, to integrate the study of socialization and cultural context with the study of language acquisition, and second, to integrate a focus on language in anthropological considerations of socialization (Kulick and Schieffelin 2004; Ochs and Schieffelin 2011). Ochs’ and Schieffelin’s work illustrated the field’s central tenets: (a) that “the process of acquiring language is deeply affected by the process of becoming a competent member of a society” and (b) that “the process of becoming a competent member of society is realized to a large extent through language” (Ochs and Scheiffelin 1984, p. 276). Further, not only did they demonstrate that patterns of interaction with language learners and developmental trajectories were embedded in cultural contexts, they also used this research to refute claims of universality in language acquisition that were commonly held by psycholinguists.

Following these early developments, language socialization quickly expanded to include literacy socialization and to offer important insights into connections between home and school contexts for children of different ethnic, racial, and socioeconomic backgrounds (Heath 1983; Michaels 1981). This “first generation” of language socialization research was followed in the 1990s by work examining the negotiation and the use of more than one language in communities and families (Garrett and Baquedano-López 2002). Language socialization thus provided a framework for examining societal language shift as well as bilingual use and development from a sociocultural point of view, integrating the interactional, ideological, and political aspects of these processes with the study of language acquisition, as discussed in detail in the following section. As Garrett and

Baquedano-López (2002) note, this increased attention to bi- and multilingual socialization brought to light the ways in which cultures are transformed, rather than simply reproduced, in language socialization processes.

Language socialization research in bi- and multilingual families typically aims to understand the allocation of different languages across intergenerational family communication, and often, the implications for language maintenance or shift. Such studies, however, vary in the extent to which they focus on family-internal versus family-external influences on communication and language learning. These varied emphases often coincide with differences in the theoretical and methodological traditions from which the studies emerge. King (2013) points to three different fields that have documented processes of family language maintenance and shift: (a) anthropological approaches, including language socialization, that focus on culture-specific beliefs about childrearing; (b) linguistic approaches that demonstrate the discourse strategies that lead to successful bilingual outcomes for children; and (c) sociological perspectives that emphasize the importance of intergenerational transmission of minority languages (p. 49). While language socialization grew out of linguistic anthropology, researchers rooted in other fields have found its central tenets useful for examining multilingualism in the family.

In this chapter, we begin with three major contributions to the study of bi- and multilingual language socialization: Kulick's (1997) study of language shift in Papua New Guinea; Zentella's (1997) analysis of language use and socialization in a Puerto Rican neighborhood in New York City; and Lanza's (1997/2004) study of two families raising children bilingually in Norwegian and English in Norway. While these three studies are all foundational, they developed from distinct research questions and within different research paradigms (the sociolinguistic study of language shift, ethnography of communication, and bilingual discourse and development, respectively). Each of these early studies drew from early language socialization research to examine how language, ideology, and the family intersect. Each also carved out new avenues for empirical investigation of multilingual contexts and new fields of study, most notably Family Language Policy (King and Fogle 2017) as mentioned below.

As researchers from many different fields have taken up language socialization as a means for understanding multilingual family language processes, questions have arisen over the methodologies, foci, and interpretation of the field's foundation in relation to current work. Garrett (2017, volume "Research Methods in Language and Education"), outlines the following interconnected features of language socialization research: (a) a longitudinal study design in which developmental changes are tracked over time, (b) collection and analysis of field-based, naturalistic audio or video data, (c) an ethnographic perspective that is "holistic" and "theoretically informed," and attention to the linkages between micro- and macrolevels of analysis (p. 6). In addition, Ochs and Schieffelin (2011) included cross-sectional, quantitative discourse analytic studies under the language socialization umbrella. The unifying tenet in these discussions is that language socialization research demands close analysis of language in interaction over time; this is crucial to the underlying sociocultural orientation in which language development is theorized to occur

through interaction and in context. While interviews and parental reports of family practices and beliefs are a means for triangulating observational data, and potentially interesting interactional events in their own right, they do not adequately represent the interactions in which children experience socialization processes (Garrett 2004).

A second concern of language socialization researchers, beyond the amount and type of data collected, has been the focus of the analysis. Avineri (2014; see also Poveda et al. 2014) argued that language socialization studies should take an ethnographic approach that focuses centrally on the activities and practices of the family studied, that is, on what the families do, with less attention paid to relating the new data to findings from prior language socialization studies. Others have argued, however, that replication of these original analytical foci (e.g., narrative talk about the day) in different types of families (adoptive or lesbian, for example) and from different points-of-view (strategies used by children rather than adults) can set the stage for new interpretations and understandings of these practices as well as demonstrate how different family configurations compare with an assumed “norm” (Fogle 2012; Wagner 2010). As in any qualitative research, then, a tension arises in the iterative process through which practices are examined and foregrounded and prior research is drawn on to understand the new data.

This review generally includes studies that conform with the methodological criteria outlined by Garrett (2017) and Ochs and Scheffelin (2011); however, not all of the studies of bilingual and multilingual parenting reviewed here claim to be language socialization studies. Discourse analytic studies of parent-child and sibling interaction as well as other linguistic anthropological approaches that focus on scale and historicity are included as examples of socioculturally oriented work that have moved the field of bi- and multilingual family interaction forward to include multiple scales and sites of socialization. Excluded here are studies relying solely on interview data or parent self-reports of parenting practices. As mentioned above, we begin with three seminal studies. We then turn to more recent work that has further examined language socialization in contexts of language shift, heritage language learning, and bi- and multilingualism, emphasizing the contribution of this work to understanding children’s agency in language socialization processes. Finally, we discuss issues and problems this work has faced in conducting such studies and applying the findings to real world issues, mainly educational policies and the need for more research focusing on transnationalism, new family configurations such as single-parent and LGBTQ-identified parent families, and the attendant issues of identity and belonging for multilingual children.

Major Contributions

Studies of multilingual families have played a crucial role in promoting better understanding of language socialization processes in general; concomitantly, language socialization approaches have been instrumental in the analysis of intergenerational interaction, language ideologies, and the ways in which family-external processes, identity, and agency intersect and shape language outcomes of

children reared in multilingual environments. As is evident below, while some language socialization work tightly focuses on the processes of language socialization via close analysis of interactional data (e.g., Lanza 1997/2004), other work aims to incorporate analysis of community belief systems, language ideologies, and sociopolitical change with examinations of family interactions (e.g., Zentella 1997).

Three seminal studies, each with a different theoretical perspective, broke new ground in bi- and multilingual language socialization in the 1990s and contributed to understanding language socialization processes more broadly. Kulick's (1997) study of language shift in Papua New Guinea employed the language socialization framework to explain how and why the younger generation in the village of Gapun was dominant in Tok Pisin rather than the local language Taiap despite parents' wishes and desires. Zentella's (1997) study of Spanish-English bilingualism in *el barrio*, a predominately Puerto Rican neighborhood of New York, also documented a shift toward English in the context of immigration. This study, originally undertaken as an ethnography of communication, developed into a language socialization study, in which social inequality and community change were important to the bilingual development of children and eventual shift to English in the community. And third, Lanza's (1997/2004) study of bilingual development used language socialization in tandem with close discourse analysis of family interactions in two Norwegian-English bilingual families to show the contextual nature of young children's bilingual development. We discuss the contributions of each of these studies in detail in this section, starting with Kulick (1997).

Kulick (1997) conducted an ethnographic study of language shift in Gapun, Papua New Guinea, where the local language, Taiap, was being replaced by the majority language, Tok Pisin. Through close analysis of parent-child interactions as well as extensive ethnographic fieldwork in the community, Kulick found that parents did not use Taiap in their interactions with young children despite their stated desires for their children to be competent in the local language. Parents' beliefs that children chose which language to use, and through such choice, demonstrated community-valued characteristics of self-will, along with the higher social status and practical importance of Tok Pisin in a period of social change, had in fact altered the interactional strategies parents used with children leading to increased use of Tok Pisin by children. Local conceptions of children's willfulness and rejection of Taiap also played a role in the declining use of Taiap with young children, pointing to the role of children's agency in these processes. This study effectively portrayed language shift as a multifaceted process that was best accounted for using a language socialization approach. Further, although language socialization research has from its very beginnings emphasized the bidirectional and collaborative nature of these processes (Duff and Doherty 2014; Ochs and Schieffelin 1984), this study was one of the first to document the importance of the construction of children's agency in understanding bi- and multilingual language socialization.

A second important study of bilingual language socialization was Zentella's (1997) long-term ethnography of a Puerto Rican community in New York City, which examined the social and linguistic identity of being 'Nuyorican'. Through

close examination of children's code-switching practices and the syntactic features and discourse strategies of so-called 'Spanglish', Zentella revealed the social lives of children from 20 bilingual homes, documenting children's creativity and linguistic strengths. Zentella also pointed to the social and economic inequities that shape family language policy in these homes and the educational policies that failed to serve this population of learners. As in Kulick's (1997) study, Zentella documented the shift to the majority language (English) in her work. While originally framed in her doctoral dissertation as an ethnography of communication (EC), over time Zentella found that central EC concepts (e.g., domains) were not applicable nor productive. Rather, local cultural practices, established social hierarchies, and inequities were more important for understanding children's bilingual development. Her work brought a political perspective to language socialization that went beyond the study of cultural beliefs and norms to highlight conflict and power as key factors in children's language development.

The first two studies reviewed here focused broadly on what have been typically considered so-called 'macro' level phenomenon in sociolinguistics, that is, political, community, and social change in relation to 'micro' interactional processes. Lanza's (1997/2004) work on English-Norwegian speaking families in Norway took a much closer look at bilingual family interactions and further established a framework – drawing from language socialization and discourse analytic approaches – to understanding bilingual parenting and children's bilingual outcomes. Lanza's study provided detailed analysis of parental interactional strategies, particularly in response to children's language mixing, and illustrated how the resulting discourse context shaped children's bilingualism. Lanza's study provided a framework for analyzing and further understanding how parental input, and importantly parental reaction to children's mixing, led to different bilingual outcomes. Further, her study demonstrated how the current psycholinguistic approaches to code-switching failed to capture adequately the contextual nature of children's bilingual development (Lanza 1992).

These three book-length studies examined bilingual language socialization with distinct analytical foci. Kulick's (1997) study emphasized the importance of caregivers' beliefs about children and the role of community theories of childhood in shaping caregivers' interactional patterns. Zentella (1997), in turn, emphasized how community dynamics and children's interactions across sites (e.g., inside the home, on the block) and across many years shaped the development of particular types of bilingual competencies in English and Spanish. Lanza (1997/2004), finally, focused on the microinteractional strategies of parents in response to children's language use, with a keen focus on the developing competencies of young children. Subsequent studies of bi- and multilingual language socialization likewise have varied in their particular analytical scale and foci, generating some tension and debate over the goals and methods taken up in language socialization research (Avineri 2014; Duff and Talmy 2011; Garrett 2004). One strand of research has emphasized family-internal or interactional processes in bi- and multilingual language socialization, while others have looked more closely at family-external phenomena. Taken together, these studies have expanded understandings of language shift over time

with a particular emphasis on cultural transformation and change (Garrett and Baquedano-López 2002).

Garrett (2005), for instance, combined the study of language shift with that of language socialization in his investigation of the communicative practices of children in the multilingual environment of St. Lucia. Based on these data, Garrett argued that rather than viewing code-switching (the alternating use of two or more languages in conversation) as a contextually-sensitive individual choice in contexts of language shift, certain speech genres became code specific. As an example, children in St. Lucia were “socialized to ‘curse’ and otherwise assert themselves by means of a creole language that under most circumstances they [were] discouraged from using” (p. 327). Garrett’s work shed light on some of the processes of language shift and, in particular, the narrowing of functions of the minority language as instantiated in parent-child interaction.

In another early language socialization study of Spanish-English bilingualism in the U.S., Schecter and Bayley (1997) examined language practices of four Mexican-descent families as part of a larger study of 40 families (Schecter and Bayley 2002). Analysis of interviews and 25 hours of recorded data per family revealed that children identified strongly with their Mexican heritage. However, families variably oriented themselves to the Spanish language and engaged in different Spanish-language practices. Guardado’s (2009) study of Spanish-speaking families in a Scout group in Canada further discussed the complex connections between identity and heritage language maintenance and the “complex, sometimes contradictory, processes of socialization” (p. 121).

In a similar context, Martínez-Roldán and Malavé (2004) conducted a case study of one 7-year-old Mexican American student and his family with the aim of illustrating how local language ideologies, identities, and literacy development intersect. This study emphasized the importance of parents’ beliefs in early biliteracy development and concluded that the de-emphasis of language heritage and self-deprecation of ethnic background, associated with wider societal discourses, were major factors in failed efforts to promote childhood bilingualism.

In addition to longitudinal, qualitative studies, language socialization can include cross-sectional studies aimed at investigating linguistic practices in specific demographic groups that shed light on cultural orientations (Ochs and Schieffelin 2011). In this vein, many studies have attempted to quantify aspects of language socialization practices in bilingual families. Of note is Blum-Kulka’s (1997) cross-cultural comparison of language use in Jewish American, Israeli American, and Israeli families. Blum-Kulka found that differences in pragmatic and metapragmatic strategies in mealtime conversations were attributable to a variety of cultural and linguistic factors. In relation to bi- and multilingual language socialization, she concluded that families in settings of multilingualism and second language learning talked about language more than monolingual families. Other studies have reported similar results concerning metalinguistic talk in multilingual families (De Geer et al. 2002).

Finally, the role of children in language socialization processes has been highlighted in studies of bi- and multilingual families. Luykx (2003), as an example,

examined intersections of bilingual language socialization and gender socialization in Aymara-speaking, Bolivian households. She investigated patterns of socialization and use of Aymara versus Spanish within the home as well as outside the home in boys' peer groups, ritual gatherings, and public meetings among other contexts. Following Kulick (1997), Luykx concluded that family language planning and socialization are dynamic processes and that socialization should not be viewed "as a one-way process, but as a dynamic network of mutual family influences" (p. 41). Luykx (2005) further argued that children themselves are "socializing agents" in family language socialization processes.

More recent contributions to bi- and multilingual language socialization have begun to focus primarily on children's agency with greater attention paid to the interactional strategies used by children to shape contexts of language learning and, by extension, the multiple and complex nature of children's agencies. Extending Lanza (1997/2004), for instance, Gafaranga (2010) studied the microinteractional processes of language shift in Rwandan Kinyarwanda and French bilingual families in Belgium. Gafaranga showed how language shift was "talked into being" through family interactions via a specific practice, i.e. a request to shift languages, what Gafaranga termed 'the medium request,' which was used in family interaction, primarily by children, to alter the language of interaction to French. Gafaranga also found that when parents resisted children's medium requests by not switching to French, a parallel conversation in the two languages ensued. Children were thus allowed to use their preferred language.

In a collective case study, Fogle (2012) examined second language socialization processes in three adoptive families (5 parents and 10 adoptees, ages 4–17), and analyzed how language ideologies, discourse practices, and family identities were negotiated and constructed in everyday activities. The data illustrated how language socialization processes were collaborative and co-constructed as children sought out opportunities for language learning and formed self and family identities. The children's strategies, in turn, had lasting effects on their parents' own language ideologies and practices. With a similar focus on the links across language ideologies and practices, King (2013) investigated how linguistic identity was constructed, constrained, and performed by three sisters, aged 1, 12, and 17, within one bilingual, transnational Ecuadorian-U.S. family. Data were collected over 14 months through weekly home visits that included participant-observation, informal interviews, and family-generated audio-recordings of home conversations. Ethnographically informed discourse analysis of family interactions and interviews examined how each of the three daughters was positioned and positioned herself discursively as a language learner and user. King's findings illustrated how widely circulating ideologies of language and language learning shaped family language practices as well as children's identities in the home as siblings and as language learners and speakers.

Other studies have also found that children play an agentive role in code selection in interaction with their parents. In this work, younger generations are found to play an important role in negotiating code use in the home with parents and other siblings. In a study of Chinese diasporic families in the UK, for example, Zhu (2008) found

that code-switching strategies were used to negotiate, mediate, and manage conflicts in values between parents and children (e.g., fulfilling family social obligations). Zhu demonstrated how cultural transformation occurred in talk in interaction in these families as children used heritage languages in strategic ways to influence their parents. Similarly, Kasanga (2008) focused on multilingual intragenerational interactions of extended families of Congolese origin that had migrated to different host nations. Kasanga focused on micro interactions among family members, siblings (or cousins) from different families who had adopted French and English over the local family language Kiswahili. This study highlighted how youth used coping strategies such as accommodation, crossing, code negotiation, and negotiation for meaning to establish a mode of communication that met the interactional and social needs of the family members.

As is evident in this brief review, researchers took up language socialization in order to better account for the highly varied outcomes and diverse contexts of multilingual family development. Language socialization offered a highly productive theoretical and methodological approach for examining interactional processes as well as the implications of those processes for language shift. Major contributions to the study of bi- and multilingual language socialization have highlighted processes of cultural change, and concomitantly, the negotiated and collaborative processes of language socialization in which documented parental desires or pre-established policies and routines are not realized and result in language shift or hybrid language practices. In these studies, parents grapple with shifting ideologies and identities in contexts of colonization, migration, and globalization. Current work in bi- and multilingual language socialization continues in this area with a greater emphasis on both the interactional and ideological processes of language shift and a greater focus on mobility and transnationalism as aspects of twenty-first century language contact.

Work in Progress

The examination of the maintenance of minority languages and development of children's multilingual competencies remains a primary focus of current work in bi- and multilingual language socialization research; however, this work takes a multisited and multifaceted approach with greater attention to language practices and ideologies across time and space as well as the sociopolitical context that shapes family-internal processes. One line of research focuses on shedding light on why families who seem to adopt similar sorts of strategies (e.g., OPOL, or One Parent One Language) often have very different outcomes in terms of child language proficiencies, with much of this work pointing to the active role of children. A second influential body of work examines how family socialization interacts with language socialization in other contexts. We will first discuss the current literature on OPOL, and then turn to multisited and scalar research across contexts.

One continuing trend in language socialization research on the effectiveness of OPOL and other parent strategies for developing bilingual language competence has been a closer focus on children's agency in socializing interactions. Some of this work has extended the focus on the bidirectional nature of language socialization in the family by studying older children's agency, and specifically resistance to the use of a heritage or minority language at home. Gyogi (2014), for example, highlighted children's agency, and specifically their construction of flexible bilingual identities, in her study of two families with Japanese-speaking mothers in London. Similar to Fogle (2012), she argues that children's agency in family language socialization is multiple and contextual as the children resisted the mothers' monolingual language policies, but demonstrated different practices in interaction with the researcher.

In a further study that integrated language socialization and family language policy (see King and Fogle 2017, in McCarty and May volume "Language Policy and Political Issues"), Kierkhah and Cekaite (2015), for example, examined how OPOL family language policies were instantiated and negotiated in a Persian-Kurdish family in Sweden. This study found that parents' requests for translation situated the parents as experts and child as "novice" in family conversations, a positioning that the child resisted through refusing to use their heritage language(s).

Departing from OPOL studies, but still focused on the management of two languages in the family, Kim et al. (2015) examined the relationship between cultural norms, power, and bilingual language use in Korean American families (see also Song 2017, this volume). This study used positioning theory to demonstrate the shifting patterns of Korean family relations, and, like Zhu (2008), demonstrated the family-internal conflicts that related to bilingual language use. Extending work on the construction of code-specific genres or registers, Smagulova (2014), adopted a functional approach to understanding language shift in a post-Soviet context. She drew on current work on register (Agha 2004) and a quantitative analysis of the use of Kazakh in four urban ethnic Kazakh families to explain how the use of Kazakh constituted a baby talk register, while the use of Russian constructed children as "autonomous social agents" (p. 370). These parental strategies devalued Kazakh and sustained the shift toward Russian in the Kazakh-speaking communities.

As the role of children has grown in importance in much of the work on OPOL and language shift in bi- and multilingual language socialization, connecting the lives of children across contexts has become of increasing interest as children's experiences outside of the home influence how they interact and use language at home. One strand of this work draws from the growing body of literature on language, mobility, and globalization (Blommaert 2010) to examine language ideologies and practices across time and space. Transnationalism is an important dimension of many immigrant families' experiences but is not adequately examined by teachers and researchers, according to Sánchez and Kasun (2010). A transnational stance, according to King (2013), "implies a break with the view of migration as a one-way, unilinear process of assimilation" (p. 51). King's study, as discussed above, demonstrates how siblings in transnational contexts position their linguistic identities differently and assume different language competencies. Transnationalism has

implications for language socialization as well as identity, belonging, kinship and gender in the family. Sánchez and Kasun, for example, describe the stigma attached to trips “home” by Mexican American youth and the efforts to hide transnational lifestyles in educational settings despite the fact that such trips and connections “help develop a greater awareness of global political and economic issues” (p. 84). From a language socialization perspective, understanding the linguistic and identity connections across national boundaries and how family language practices connect with language socialization in the different sites of young migrants’ belongings can be vital to understanding child development and educational outcomes. With these goals in mind, studies of transnational youth have aimed at developing new methodological approaches within linguistic anthropology in order to better capture multiple socialization processes beyond parent-child interactions.

Notable among this work is a set of studies centered on a small town in Pennsylvania with a recent and quickly expanding Mexican migrant population. Wortham and colleagues have studied the multiple aspects of children’s educational experiences and community language ideologies across varying scales (Gallo et al. 2014; Mortimer and Wortham 2015; Wortham et al. 2011; Wortham and Rhodes 2013). Wortham and Rhodes (2013), for example, described the process through which certain aspects of one child’s identity become salient across time and space. The study focused on the emergence of one young Mexican migrant’s identity as a good reader across different contexts. The researchers argue that aspects of family interactions, educational practices, local community characteristics, and national discourses served as heterogenous resources for her trajectory of identification. Together, the process of identifying relevant heterogenous resources is likened to the formation of a musical chord. This analytical metaphor helps to draw together findings from different sites of ethnographic research.

The ethnographic framework of nexus analysis (Scollon and Scollon 2004) has also been applied to children’s bi- and multilingual language socialization in order to capture language socialization processes across time and space. Pietikäinen et al. (2008), for example, examined how one Sami boy in the Finnish north appropriated and rejected different language resources in moment-to-moment interaction. In this study, nexus analysis provided a tool for drawing together multimodal data collected from the research participant to understand his multilingual languaging practices. The framework also usefully captures language ideologies and practices across scales of space and time and brings together analysis of public discourse, habitus and socialization, and interaction and offers an effective tool for language socialization research that seeks to capture simultaneous processes (Scollon and Scollon 2007).

Thus, as one line of research continues to focus closely on family-internal processes of raising bilingual children and promoting bilingual competence, other studies have begun to propose innovative ways for researching language socialization processes across contexts to better investigate the contingent nature of bilingual language competence and identity. This has been productive work, but it is not without its problems and difficulties, as discussed below.

Problems and Difficulties

As we have made evident through this review, there is now a rich body of research on bi- and multilingual language socialization, with much of that work focusing on contexts of transnationalism, mobility, and the complex interactions across family-internal and family-external processes. While the language socialization approach has been durable and prolific, one important question concerns the extent to which this work has influenced public debate or shaped policy for the large and growing number of multilingual children. In the U.S., for instance, despite the abundant, rich ethnographic work demonstrating the flexible and creative language competencies of multilingual children, work that should be extended and built upon in educational contexts, deficit discourses of bi- and multilingualism are still pervasive. Indeed, public policy and educational policy in the U.S. and elsewhere are far more likely to be shaped by quantitative studies (e.g., Hart and Risley 1995), which compare, for instance, high and low socioeconomic status families in terms of quantity and quality of language input. Unfortunately, many of these psycholinguistically informed studies are used to point to the deficiencies of parenting practices and the need for remedial school programs or parenting training initiatives (Avineri and Johnson 2015).

An important challenge for language socialization researchers is to use their findings to advocate for more responsive and appropriate public and educational policy for multilingual youth. Language socialization, as a framework, is fundamentally about an academic understanding of child or novice language development within, and as an aspect of, particular cultural contexts. For researchers who study language socialization within multilingual families, addressing these basic academic questions alone is insufficient. It is part of our responsibility to participate in the public debate around multilingual educational policy, and to bring to light the many skills and resources of this population. Efforts such as Ana Celia Zentella's movement for anthropolitical linguistics are underway, but much more needs to be done.

Future Directions

Recent decades have seen transformations in family structures and kinship relations, largely as an outcome of globalization, transnationalism, and postindustrial societal processes. These changes have included increases in transnational kinship configurations, transnational adoption, same-sex parent families, single-parent families, and grandparents as primary caregivers (Boehm 2008; Esposito and Biafora 2007; Poveda et al. 2014). Despite this growing diversity in potential family and kinship arrangements, many if not most studies of bi- and multilingual language socialization continue to focus on middle-class families with two cis-gender heterosexual parents or fail to foreground family configurations as an influential aspect of language socialization. Fluidity in family structures and "new" family configurations potentially shape the possibilities for the development of bilingual competence and

further connect to parental involvement at school as well as children's identities and belonging. Future work in bi- and multilingual language socialization should consider these issues with greater depth, drawing on the multisited methodologies reviewed above.

This work is important, both for our understanding of the range of family types, but also because it helps understand what were previously considered 'universal' tenets. For instance, in an early study of single-parent bilingual families, Obied (2010) asked whether divorced or single parent families can raise bilingual and biliterate children. Earlier research on bi- and multilingual language socialization had focused on OPOL strategies, suggesting that single parents would not have the resources to raise bilingual children. Contrary to the dictates of OPOL, Obied found that single parents and nonresidential parents who are actively involved in the child's language development can effectively promote child bilingualism and biliteracy.

More recently, Poveda et al. (2014) have investigated language socialization in single-parent homes more closely, though their study did not include discussions of bilingualism. Their study, which focused on family interactions between mothers and children in single-parent-by-choice families, found that language socialization in these families was aimed at not defining the family by absence of a father, but rather by emphasizing other social networks, child agency, including the children's role in the construction of the single parent family, and open disclosure about the process of how the family was created (p. 323). Such findings have implications for bilingual language socialization as the children play an instrumental role in constructing the family identity and kinship relations. As family networks can extend outside of the immediate nuclear family, the potential for bilingual language socialization in close contact with other families in the community then potentially increases. Further work on such parenting practices could yield exciting insights about the interactions of family and community.

Other work has centered more closely on the role of fathers in transnational language socialization processes. Gallo's (2014) study of Mexican immigrant fathers found that, contrary to public discourses that construct fathers as "illegals" and invisible as caring fathers and husbands, the participants in her study were actively involved in the literacy and language development of their children. Existing political and social structures and discourses, however, could negatively impact families as minor infractions sometimes led to deportation that separated children and fathers. Gallo argues that understanding fathers' participation in family language and literacy socialization can lead to new policies to support transnational children in school.

Future directions in bi- and multilingual language socialization center around more concentrated study of family configuration in postindustrial and transnational settings. Such work debunks commonly held stereotypes of gender norms and roles that have deep implications for how language practices occur in family settings. More studies that investigate these processes and mobility of family members across time and space can yield better insight into how schools and educational policies should respond to children in transnational, single-parent, and queer families.

Conclusion

The study of bi- and multilingual family language socialization has provided important insights into the ways in which language ideologies, practices, and management in the family connect with societal language maintenance and shift, children's educational experiences, and the construction of identity and belonging in post-industrial, globalizing, and transnational contexts. Such studies have revealed the interactional strategies and ideological aspects of promoting bilingual competence for young children. Early major contributions to bi- and multilingual language socialization pointed to the importance of children in directing and shaping language socialization processes. This early work has also demonstrated the complex identity negotiations associated with new contexts of migration and family configurations. Multisited research that considers children at home, at school, and in their communities further points to a need for understanding language socialization processes across scales and sites as children develop different belongings and identities in different contexts that have clear implications for language development and educational policies. Future work in this area will focus on different parenting configurations, multiple and complex language ideologies, and the children's agency in interactional processes in the home with greater attention to contexts out of the home that shape these phenomena.

Cross-References

- ▶ [Language Socialization and Family Dinnertime Discourse](#)
- ▶ [Language Socialization, Language Ideologies, and Language Shift Among School-Aged Children](#)
- ▶ [Language Socialization in Children's Peer and Sibling-Kin Group Interactions](#)
- ▶ [Language Socialization in Korean Transnational Communities](#)
- ▶ [Language Socialization in Latino Communities](#)
- ▶ [Language Socialization in Working Families](#)
- ▶ [Language Socialization: An Historical Overview](#)

Related Articles in the Encyclopedia of Language and Education

- Paul Garrett: [Researching Language Socialization](#). In Volume: Research Methods in Language and Education
- Kendall King and Lyn Fogle: [Family Language Policy](#). In Volume: Language Policy and Political Issues in Education
- Django Paris and Lorena Gutierrez: [Youth Language in Education](#). In Volume: Language Policy and Political Issues in Education
- Thomas Ricento: [Researching Historical/Political Perspectives on Language, Education and Ideology](#). In Volume: Research Methods in Language and Education

References

- Agha, A. (2004). Registers of language. In A. Duranti (Ed.), *A companion to linguistic anthropology* (pp. 23–45). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Avineri, N. (2014). Review of Second language socialization and learner agency: Adoptive family talk. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology*, 24(1), 98–108.
- Avineri, N., & Johnson, E. J. (2015). Introduction to invited forum ‘Bridging the language gap’. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology*, 25(1), 67–68.
- Blommaert, J. (2010). *The sociolinguistics of globalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Blum-Kulka, S. (1997). *Dinner talk: Cultural patterns of sociability and socialization in family discourse*. Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Boehm, D. (2008). “Now I am a man and a woman”: Gendered moves and migrations in a transnational Mexican community. *Latin American Perspectives*, 35(16), 16–30.
- De Geer, B., Tulviste, T., Mizera, L., & Tryggvason, M.-T. (2002). Socialization in communication: Pragmatic socialization during dinnertime in Estonian, Finnish and Swedish families. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 34, 1757–1786.
- Duff, P., & Doherty, L. (2014). Examining agency in (second) language socialization research. In P. Deters, X. Gao, E. R. Miller, & G. Vitanova (Eds.), *Theorizing and analyzing agency in second language learning* (pp. 54–72). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Duff, P., & Talmy, S. (2011). Language socialization approaches to second language acquisition: Social, cultural, and linguistic development in additional languages. In D. Atkinson (Ed.), *Alternative approaches to second language acquisition* (pp. 95–116). London: Routledge.
- Esposito, D., & Biasfora, F. (2007). Toward a sociology of adoption: Historical deconstruction. In R. Javier, A. Baden, F. Biafora, & A. Camacho-Gingerich (Eds.), *Handbook of adoption: Implications for researchers, practitioners and families* (pp. 17–31). London: Sage.
- Fogle, L. W. (2012). *Second language socialization and learner agency: Adoptive family talk*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Gafaranga, J. (2010). Medium request: Talking language shift into being. *Language in Society*, 39(02), 241–270. doi:[10.1017/S0047404510000047](https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404510000047).
- Gallo, S. (2014). *Mexican immigrant fathers and their children: An investigation of communicative resources across contexts of learning*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Pennsylvania.
- Gallo, S., Link, H., Allard, E., Wortham, S., & Mortimer, K. (2014). Conflicting ideologies of Mexican immigrant English across levels of schooling. *International Multilingual Research Journal*, 8(2), 124–140.
- Garrett, P. B. (2004). Review of language socialization in bilingual and multilingual societies. *Language in Society*, 33(5), 776–779.
- Garrett, P. B. (2005). What a language is good for: Language socialization, language shift, and the persistence of code-specific genres in St Lucia. *Language in Society*, 34(3), 327–361.
- Garrett, P. B. (2017). Researching language socialization. In K. A. King, Y. Lai, & S. May (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of language and education. Research methods in language and education*. Boston: Springer.
- Garrett, P. B., & Baquedano-López, P. (2002). Language socialization: Reproduction and continuity transformation and change. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 31, 339–361.
- Guardado, M. (2009). Speaking Spanish like a boy scout: Language socialization, resistance, and reproduction in a heritage language scout troop. *Canadian Modern Language Review/La Revue Canadienne Des Langues Vivantes*, 66(1), 101–129. doi:[10.3138/cmlr.66.1.101](https://doi.org/10.3138/cmlr.66.1.101).
- Gyogi, E. (2014). Children’s agency in language choice: A case study of two Japanese-English bilingual children in London. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 18(6), 1–16. doi:[10.1080/13670050.2014.956043](https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2014.956043).
- Hart, B., & Risley, T. R. (1995). *Meaningful differences in the everyday experience of young American children*. Baltimore: Paul H Brookes Publishing.

- Heath, S. B. (1983). *Ways with words: Language, life and work in communities and classrooms*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kasanga, L. A. (2008). “cheap” *c’est quoi?* Immigrant teenagers in quest of multilingual competence and identity. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 5(4), 333–356.
- Kierkhah, M., & Cekaite, A. (2015). Language maintenance in a multilingual family: Informal heritage language lessons in parent-child interactions. *Multilingua*, 34(3), 319–346.
- Kim, A. Y., Lee, J. S., & Lee, W. (2015). Examining Korean American parent-child relationships through bilingual language use. *Journal of Family Communication*, 15(3), 269–287. doi:10.1080/15267431.2015.1044089.
- King, K. A. (2013). A tale of three sisters: Language ideologies, identities, and negotiations in a bilingual, transnational family. *International Multilingual Research Journal*, 7(1), 49–65. doi:10.1080/19313152.2013.746800.
- King, K. A., & Fogle, L. W. (2017). Family language policy. In T. McCarty & S. May (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of language and education. Language policy and political issues*. Boston: Springer.
- Kulick, D. (1997). *Language shift and cultural reproduction: Socialization, self and syncretism in a Papua New Guinean village*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kulick, D., & Schieffelin, B. (2004). Language socialization. In A. Duranti (Ed.), *A companion to linguistic anthropology* (pp. 347–368). Malden: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Lanza, E. (1992). Can bilingual two-year-olds code-switch? *Journal of Child Language*, 19(3), 633–658.
- Lanza, E. (1997/2004). *Language mixing in infant bilingualism: A sociolinguistic perspective*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Luykx, A. (2003). Weaving languages together: Family language policy and gender socialization in bilingual Aymara households. In S. Schecter & R. Bayley (Eds.), *Language socialization in bilingual and multilingual societies* (pp. 25–43). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd.
- Luykx, A. (2005). Children as socializing agents: Family language policy in situations of language shift. In J. Cohen, K. McAlister, K. Rolstad, & J. MacSwan (Eds.), *ISB4: Proceedings of the 4th international symposium on bilingualism* (pp. 1407–1414). Somerville: Cascadilla Press.
- Martínez-Roldán, C. M., & Malavé, G. (2004). Language ideologies mediating literacy and identity in bilingual contexts. *Journal of Early Childhood Literacy*, 4(2), 155–180.
- Michaels, S. (1981). Sharing time: Children’s narrative styles and differential access to literacy. *Language in Society*, 10, 423–442.
- Mortimer, K. S., & Wortham, S. (2015). Analyzing language policy and social identification across heterogeneous scales. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 35, 160–172. doi:10.1017/S0267190514000269.
- Obied, V. M. (2010). Can one-parent families or divorced families produce two-language children? An investigation into how Portuguese–English bilingual children acquire biliteracy within diverse family structures. *Pedagogy, Culture & Society*, 18(2), 227–243. doi:10.1080/14681366.2010.488047.
- Ochs, E. (1988). *Culture and language development: Language acquisition and language socialization in a Samoan village*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ochs, E., & Schieffelin, B. B. (2011). The theory of language socialization. In A. Duranti, E. Ochs, & B. B. Schieffelin (Eds.), *The handbook of language socialization* (pp. 1–21). Hoboken: Wiley-Blackwell. doi:10.1002/9781444342901.ch1.
- Ochs, E., & Schieffelin, B. (1984). Language acquisition and socialization: Three developmental stories and their implications. In R. Shweder & R. Levine (Eds.), *Culture theory: Essays on mind, self, and emotion* (pp. 276–320). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Pietikäinen, S., Alanen, R., Dufva, H., Kalaja, P., Leppänen, S., & Pitkänen-Huhta, A. (2008). Languageing in Ultima Thule: Multilingualism in the life of a Sami boy. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 5(2), 79–99.
- Poveda, D., Jociles, M. I., & Rivas, A. M. (2014). Socialization into single-parent-by-choice family life. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 18(3), 319–344. <http://doi.org/10.1111/josl.12085>.

- Sánchez, P., & Kasun, G. S. (2010). Connecting transnationalism to the classroom and to theories of immigrant student adaptation. *Berkeley Review of Education*, 3(1), 71–93.
- Schecter, S. R., & Bayley, R. (1997). Language socialization practices and cultural identity: Case studies of Mexican-descent families in California and Texas. *TESOL Quarterly*, 31(3), 513–541.
- Scollon, R., & Scollon, S. W. (2004). *Nexus analysis: Discourse and the emerging Internet*. London: Routledge.
- Scollon, R., & Scollon, S. W. (2007). Nexus analysis: Refocusing ethnography on action. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 11(5), 608–625. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9841.2007.00342.x.
- Schecter, S. R., & Bayley, R. (2002). *Language as cultural practice: Mexicanos en el norte*. Hillsdale: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Smagulova, J. (2014). Early language socialization and language shift: Kazakh as baby talk. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 18(3), 370–387.
- Song, J. (2017). Language socialization in Korean communities. In P. Duff & S. May (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of language and education. Language socialization*. Boston: Springer.
- Wagner, S. N. (2010). Bring sexuality to the table: Language, gender, and power in seven lesbian families. *Gender and Language*, 4(1), 33–72.
- Wortham, S., & Rhodes, C. (2013). Life as a chord: Heterogeneous resources in the social identification of one migrant girl. *Applied Linguistics*, 34(5), 536–553.
- Wortham, S., Allard, E., Lee, K., & Mortimer, K. (2011). Racialization in payday mugging narratives. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology*, 21, E56–E75.
- Zentella, A. C. (1997). *Growing up bilingual: Puerto Rican children in New York*. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Zhu, H. (2008). Duelling languages, duelling values: Codeswitching in bilingual intergenerational conflict talk in diasporic families. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 40, 1799–1816.

Language Socialization in Working Families

Amy L. Paugh

Abstract

In recent decades, there has been a rise in dual-career families as women have increasingly entered the paid workforce in the USA, Canada, Europe, and elsewhere. Accompanying these trends is a growing body of cross-disciplinary research that examines the relations between work and family, or what are commonly called “working families.” Though broad enough to describe any family in which one or more adults work, this term has been used to refer to dual-earner or employed single-parent families with children, in contrast to families where only one of two cohabiting parents is the wage earner. Much of this literature has analyzed survey data and self-reports, such as questionnaires and interviews. It is in this context that the language socialization paradigm has offered new ways of analyzing working families through careful attention to their everyday social interaction across settings within and outside the home. This research takes a distinctly ethnographic approach, revealing what working families do during their daily lives and illuminating how language socialization occurs through family activities, routines, and talk. This chapter reviews language socialization research that focuses on the work and family interface, including how postindustrial families grapple with cultural ideologies and pressures as they seek to balance work and family demands, and negotiate their children’s autonomy and dependence.

Keywords

Language socialization • Working families • Work and family • Socioeconomic class • Social interaction • Habitus • Children

A.L. Paugh (✉)

Department of Sociology and Anthropology, James Madison University, Harrisonburg, VA, USA
e-mail: paughal@jmu.edu

Contents

Introduction	98
Early Developments	98
Major Contributions	100
Problems and Difficulties	104
Future Directions	105
Cross-References	106
Related Articles in the Encyclopedia of Language and Education	107
References	107

Introduction

In recent decades, there has been a rise in dual-career families as women have increasingly entered the paid workforce in the USA, Canada, Europe, and elsewhere (Waite and Nielsen 2001). Accompanying these trends is a growing body of research in psychology, sociology, anthropology, and other disciplines that examines the relations between work and family (Perry-Jenkins et al. 2000; Pitt-Catsouphes et al. 2006). The term “working families” emerged in this literature as a signifier of research that investigates the interface between work and family. Though broad enough to describe any family in which one or more adults work, it often has been used to refer to dual-earner or employed single-parent families with children, in contrast to “traditional” arrangements where one parent is the wage earner (such as the father) and the other parent the homemaker (such as the mother). This research has focused on the management of time and childcare by working parents, the distribution of family chores, working families’ goals and values, child outcomes relative to parental employment, family well-being, and the challenges involved in balancing work and family demands. Much of the literature analyzes survey data and self-reports, such as questionnaires and interviews. While such studies are valuable, only recently have studies examined spontaneous social interactions in which parents and children communicate and organize working-family life (Ochs and Kremer-Sadlik 2013; Tannen et al. 2007). It is in this context that the language socialization paradigm has offered new ways of analyzing working families through careful attention to their everyday social interaction across settings within and outside the home. This research takes a distinctly ethnographic approach, revealing what working families actually do during their daily lives and examining how language socialization occurs through family activities, routines, and talk.

Early Developments

Language socialization research takes as its focus how children and other novices acquire (or do not acquire) the linguistic and cultural knowledge needed to become competent members of their families and communities (Duranti et al. 2012). Though the intersection of work and family is a relatively new focus, many early language

socialization studies were concerned with topics pertaining to work-family issues, such as the organization of caregiving, the daily round of work and household chores, gendered divisions of labor, and families' economic activities in nonindustrialized societies (Ochs 1988; Schieffelin 1990). Even language socialization studies that have focused on other issues shed light on how the goals of working adults can affect all areas of family life. Kulick (1992), for example, demonstrated how language shift in the small village of Gapun, Papua New Guinea, was occurring through a transformation in language socialization practices linked to villagers' changing notions of their place in the world, largely due to encroaching proletarianization, a growing cash economy, religious influence, and their desire for a more Western life style.

Language socialization studies of family life in the USA have been very influential. One such study was Heath's (1983) examination of how socioeconomic class differences shape language socialization practices, with significant consequences once children enter formal education in the USA. Through a detailed examination of socializing practices in working-class Euro- and African-American and middle-class Euro-American households, Heath explored how the early socialization of class-inflected ways of taking meaning can influence children's academic trajectories in formal education. Heath illustrated how middle-class strategies of reading and engaging in bedtime stories (including encouraging children to elaborate on and associate stories with their daily lives) facilitate the development of a school-based model that allows middle-class children to smoothly transition into and succeed in school, in contrast to the educational struggles faced by children from working-class and ethnic minority families that approach literacy events differently. In a similar vein, Lareau's (2003) ethnographic study of child-rearing patterns among American families suggested that class impacts parenting strategies in ways that contribute to the maintenance of class differentiation. What she calls "concerted cultivation" in middle-class families imparts differential advantages to their children, compared to the "accomplishment of natural growth" model facilitated by working-class parents (see also Kusserow 2004).

The work of Ochs, Taylor, and colleagues on dinnertime narratives among Euro-American families in Los Angeles contributed significantly to the literature on middle-class dual-earner working families. Ochs and colleagues found that through social interaction during dinnertime routines, family members share information, aid one another with problematic events in their lives, and give shape to family values, solidarity, social organization, gender roles and identities, and relationships (e.g., Ochs and Taylor 1995; also see Blum-Kulka 1997; Tannen et al. 2007). Like Heath, they asserted that storytelling with family members socializes middle-class children to intellectual skills that are valued in mainstream educational settings, such as critical thinking, perspective-taking, and metacognition (Ochs et al. 1992).

Though not specifically concerned with the consequences of having full-time working parents, these studies offer carefully documented insights into the socialization of Bourdieu's notion of *habitus* (e.g., Bourdieu 1977; see Kulick and Schieffelin 2004). *Habitus* includes learned dispositions to act in particular ways, including how to communicate verbally and nonverbally, as well as taken-for-granted

assumptions about the world. These socialized ways of thinking and being provide the individual with the ability to act according to expected norms, but also allow for creativity in social life. Language socialization methodology offers a way to understand how habitus is acquired, shaped, and subtly changed through everyday interactions between experts and novices, parents and children. Careful attention to adult-child and child-child social interaction brings to light unquestioned assumptions and unspoken rules that organize family and social life. The focus is on *activities* during which novices and experts interact, including those in which children are actively involved as participants and observers. Through attentive observation of such activities, language socialization research can shed light on how children acquire a habitus particular to working-family life, including how to be a worker – and a certain kind of worker at that – long before they begin working themselves (Paugh 2005, 2012).

Major Contributions

Language socialization research on working families seeks to engage with the growing interdisciplinary research focus on work and family in industrialized nations in Europe and North America. This relatively recent body of literature was strongly influenced by the efforts of a philanthropic organization, the Alfred P. Sloan foundation. The Sloan Foundation initiated a “Workplace, Workforce, and Working Families Program” to establish a body of research and community of scholars focusing on the social and economic changes accompanying the increase in dual-earner families in the USA. Since 1994, the program funded eight centers and numerous smaller projects on the issues facing middle-class dual-earner families in particular. Each Sloan Center on Working Families pursued its own detailed approach to the study of the work-family interface.

It was in this context that a new strand of language socialization research focusing on working families developed. In 2001, the UCLA Sloan Center on the Everyday Lives of Families (CELf) was established and directed by Elinor Ochs, one of the founders of the language socialization approach. CELf integrated perspectives from anthropology, applied linguistics, education, and clinical psychology into one unified research agenda investigating multiple dimensions of the family life of 32 middle-class dual-earner families in Los Angeles, California. To qualify as “working families” for this research, families had to include two parents working 30 or more hours per week outside the home, and 2–3 children (with one 8–10 years old). The families represented various ethnicities (Euro-American, African-American, Asian-American, Latino) and middle-class incomes, but all were responsible for a monthly home mortgage.

A major goal of this extensive study was to document and analyze the ways in which members of working families actually live their lives and interact with one another on a daily basis while coping with the demands of work, family, and other activities. A detailed attention to social interaction was central to CELf’s approach from its conception, with ethnographic video recording of naturally occurring family

interaction in and outside the home as a primary method. This was combined with a range of interdisciplinary methods: ethnoarchaeological tracking of family members' activities and uses of space; mapping and digital photographing of families' homes and artifacts; interviews about education, health, daily routines, social networks, and children's lives; standardized psychological questionnaires and measures; and saliva sampling of cortisol, a stress hormone (see Ochs and Kremer-Sadlik 2013, for details).

The CELF methodology was duplicated on a smaller scale in satellite centers in Italy and Sweden, two countries that, like the USA, have experienced a dramatic rise in the number of two-career families. CELF-Italy (or iCELf), directed by Clotilde Pontecorvo at the Università di Roma La Sapienza, and CELF-Sweden, directed by Karin Aronsson at the University of Linköping, added an international and comparative perspective on the daily lives of middle-class working families. Together with the UCLA CELF, the three centers created an extensive digital video archive of family and household activities, including everyday conversation and language socialization practices of working families. This research illustrates the cultural constitution of family life through everyday interactions, activities, practices, and discourses in a particular moment in time. The use of video as a research method allows examination of actual familial interaction and engagement in activities, rather than relying only on self-reports.

In the three centers, the language socialization model was a component of the project methodology and was employed theoretically by many of the scholars analyzing the extensive data sets. Resulting studies highlight the importance of mundane interactions for creating shared worldviews, socializing competence, and reproducing and transforming knowledge about the family, community, workplace, and world. Through participation in daily routines and social interactions as both active participants and observers, children are socialized into culturally specific orientations toward work, education, time, morality, responsibility, individualism, success, well-being, and what it means to be a family – all of which take on particular forms in the postindustrialized, largely child-centered societies examined in this growing literature. In these dual-earner families where both parents have chosen to or decided they must work outside the home, children are exposed to a middle-class habitus with particular conceptions of work, achievement, interdependence, autonomy, and entrepreneurialism (Ochs and Kremer-Sadlik 2015).

How families make use of the time they have together, for instance, offers a valuable window into the socialization of a middle-class habitus that may nurture life advantages for mainstream children and maintain their middle-class status in adulthood. Goodwin (2007) found that through spontaneous family interactions, American middle-class children in the UCLA CELF study are afforded opportunities for acquiring and exploring valued cultural knowledge (such as idioms and theories about the world) in the midst of other everyday tasks and activities (such as during mealtime or while parking the car). Kremer-Sadlik and Kim (2007) argued that parents' talk during children's participation in organized sports activities, informal play, and "passive" engagement in sports (e.g., watching sports on TV) serves as an important socializing tool for middle-class American family values, goals, and

desires. Parents assess children's sports performances, socialize ways of dealing with pain and disappointment, and transmit culturally specific ideals about competitiveness, sportsmanship, and loyalty. Exploring this in depth, Goodwin (2006a) investigated one CELF family's routine socialization of a "competitive spirit" through talk about sports and academic activities. Through explicit coaching of their children to succeed in sports or homework activities (like hockey, bike riding, or spelling) and in more indirect socialization (such as ranking children's sports competence or performance relative to other children), the parents in this American family transmit the notion that competition and achievement are highly valued in their culture.

The ways in which dual-earner families manage, organize, and socialize understandings of time – one of the frequently cited concerns of busy families – is an important area of investigation (Kremer-Sadlik and Paugh 2007; Ochs and Kremer-Sadlik 2013). Analyzing iCELF data, Liberati et al. (2004) explored how children in Italian middle-class working families are socialized through language into culturally specific rules of time, including expectations for its use and how not to "waste" it by making profitable use of waiting time and anticipating and planning for future activities and tasks. Similarly, Wingard (2007) analyzed American parent-child interaction in the UCLA CELF data for the use of recurrent linguistic forms (such as "before," "after," "first," and "now") in planning activities for the day. She suggests that negotiations over how time is to be used socialize children to concepts of time and how to prioritize competing activities in highly scheduled working-family life. These studies show that through social interaction with caregivers, children acquire an awareness of personal time and family time, how to comprehend and manage both, and how time management is linked to ideas about morality, responsibility, and success.

Homework is a pervasive, time-consuming routine and socializing activity in middle-class dual-earner homes in the USA, Italy, and Sweden, one that is shaped by cultural ideals of "good" parenting and ideologies of childhood (Forsberg 2009; Kremer-Sadlik and Fatigante 2015; Wingard and Forsberg 2009). Liberati (2005), for example, found that children in middle-class Italian working families are socialized into valued work ethics through parents' involvement with their homework practices. Homework is constructed as "children's work," with parents striving to socialize work practices and skills, while fostering children's development of responsibility and their own self-initiative. Wingard (2006) examined American parents' inquiries into and directives about children's homework, exploring the tensions between parental control and socialization of child autonomy as working parents tried to plan out the afternoon's activities around and prompt children to do their homework. Homework acts as a routine organizer of family life, despite hectic schedules, indicating its importance in middle-class families (Pontecorvo et al. 2013; Wingard 2006).

Routines and discourses about household work, personal hygiene, and the distribution and scheduling of chores are prime sites for the language socialization of middle-class norms and child-centered ideologies in the working-family context (although middle-class parents tend to prioritize them less than children's homework and extracurricular activities; see Klein and Goodwin 2013). Arcidiacono et al. (2004)

explored how family roles and culturally specific notions of work, family, competence, and responsibility are socialized through household work disputes about household tasks in their iCELF videotaped corpus of Italian working families. In a comparative study of the USA and Italy CELF data, Fasulo et al. (2007) considered how children's agency may be constructed or limited by how parents focus on and socialize hygiene and household cleaning practices through verbal and nonverbal interaction. Goodwin (2006b) analyzed interactions involving directive sequences in the UCLA CELF families for how families' interactive styles socialize, or fail to socialize, children into accountability for their actions and responsibilities. Interactions in which parents and children jointly establish frameworks of mutual orientation and alignment to an activity and parents are persistent in pursuing their directives display more successful outcomes than those in families where this does not take place and children are successful at bargaining (such as getting out of doing a chore requested by a parent). Klein and Goodwin (2013) further contrasted consistent versus inconsistent socialization practices in encouraging the uptake of responsibility for domestic chores and personal care among children in the UCLA CELF families. Those families with close parental monitoring and routine assignment of chores prompted greater accountability and willingness on the part of children to complete tasks. In a similar vein, Aronsson and Cekaite (2011) documented how middle-class working families in Sweden negotiate with children regarding personal cleanliness and household chores, and through forming "activity contracts" help to socialize accountability and self-regulation among children. Such negotiations and monitoring of children's tasks do not appear to be so pervasive in other cultures, such as among the Samoans and Peruvian Matsigenka described by Ochs and Izquierdo (2009) in their comparison of the socialization of responsibility in those societies to middle-class American working families.

Examination of food interactions gives insights into the socialization of food preferences, eating practices, and human sociality in working families. In a comparative study of the socialization of "taste" during dinnertime among 20 middle-class families in Italy and the USA, Ochs et al. (1996) demonstrated that negotiations over food become a prime site for the socialization not only of culturally specific eating habits but also notions of morality, individualism, relationships, pleasure, and consumption (also Ochs and Shohet 2006). Paugh and Izquierdo (2009) found similar themes in dinnertime interactions among the UCLA CELF families for how they managed food-related conflicts and socialized strategies of negotiation over eating practices and individual autonomy. Comparing French and American dual-earner families, Kremer-Sadlik and colleagues (2015) argued that the cultural organization of dinner impacts children's consumption of fruits and vegetables. In one of the Swedish dual-earner families in the CELF-Sweden project, Aronsson and Gottzén (2011) examined "food morality" and related negotiations involving generational positions and affective stance-taking at mealtime.

Dinnertime interaction also provides a fruitful arena for the study of how ideologies about work and success are socialized. In an interview-based study, Galinsky (1999) found that American children in grades 3–12 know a considerable amount about their parents' work, even though parents generally report that they do not talk

to their children about it. Paugh (2005, 2012) used a language socialization approach to investigate how children learn about parental work (and ways of talking about it) through dinnertime conversations among middle-class dual-earner American families in Los Angeles. Through overhearing and co-constructing their parents' narratives about work-related experiences, children are socialized into particular understandings about work, expectations regarding work conduct (such as morality, competence, and accountability), and family values and goals, such as about work-family balance. Parents' future-oriented work narratives told collaboratively with or in the presence of children model for them how to talk about and deal with job-related uncertainty in American working life (Paugh 2012).

Even bedtime routines in working families have been shown to accomplish much more than the functional goal of getting children to go to sleep. Analyzing the UCLA CELF data, Sirota (2006) described them as collaborative interactions involving extensive negotiation of child autonomy and interdependence, with parents and children using mitigation, politeness, and bargaining strategies in their relational work to both prepare for and delay the bedtime separation. Through bedtime routines, then, American middle-class children are socialized into culturally valued aspects of personhood, including acquiring a particular balance of autonomous self-initiative combined with reliance on intimate familial relationships. As with negotiations about children's homework, chores, personal hygiene, and eating practices, bedtime interactions are a prime site for exploring local ideologies of children and childhood, generational positioning, and the daily struggles of working families.

Problems and Difficulties

More cross-cultural research on language socialization in working families is needed to expand the literature and offer case studies for comparison. Most of the work described here took place in the context of Sloan-funded research in Western settings. While the interface between work and family is of considerable interest in those contexts, more comparative research is needed that has work and family as its focus. In other words, there is a distinction between language socialization research that focuses on the family's role in socialization and language socialization research examining the connections to families' working status. Remaining attuned to the work-family literature, including research emerging from psychology and sociology, may help bridge language socialization research on working families to the larger body of language socialization literature and anthropology generally.

Another challenge is to address the diversity of family types that exist and are recognized in a social group. In fact, the definition of "family" and its cultural construction in historical context are issues that have plagued family and kinship studies for decades (Carsten 2000; Franklin and McKinnon 2001). In the face of a multitude of possible family forms (dual parent, single parent, same-sex, heterosexual, extended, adoptive, blended, etc.) accentuated by the availability of new reproductive technologies, delineating units of study and comparing and contrasting

similarities, differences, and patterns across families is a significant challenge to language socialization and other research on working families. In the UCLA CELF study, all families were two-parent and most included heterosexual partnerships; however, there were two same-sex partnerships, and the families included biological, adoptive, and stepparents. Clearly more family types – particularly the increasing number of single-parent working families in the USA and elsewhere – need to be represented and studied through an ethnographic, language socialization approach.

The focus of much recent research has been on working families of a *middle-class* socioeconomic background. While this focus has been explained in that middle-class dual-earner families reportedly are understudied in the work-family literature, it raises several questions. What is excluded when focusing only on middle-class families? How is “middle-class” defined? Should researchers impose income limits, or should families self-select according to their own definitions of middle-class? As this area of language socialization research grows, it would be beneficial for scholars to examine a range of social groups, and to be specific in how they define “working families.”

Finally, as in any study of language socialization, researchers need to be careful not to depict working families as homogenous or unchanging. Often portrayed in the work-family literature as “overwhelmed,” “stressed,” and experiencing “time famine,” working families should not be denied an active role in the construction of their own lives. The language socialization approach to working families must deal with the challenges of individual variation and change (including families at different life stages) while trying to illuminate problems, concerns, and strategies shared across working families. There is a need for longitudinal research that follows working families for an extended period of time (such as over the course of a year or several years), as well as more comparative work along the lines of Heath’s (1983) ground-breaking study described above.

Future Directions

The three centers on Everyday Lives of Families amassed an extensive corpus of family life and social interaction, trained a new generation of language socialization researchers, and stimulated collaborative analysis of data. This comparative effort illustrates commonalities and differences among working families in these diverse cultural contexts. It also offers new cross-disciplinary ways of collecting and analyzing language socialization data, such as combining the use of ethnoarchaeological methods with video-taping to better understand interactional patterns and the use of material objects and spaces at home (see Ochs and Kremer-Sadlik 2013). These methods may be incorporated into language socialization studies more generally.

As work-family research expands, language socialization has much to offer. Through its methodologies and theories, researchers can study the moment-to-moment and turn-by-turn ways in which working families are created and maintained through interaction, shedding light on families’ concerns and the

meanings of work and family. It can attend to how working families deal with but also resist the pressures and time restrictions put on them, as well as how parents may rework the socialization patterns they grew up with and how children may come to interpret and resist the working-family frameworks into which they are socialized. More cross-cultural studies would enrich this literature, particularly studies that examine diverse families from a variety of class, ethnic, and other backgrounds. Marti (2012), for example, provides a detailed look into working-family life in Chiapas, Mexico, detailing children's observations of in-home store activities and interactions, and how they learn to participate in them. Such comparative research could bring to light alternative strategies for managing work and family, and link language socialization in working families to larger globalizing processes.

A greater focus on language socialization across the lifespan (Garrett and Baquedano-López 2002) would contribute to anthropological and work-family literature. Future studies could focus on how adults are socialized into being *working parents* by their children, their partners, their own parents, or their peers, coworkers, and others in their lives. How do working parents socialize one another to be working parents through their everyday social interaction? How do children socialize their working parents? This may entail more attention to language socialization involving paid work-related activities that directly influence the family, such as work-related activities brought into the home or when the family is brought to work-related events, preparation for work, the coordination and performance of work activities through electronic means from home, narratives and reports about work, and children's engagement in paid and unpaid work (e.g., Marti 2012), to name a few. For example, Baquedano-López (2002) did some initial exploration of the language socialization practices of predominantly Latina, Spanish-speaking nannies caring for mostly Euro-American, English-speaking children in West Los Angeles, noting implications for children's acquisition of Spanish, the socialization of affect and morality in the nanny-child relationship, and how children are being socialized as consumers of care. A focus on these activities could illuminate what children learn about work from their parents long before they begin working themselves and how this impacts their future career goals and trajectories.

Language socialization research in working families offers much potential for enriching the work-family literature, as well as contributing to the language socialization paradigm with its interdisciplinary methods and attention to work and family in today's growing global economy.

Cross-References

- ▶ [Bi- and Multilingual Family Language Socialization](#)
- ▶ [Language Socialization and Family Dinnertime Discourse](#)
- ▶ [Language Socialization and Multimodality in Multilingual Urban Homes](#)
- ▶ [Language Socialization: An Historical Overview](#)

Related Articles in the Encyclopedia of Language and Education

Kendall King and Lyn Fogle: [Family Language Policy](#). In Volume: Language Policy and Political Issues in Education

References

- Arcidiacono, F., Pontecorvo, C., & Liberati, V. (2004). *Children's roles and responsibilities in household work: Hammer or rolling pin?* Working Paper No. 1, iCELF, Università di Roma La Sapienza.
- Aronsson, K., & Cekaite, A. (2011). Activity contracts and directives in everyday family politics. *Discourse & Society*, 22(2), 137–154.
- Aronsson, K., & Gottzén, L. (2011). Generational positions at a family dinner: Food morality and social order. *Language in Society*, 40, 405–426.
- Baquedano-López, P. (2002). *A stop at the end of the bus line: Nannies, children, and the language of care*. Working Paper No. 51, Center for Working Families, University of California, Berkeley.
- Blum-Kulka, S. (1997). *Dinner talk: Cultural patterns of sociability and socialization in family discourse*. Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Bourdieu, P. (1977). *Outline of a theory of practice* (trans: Nice, R.). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Carsten, J. (Ed.). (2000). *Cultures of relatedness: New approaches to the study of kinship*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Duranti, A., Ochs, E., & Schieffelin, B. (Eds.). (2012). *The handbook of language socialization*. Malden: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Fasulo, A., Loyd, H., & Padiglione, V. (2007). Children's socialization into cleaning practices: A cross-cultural perspective. *Discourse & Society*, 18(1), 11–33.
- Forsberg, L. (2009). *Involved parenthood: Everyday lives of Swedish middle-class families*. Linköping: Linköping University Press.
- Franklin, S., & McKinnon, S. (Eds.). (2001). *Relative values: Reconfiguring kinship studies*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Galinsky, E. (1999). *Ask the children: What America's children really think about working parents*. New York: Morrow.
- Garrett, P., & Baquedano-López, P. (2002). Language socialization: Reproduction and continuity, transformation and change. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 31, 339–361.
- Goodwin, M. H. (2006a). *Socialization for the competitive spirit and excellence: A case study*. Working Paper #47, UCLA Sloan Center on Everyday Lives of Families.
- Goodwin, M. H. (2006b). Participation, affect, and trajectory in family directive/response sequences. *Text & Talk*, 26(4/5), 515–544.
- Goodwin, M. H. (2007). Occasioned knowledge exploration in family interaction. *Discourse & Society*, 18(1), 93–110.
- Heath, S. B. (1983). *Ways with words: Language, life, and work in communities and classrooms*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Klein, W., & Goodwin, M. H. (2013). Chores. In E. Ochs & T. Kremer-Sadlik (Eds.), *Fast-forward family: Home, work, and relationships in middle-class America* (pp. 111–129). Berkeley/Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Kremer-Sadlik, T., & Fatigante, M. (2015). Investing in children's future: Cross-cultural perspectives and ideologies on parental involvement in education. *Childhood*, 22(1), 67–84.
- Kremer-Sadlik, T., & Kim, J. L. (2007). Lessons from sports: Children's socialization to values through family interaction during sports activities. *Discourse & Society*, 18(1), 35–52.

- Kremer-Sadlik, T., & Paugh, A. (2007). Everyday moments: Finding “quality time” in American working families. *Time & Society*, 16(2/3), 287–308.
- Kremer-Sadlik, T., Morgenstern, A., Peters, C., Beaupoil, P., Caët, S., Debras, C., & le Mené, M. (2015). Eating fruits and vegetables: An ethnographic study of American and French family dinners. *Appetite*, 89, 84–92.
- Kulick, D. (1992). *Language shift and cultural reproduction: Socialization, self, and syncretism in a Papua New Guinean village*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Kulick, D., & Schieffelin, B. (2004). Language socialization. In A. Duranti (Ed.), *A companion to linguistic anthropology* (pp. 349–368). Malden: Blackwell.
- Kusserow, A. (2004). *American individualisms: Child rearing and social class in three neighborhoods*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Lareau, A. (2003). *Unequal childhoods: Class, race, and family life*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Liberati, V. (2005). “If you have to know it, you have to know it!”: Socializing children to work ethics in doing homework. Working Paper No. 7, iCELF, Università di Roma La Sapienza.
- Liberati, V., Arcidiacono, F., & Pontecorvo, C. (2004). *Socializing to time in three Italian families*. Working Paper No. 2, iCELF, Università di Roma La Sapienza.
- Marti, F. (2012). *Household diversification and children’s economic socialization: An examination of in-home businesses among urban Mexican families*. Ph.D. dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles.
- Ochs, E. (1988). *Culture and language development: Language acquisition and language socialization in a Samoan village*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Ochs, E., & Izquierdo, C. (2009). Responsibility in childhood: Three developmental trajectories. *Ethos*, 37(4), 391–414.
- Ochs, E., & Kremer-Sadlik, T. (2013). *Fast-forward family: Home, work, and relationships in middle-class America*. Berkeley/Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Ochs, E., & Kremer-Sadlik, T. (2015). How postindustrial families talk. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 44, 87–103.
- Ochs, E., & Shohet, M. (2006). The cultural structuring of mealtime socialization. *New Directions for Child and Adolescent Development*, 111, 35–49.
- Ochs, E., & Taylor, C. (1995). The father knows best dynamic in dinnertime narratives. In K. Hall & M. Bucholtz (Eds.), *Gender articulated* (pp. 97–120). New York: Routledge.
- Ochs, E., Taylor, C., Rudolph, D., & Smith, R. (1992). Storytelling as theory-building activity. *Discourse Processes*, 15, 37–72.
- Ochs, E., Pontecorvo, C., & Fasulo, A. (1996). Socializing taste. *Ethnos*, 61(1–2), 5–42.
- Paugh, A. (2005). Learning about work at dinnertime: Language socialization in dual-earner American families. *Discourse & Society*, 16, 55–78.
- Paugh, A. (2012). Speculating about work at dinnertime: Dinnertime narratives among dual-earner American families. *Text & Talk*, 32(5), 615–636.
- Paugh, A., & Izquierdo, C. (2009). Why is this a battle every night?: Negotiating food and eating in American dinnertime interaction. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology*, 19(2), 185–204.
- Perry-Jenkins, M., Repetti, R., & Crouter, A. (2000). Work and family in the 1990s. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 62, 981–998.
- Pitt-Catsoupes, M., Kossek, E., & Sweet, S. (Eds.). (2006). *The work and family handbook: Multidisciplinary perspectives, methods, and approaches*. Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Pontecorvo, C., Liberati, V., & Monaco, C. (2013). How school enters family’s everyday life. In G. Marsico, K. Komatsu, & A. Iannaccone (Eds.), *Crossing boundaries: Intercontextual dynamics between family and school* (pp. 3–34). Charlotte: Information Age Publishing.
- Schieffelin, B. (1990). *The give and take of everyday life: Language socialization of Kaluli children*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Sirota, K. G. (2006). Habits of the hearth: Children’s bedtime routines as relational work. *Text & Talk*, 26(4/5), 493–514.

- Tannen, D., Kendall, S., & Gordon, C. (Eds.). (2007). *Family talk: Discourse and identity in four American families*. Oxford, UK/New York: Oxford University Press.
- Waite, L. J., & Nielsen, M. (2001). The rise of the dual-earner family, 1963–1997. In R. Hertz & N. Marshall (Eds.), *Working families: The transformation of the American home* (pp. 23–41). Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Wingard, L. (2006). Parents' inquiries about homework: The first mention. *Text & Talk*, 26(4/5), 573–598.
- Wingard, L. (2007). Constructing time and prioritizing activities in parent–child interaction. *Discourse & Society*, 18(1), 75–91.
- Wingard, L., & Forsberg, L. (2009). Parent involvement in children's homework in American and Swedish dual-earner families. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 41(8), 1576–1595.

Language Socialization and Multimodality in Multilingual Urban Homes

Kate Pahl

Abstract

This chapter looks at the interlinking of language and culture in home settings. It understands language socialization to be intertwined with family experiences. It draws on a sociocultural lens to understand how children draw on richly textured home literacy and language practices to support their linguistic repertoires. The chapter discusses ways in which digital and multimodal literacies contribute to these multilingual repertoires within homes and communities. An understanding of the fluid and complex world of translanguaging within and beyond linguistic repertoires is provided within recent scholarship. Literacy and language practices are constantly travelling in the context of increasing urbanization and globalization, and this chapter provides an account of the changing research traditions that support theorization of these practices. The chapter begins with a discussion from Vygotsky (In: Cole M, John-Steiner V, Scribner S, Souberman E (eds) *Mind in society: the development of higher psychological processes*. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA, 1978) about the relationship between language and tools. The argument is concerned with the ways socialization happens in home settings, and the discussion centers on the complex intertextual weaving of linguistic practices that have been observed within home settings. Ethnographic research is ideally placed to make these observations. Children's linguistic practices are multimodal, multilingual, and digital and travel across sites, creating new kinds of practices as they evolve. This chapter provides an account of research that captures these practices in all of their complexity.

K. Pahl (✉)
University of Sheffield, Sheffield, UK
e-mail: k.pahl@sheffield.ac.uk

Keywords

Language • Culture • Multimodality • Multilingualism • Homes • Trans-
 languaging • Digital literacies • Intertextuality • Learning • Urbanization

Contents

Introduction	112
Early Developments	113
Major Contributions	114
Work in Progress	117
Problems and Difficulties	118
Future Directions	119
Cross-References	120
Related Articles in the Encyclopedia of Language and Education	120
References	120

Introduction

Language and culture are inextricably intertwined. The home is where cultural practices are first experienced, and within that context, children born into multilingual families experience and construct cultural identity through languages. Children forge relationships with their families and extended families through multiple languages. These relationships and interactions contribute to the development of identities, which are then sedimented within language, and within texts, which then travel across sites (Rowse and Pahl 2007). As children come to speak and write within households, their communicative repertoires include home languages as well as languages taught outside the home (Kenner 2004; Gregory et al. 2004). However, interaction is not just mediated by language; it is also mediated by gesture and other tools we use to make meaning, including signs and symbols. Language can be seen to be part of a wider landscape of multimodal communication, including images and gesture. The linguistic experience of multilingual children is therefore found inscribed within multimodal signs.

As children learn languages, they begin to experience their written forms. For example, they see words written in Arabic, Chinese, Urdu, and Turkish and experience different script systems at home and at school. Many children growing up multilingually also attend after-school clubs or Saturday schools where their home languages are taught and celebrated. They are immersed in these languages at home, and their meaning-making, in multiple modes (gesture, images, talk), draws on these experiences of multilingual identities. An appreciation of the richness of multimodal, multilingual communicative practices and semiotic repertoires aids in understanding what children bring to school literacy and language practices. For this reason, children's multimodal, multilingual text-making in homes and communities is a particularly valuable resource for researchers and practitioners. In this chapter, I review early and current developments in research on language socialization and multimodality in multilingual urban homes.

Early Developments

Initial approaches to language socialization drew on Vygotsky's (1978) insights about the relationship between language and artifacts, or tools and learning, which appeared in his book, *Mind and Society*. Vygotsky noticed how children externalized their thinking through the use of tools and symbols. The work of researchers such as Michael Cole (1996) tracked the ways in which children interacted with tools in order to develop their cognitive activities. Cole's work illuminated the relationship between mind as internalized culture and culture as externalized mind and, crucially, focused on activity and practices as a unit of study. The recognition that the cultural experiences of children could be observed in practice was critical to understandings of children's experiences of growing up multilingually. Research which focused on play and role-playing in informal and home situations illuminated this. By focusing on a practice theory of learning, children's observable activities could be extended to include their meaning-making at home and in community centers. The work of Barbara Rogoff (1990) was helpful in showing how young children learn from taking part in everyday activities with family members. Duranti and Ochs (1996) explored the way in which Californian Samoan families combined practices from their past cultural heritage with new practices. These syncretic literacy practices, or the intercultural combination, recombination, and transformation of practices, were observed in book reading and in the way in which family reading materials were stored.

Much early work on language socialization saw learning as social, situated learning within observed social practice. Halliday (1978) recognized that language could be seen as a social process. Research on literacy practices in homes and communities by ethnographers such as Hymes (e.g., 1996), who studied native American narratives, and Heath (1983), who investigated three different communities in the rural Carolinas, developed an understanding of each community's different literacy and language practices. By observing cultural practice, the making of culture could be discerned. The concept of "culture as a verb," from Street (1993), describes the way in which multilingual children shape and change cultural content as they use language and make texts. Furthermore, text-making by young children can be understood as drawing on a number of texts from different domains and therefore has an intertextual quality. In this context, the work of Bakhtin (1981) has been influential in describing the way in which texts are hybrid. Researchers of children's talk, such as Maybin (2006), who carried out a study of young children's informal talk in the UK, have drawn on Bakhtin's work to describe the way in which children's communicative repertoires are intertextual and carry others' voices within them. These complex practices can contribute to the way language socialization occurs, as children draw on a myriad of voices, overheard and within sociocultural contexts, to make sense of their worlds.

Initial studies of young children's multimodal and multilingual practices came out of anthropology, where studies like those of Scribner and Cole (1981) of the Vai culture in West Africa informed an understanding of how language and literacy practices were linked to different domains and cultural practices. They were also

informed by cultural psychology and theories of mind and culture (Cole 1996). Early work by Kress (1997) began to identify the way in which language is embedded in a wider communicational landscape, including visual representation. Kress described how children make signs in a number of different modes, drawing on different representational resources. Kress used the term *multimodality* to draw attention to the variety of modes children use when they make meaning. Children's drawings, gesture, and speech are meshed together and work to create an ensemble of semiotic resources. Research in multilingual communities, such as the work showcased within the volume edited by Gregory (1997), particularly in East London, UK, identified how children draw on semiotic resources in out-of-school contexts to make meaning. In these initial studies, the different cultural worlds that children inhabit were beginning to be mapped out.

Major Contributions

Recent research has focused on studying the literacy and language practices and socialization of multilingual children growing up in homes and communities. For example, Gregory and Williams (2000) examined the literacy and language learning of Bangladeshi children in East London and, using ethnographic methods, looked at the ways in which these children learned Arabic in the Mosque school, learned reading and writing in English at school, and spoke Urdu or Punjabi within their homes. They subsequently studied four faith communities in London to look at how children syncretically combine different traditions to make sense of faith and everyday experiences (Gregory et al. 2013a).

Blackledge and Creese (2010) studied children's multilingual practices in complementary schools across four cities in the UK with particular attention to the linguistic practices and the performance of identities in those settings. Their argument was that the ways in which multilingualism had been conceptualized in mainstream education or policy discourse did not correspond with what the children were doing. A much more complex, multi-semiotic, blurred, and blended picture emerged with the concept of "translanguaging" (García 2009), a key part of everyday multilingualism, as opposed to the more linguistically divided and formal term "code-switching" often used within sociolinguistics (Blackledge and Creese 2010).

Kenner's (2004) study of young children learning to write at home, situated in Arabic-, Chinese-, and Spanish-speaking communities in London, described how young children engaged with multiple learning environments to develop their scripts in both their home language and the languages they were learning at school. Different kinds of writing systems could be understood in terms of their different semiotic affordances. Affordances is a term used by Kress and van Leeuwen (2001) to describe the possibilities within a particular mode for meaning-making, such as the ability of a script to suggest certain images (see Kress 2010). Kenner explored ways in which the children used the affordances at their disposal. For example, Arabic and English are presented in very distinct visual ways. By focusing on the interest of the sign-maker, and the different representational resources available to

children as they make meaning, a richer picture of children growing up in the complex urban multilingual spaces they encounter emerged. Children's representational choices became infused with their cultural identities. A child who wished to represent herself in a drawing, for example, could draw on multi-semiotic resources and cultural icons from a multitude of global and local influences. Kenner used the example of a child who used Chinese symbols together with the English words "Girl Power," plus a drawing of a girl and hearts, to produce a multi-semiotic, multilingual text.

Research on multilingualism and multimodality have focused on the different communicative practices children from multilingual backgrounds bring to the school setting. For example, detailed ethnographies carried out in Hispanic communities in Arizona, in southwestern USA, by Moll et al. (1992, also see contributions in Gonzalez et al. 2005) found that homes were full of funds of knowledge that could be seen as resources for children to draw on. These home funds of knowledge could also inform pedagogy. Likewise, the work of Guitérrez et al. (1999), also in southwestern USA, looking at classrooms, examined how home language experience could be mixed with school literacy. They used the concept of a "third space" to describe the space which children and teachers create by drawing on linguistic practices from home within school settings. Moje et al. (2004), in their research on teenage out-of-school literacy practices in northern USA, argued that communicative practices that take place within a third space draw on funds of knowledge from home and communities, and can be multimodal, involving gesture (e.g., stunt riding) and oral storytelling (e.g., telling the story of the stunt). Popular cultural texts, including digital online games and multimedia, have provided a widely consulted source of information. Many experiences with popular cultural texts involve working across modes and across languages in order to develop knowledge that, Moje et al. (2004) argued, could usefully be melded with school literacies. Lin and Li (2015) researched the fluid, heteroglossic, and non-compartmentalized nature of translanguaging literacies, with a particular focus on digital literacies and popular culture. They argued, drawing on Cangarajah (2013), that a focus on "translanguaging practice" highlighted the need to recognize the fluidity and complexity of crosslinguistic encounters. The terms "bilingual" and "multilingual" do not sufficiently allow for the complexity of these forms, in that they present them as discrete terms. New constructs, such as "translanguaging" (García 2009) and "metrolinguistic" (Pennycook 2010), have therefore emerged in recent years to describe this new landscape. Rather than use terms such as "bilingualism," scholars are now recognizing that children in urban settings live in a multilingual linguistic landscape.

Digital multilingual multimodal literacies are a key focus of research. Increasingly, families engage with online multilingual digital media across languages and sites. Children draw on these multimodal multilingual semiotic repertoires as they compose oral and written texts. A term that has been used to describe the ways in which children engage with online multilingual practices in a global, digital context is "cosmopolitanism," which evokes a sense of reaching out into the world, as well as of inviting others into a space of belonging. Hull and Stornaiuolo (2014), for

example, have used the lens of cosmopolitanism to describe how young people narrate their worlds in digital online spaces to create new responses to world-making together. Children draw on multiple literacies, that is, a range of literacy practices from both digitized media and popular culture to make meanings across languages, in ways that are blended, hybrid, and meshed with popular culture. Orellana (2016) has described how immigrant children in diverse cultural spaces blend and connect, and she uses the word “love” as a lens for this process. Payne and Almansour (2014) have described how young people learned languages that tied in with their popular cultural interests in informal settings. Their personal spaces were decorated with multilingual signs written in multiple languages. Online spaces are facilitating new multilingual worlds of belonging and possibility where young people can engage in “world-making activities” whereby they narrate their sense of self and create new content to upload onto the Web (Hull and Stornaiuolo 2014; Vasudevan and DeJaynes 2013).

The concept of syncretic literacy practices, as noted earlier, has been used to describe how children draw on multiple resources to make meaning, including their religion and their culture, languages, and school experiences (Gregory et al. 2013b; Volk and de Acosta 2001). Volk and de Acosta extended the work of Duranti and Ochs (1996) in looking at ways in which children blend practices from different domains in new contexts. They described how bilingual children’s developing literacy and language was supported by a network of people including parents, grandparents, and elders in church in the context of Puerto Rican communities in the USA. Children combined experiences from home, school, church, and other spaces to make meaning. Syncretism was used to describe the coming together of multilayered worldviews, across digital sites and arts practice, and in Gregory et al.’s (2013b) conceptualization, it describes the ways in which children bring multiple ways of knowing, speaking, and doing into new creations and narratives.

Linguistic ethnography in the UK and linguistic anthropology in the USA have been used as methodologies in order to develop an understanding of young children’s out-of-school multilingual literacy practices and semiotic repertoires (Blackledge and Creese 2010; Copland and Creese 2015; Maybin 2013; Snell 2013). Linguistic ethnography can uncover “invisible” literacy and language practices. For example, in the UK, Parke et al. (2002) described how important it is that both the “visible” and “invisible” language practices of young bilinguals are drawn upon in schools. Indigenous literacies have been explored as a lens that widens and challenges dominant views of literacy. De Souza (2005) argued that it is vital that visual and multilingual literacies are recognized within mainstream schooling. Multilingual home literacy practices offer an alternative lens from which to conceptualize literacy practices. They are often material and linked to wider home practices such as embroidery, sewing, gardening, and intergenerational stories (Pahl 2014).

A focus on multimodality, as described earlier, emerged as a result of closely observing children’s text-making at home and in classrooms. Many researchers observed how children often composed multimodal texts, which consisted of both drawing and writing (Dyson 2003). Kendrick and McKay (2004), in Canada, and Lancaster (2001), in the UK, argued that the use of wider symbol systems than

writing was not an add-on but instead was a way of expressing a wide range of experience and emotions. Kendrick (2015) has cited visual anthropology as being a key methodological starting point for visual research with young people in Uganda. Children use a wide range of signs to make meaning, and as they make meaning, they transform the materials they use. This transformative action can be observed in the meaning-making of multilingual children.

This crossing of symbolic and linguistic repertoires reveals the transformative nature of sign-making. In a longitudinal ethnographic study of children's communicative practices in homes conducted in London, UK, Pahl (2004) studied the experience of Fatih, a Turkish boy, at home. She observed that there was a strong relationship between narratives and artifacts in homes. An object would tell a story, and children produced images drawing on aspects of that story. Key artifacts in homes seemed to "hold" a family's history and identity. In the case of families who had experienced migration, these objects often had particular resonance. Multilingual homes contain many literacy artifacts in different languages, such as Qu'ranic wall texts, videotapes, dual-language texts, letters from other countries, and so on. These cultural resources can be used in classrooms where different script systems can be displayed on walls, and children's writing competencies can be supported in dual-language books as part of their language/literacy socialization.

Popular culture, including particular television and online spaces, is a key site from which children extend their literate multilingual identities. Marsh (2006) described how a child from Wales in the UK, who was being educated in a Welsh-speaking school and only spoke Welsh at home, was able to learn English from watching television. Likewise, Kenner (2004) argued that resources such as satellite television allowed children to maintain contact with the cultural and linguistic resources of their home languages. Pahl (2005) described how the bird drawings of her young participant, Fatih, were combined with an interest in Super Mario, a videogame that Fatih played frequently requiring the player to complete a number of tasks. A long-term family narrative, that of the bird, was combined in one text by Fatih with an image from popular culture, that of Super Mario. In this kind of image, one text is holding a number of different meanings across modalities and cultural systems, and Fatih's various interests are sedimented within the text, despite being drawn from different domains. Rowsell and Pahl (2007) described this process as one of sedimented identities in texts.

Work in Progress

Many literacy practices these children engage in and produce are rendered invisible by monolingual language practices. One advocate of minority children's language practices is Naqvi (2015), who has worked to promote dual-heritage books and parental involvement within mainstream schooling, but in a way that acknowledges the role of cultures, identity, and difference. In the US, Schwartz and Gutiérrez (2015) have worked with families to explore their new media repertoires as well as their everyday practices. They have looked at the idea of "joint media engagement"

in everyday practices, with a particular focus on multilingual Hispanic-heritage families. In the UK, Gregory et al. (2013a) have been researching children's faith literacies in order to understand the processes and practices of becoming literate in faith settings.

The dynamics of multilingualism in particular settings was the focus of an edited volume by Stroud and Prinsloo (2014), exploring children's and young people's multilingual digital language and literacy practices. The work by Blommaert and Backus (2012) has described the way in which children and young people draw on multilingual semiotic repertoires when making meaning in superdiverse settings. The work of Vertovec (2007) in relation to superdiversity has further expanded an understanding of what it might be to be a child growing up in multilingual neighborhoods. A new Arts and Humanities Research Council-funded research project in the UK, *Translation and translanguaging: Investigating linguistic and cultural transformations in superdiverse wards in four UK cities* (<http://www.birmingham.ac.uk/generic/tlang/index.aspx>), is taking this work further in relation to understanding how people communicate multilingually across diverse languages and cultures. There continues to be a need for research on children's (multilingual, multimodal) language and literacy socialization in complex multilingual contexts such as those presented above and in other parts of the world as well (e.g., the Middle East and South Asia).

Creating dual-heritage textbooks in school that draw on intercultural knowledge to support children's multilingual/multiliterate socialization has been the focus of much research in Canada. Research by Cummins et al. (2005) in Toronto, for example, has emphasized how home languages can be usefully drawn upon in dual-language textbooks authored by children. Naqvi (2015) has conducted research drawing on Cummins and Early's (2011) work, in which a culture of multiliteracies is established within schools through shared book creation, and a "wealth" model is created through education about diverse cultures and interculturality. Toohey and Dagenais (also in Canada) have also developed an online dual-language book resource known as ScribJab for this same purpose: <http://www.scribjab.com/en/about/about.html>.

Their work has extended into exploring youth video-making to show the ways in which children's multilingual practices can develop through multimodal digital productions (Toohey and Dagenais 2015).

Problems and Difficulties

In some contexts, there continues to be a lack of awareness about the diversity of children's multilingual language and literacy practices outside the classroom. Key questions for practitioners and researchers include who supports children's language socialization in languages other than the dominant language? How do children's linguistic repertoires become supported and how do they flourish in a multimodal landscape of communication? What kinds of multilingual and multimodal communicative practices are recognized and what kinds are left unrecognized? What kinds

of strategies do multilingual families employ to support their children's heritage languages? The challenges of postcolonialism and diversity need to be addressed by focusing on the voices and practices of multilingual children. New digital platforms are emerging all the time, and children are learning new language as they share information via Facebook, Twitter, Instagram, or other multimedia platforms. The world of education research has yet to catch up with these practices and sites.

Future Directions

Children's online digital worlds continue to be a rich focus of research on children's multilingual and multimodal literacies and socialization. The work of Ito, Gutiérrez, Livingstone, and a team of scholars has brought together researchers looking at children's digital media platforms to advocate a connected learning model which takes account of the fluidity and complexity of children and young people's online encounters (Ito et al. 2012). Ways in which children blend and cocreate digital multilingual online texts, following the international Space2Cre8 project (Space2Cre8.com), have shaped new directions for the future, with a focus on cosmopolitan literacies that are multi-semiotic and multilingual (Hull and Stornaiuolo 2014). The process of "world-making" using a framework of cosmopolitanism (Stornaiuolo 2015) opens up new spaces in which multilingual practices can be shared across the globe.

Indigenous literacies have emerged as a field that challenges the framing of how multilingualism is researched and understood (de Souza 2015). From the perspective of resistance theories and theories of change (Tuck and Yang 2014), there is a powerful argument for new research on multilingualism to be conducted by young people for young people. The use of films and online platforms can facilitate a much more open process of coproduced community research, in collaboration with community partners who have the experience of working in various contexts. Organizations such as Refugee Youth in the UK (<http://www.refugeeyouth.org>) are conducting their own research via participatory action research, investigating language socialization in multilingual urban areas.

Space and place continue to inform studies of language socialization, contributing, for example, to a better understanding of rural children's multilingual meaning-making. The concept of "translingual literacies" describes the way in which the terms "bilingual" or "multilingual literacy" still construct linguistic entities as stable; future research should emphasize instead the fluid, dynamic nature of the translingual landscapes and practices (Cangarajah 2013). Understanding the importance of Islamic concepts of space and time in a postcolonial context, for example, as realized through the Islamic calendar, or Qu'ranic inscriptions as displayed on walls, will produce new insights about the multiple means and modes of literacy socialization and semiosis in contemporary society (Rosowsky 2008, 2015). Multilingual children, as they grow up in complex, urban, hybrid neighborhoods, are the communicative meaning makers of tomorrow, and we must focus on what they bring to literacy and language practices.

Cross-References

- ▶ [Bi- and Multilingual Family Language Socialization](#)
- ▶ [Heritage Language Learning and Socialization](#)
- ▶ [The Ecology of Second Language Acquisition and Socialization](#)

Related Articles in the Encyclopedia of Language and Education

- Adrian Blackledge and Angela Creese: [Language Education and Multilingualism](#). In Volume: Language Policy and Political Issues in Education
- Nayr Ibrahim: [Developing Literacy, and Identities, in Multiple Languages](#). In Volume: Literacies and Language Education
- Carey Jewitt: [Multimodal Discourses Across the Curriculum](#). In Volume: Language, Education and Technology
- Heather Lotherington: [Elementary Language Education in Digital Multimodal and Multiliteracy Contexts](#). In Volume: Language, Education and Technology
- Jennifer Rowsell and Diane Collier: [Researching Multimodality in Language and Education](#). In Volume: Research Methods in Language and Education
- Brian Street: New Literacies, New Times: [Developments in Literacy Studies](#). In Volume: Literacies and Language Education

References

- Bakhtin, M. M. (1981). *The dialogic imagination*. In M. Holquist (Ed.), (C. Emerson & M. Holquist, Trans.). Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Blackledge, A., & Creese, A. (2010). *Multilingualism: A critical perspective*. London: Continuum Press.
- Blommaert, J., & Backus, A. (2012). *Superdiverse repertoires and the individual* (Tilburg papers in cultural studies, Vol. 24). Tilburg: University of Tilburg.
- Cangarajah, A. S. (Ed.). (2013). *Literacy as translanguing practice: Between communities and classrooms*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Cole, M. (1996). *Cultural psychology: A once and future discipline*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Copland, F., & Creese, A. (2015). *Linguistic ethnography: Collecting, analysing and presenting data*. London: Sage.
- Cummins, J., & Early, M. (Eds.). (2011). *Identity texts: The collaborative creation of power in multilingual schools*. Stoke on Trent: Trentham Books.
- Cummins, J., Bismilla, V., Cohen, S., Giampapa, F., & Leoni, L. (2005). Timelines and lifelines: Rethinking literacy instruction in multilingual classrooms. In J. Rowsell & D. Booth (Eds.), *Literacy revisited, Orbit magazine* (Vol. 36, pp. 26–30). Toronto: OISE/University of Toronto Press.
- Duranti, A., & Ochs, E. (1996). *Syncretic literacy: Multiculturalism in Samoan American families*. Santa Cruz: National Center for Research on Cultural Diversity and Second Language Learning, University of California, Santa Cruz. Research report no. 16
- Dyson, A. H. (2003). “Welcome to the jam”: Popular culture, school literacy, and the making of childhoods. *Harvard Educational Review*, 73(3), 328–361.
- García, O. (2009). *Bilingual education in the 21st century: A global perspective*. Malden: Wiley-Blackwell.

- Gonzalez, N., Moll, L., & Amanti, C. (Eds.). (2005). *Funds of knowledge: Theorizing practices in households, communities and classrooms*. Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Gregory, E. (Ed.). (1997). *One child, many worlds: Early learning in multicultural communities*. London: David Fulton.
- Gregory, E., & Williams, A. (2000). Work or play? Unofficial literacies in the lives of two East London communities. In M. Martin-Jones & K. Jones (Eds.), *Multilingual literacies: Reading and writing different worlds* (pp. 37–54). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Gregory, E., Long, S., & Volk, D. (Eds.). (2004). *Many pathways to literacy: Young children learning with siblings, grandparents, peers, communities*. London: Routledge.
- Gregory, E., Choudhury, H., Ilankuberan, A., Kwapong, A., & Woodham, M. (2013a). Practise, performance and perfection: Learning sacred texts in four faith communities in London. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 220, 27–48.
- Gregory, E., Volk, D., & Long, S. (2013b). Guest editors' introduction: Syncretism and syncretic literacies. *Journal of Early Childhood Literacy*, 12(3), 309–321.
- Gutiérrez, K. D., Baquedano-López, P., & Tejada, C. (1999). Rethinking diversity: Hybridity and hybrid language practices in the third space. *Mind, Culture, and Activity*, 6(4), 286–303.
- Halliday, M. A. K. (1978). *Language as social semiotic*. London: Arnold.
- Heath, S. B. (1983). *Ways with words: Language, life and work in communities and classrooms*. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.
- Hull, G., & Stornaiuolo, A. (2014). Cosmopolitan literacies, social networks and “proper distance”: Striving to understand in a global world. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 44(1), 15–44.
- Hymes, D. (Ed.). (1996). *Ethnography, linguistics, narrative inequality: Towards an understanding of voice*. London: Routledge.
- Ito, M., Gutiérrez, K., Livingstone, S., Penuel, B., Rhodes, J. Salen, K., . . . Watkins, S. C. (2012). Connected learning: An agenda for research and design. Available online: <http://dmlhub.net/publications/connected-learning-agenda-for-research-and-design/>. Accessed 14 June 2015.
- Kendrick, M. (2015). The affordances and challenges of visual methodologies. In J. Rowsell & K. Pahl (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of literacy studies* (pp. 619–633). London: Routledge.
- Kendrick, M., & McKay, R. (2004). Drawings as an alternative way of understanding young children's constructions of literacy. *Journal of Early Childhood Literacy*, 4(1), 109–128.
- Kenner, C. (2004). *Becoming biliterate: Young children learning different writing systems*. Stoke on Trent: Trentham Books.
- Kress, G. (1997). *Before writing: Rethinking the paths to literacy*. London: Routledge.
- Kress, G. (2010). *Multimodality*. London: Routledge.
- Kress, G., & van Leeuwen, T. (2001). *Multimodal discourse: The modes and media of contemporary communication*. London: Cassell.
- Lancaster, L. (2001). Staring at the page: The functions of gaze in a young child's interpretation of symbolic forms. *Journal of Early Childhood Literacy*, 1(2), 131–152.
- Lin, A. M., & Li, D. C. S. (2015). Bi/multilingual literacies in literacy studies. In J. Rowsell & K. Pahl (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of literacy studies* (pp. 79–88). London: Routledge.
- Marsh, J. L. (2006). Global, local/public, private: Young children's engagement in digital literacy practices in the home. In K. Pahl & J. Rowsell (Eds.), *Travel notes from the new literacy studies: Instances of practice* (pp. 19–48). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Maybin, J. (2006). *Children's voices: Talk, knowledge and identity*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Maybin, J. (2013). Working towards a more complex sociolinguistics. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 17(4), 547–555.
- Moje, E. B., Ciechanowski, K. M., Kramer, K., Ellis, L., Carrillo, R., & Collazo, T. (2004). Working toward third space in content area literacy: An examination of everyday funds of knowledge and discourse. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 39, 38–70.
- Moll, L., Amanti, C., Neff, D., & Gonzalez, N. (1992). Funds of knowledge for teaching: Using a qualitative approach to connect homes and classrooms. *Theory Into Practice*, 31(2), 132–141.
- Naqvi, R. (2015). Postcolonial approaches to literacy: Understanding the “Other”. In J. Rowsell & K. Pahl (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of literacy studies* (pp. 49–61). London: Routledge.
- Orellana, M. F. (2016). *Immigrant children in transcultural spaces: Language, learning and love*. London: Routledge.

- Pahl, K. (2004). Narratives, artifacts and cultural identities: An ethnographic study of communicative practices in homes. *Linguistics and Education*, 15(4), 339–358.
- Pahl, K. (2005). Narrative spaces and multiple identities: Children's textual explorations of console games in home settings. In J. Marsh (Ed.), *Popular culture, media and digital literacies in early childhood* (pp. 29–53). London: Routledge/Falmer.
- Pahl, K. (2014). The aesthetics of everyday literacies: Home writing practices in a British Asian household. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly*, 45(3), 293–311.
- Parke, T., Drury, R., Kenner, C., & Helavaara, R. L. (2002). Revealing invisible worlds: Connecting the mainstream with bilingual children's home and community learning. *Journal of Early Childhood Literacy*, 2(2), 195–220.
- Payne, M., & Almansour, M. (2014). Foreign language planning in Saudi Arabia: Beyond English. *Current Issues in Language Planning*, 5(3), 327–342.
- Pennycook, A. (2010). *Language as local practice*. London: Routledge.
- Rogoff, B. (1990). *Apprenticeship in thinking: Cognitive development in social contexts*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Rosowsky, A. (2015). Faith literacies. In J. Rowsell & K. Pahl (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of literacy studies* (pp. 169–180). London: Routledge.
- Rosowsky, A. (2008). *Heavenly readings: Liturgical literacy in a multilingual context*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Rowsell, J., & Pahl, K. (2007). Sedimented identities in texts: Instances of practice. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 42(3), 388–401.
- Schwartz, L., & Gutierrez, K. (2015b). Literacy studies and situated methods: Exploring the social organization of household activity and family media use. In J. Rowsell & K. Pahl (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of literacy studies* (pp. 49–61). London: Routledge.
- Scribner, S., & Cole, M. (1981). *The psychology of literacy*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Snell, J. (2013). Dialect, interaction and class positioning at school: From deficit to difference to repertoire. *Language and Education*, 7(2), 110–128.
- de Souza, L. M. (2015). Indigenous literacies in literacy studies. In J. Rowsell & K. Pahl (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of literacy studies* (pp. 157–169). London: Routledge.
- Stornaiuolo, A. (2015). Literacy as worldmaking: Multimodality, creativity and cosmopolitanism. In J. Rowsell & K. Pahl (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of literacy studies* (pp. 561–572). London/New York: Routledge.
- Street, B. V. (1993). Culture is a verb: Anthropological aspects of language and cultural process. In D. L. Gradoll, L. Thompson, & M. Bryam (Eds.), *Language and culture* (pp. 24–44). Clevedon: BAAL and Multilingual Matters.
- Stroud, C., & Prinsloo, M. (Eds.). (2014). *Educating for language and literacy diversity: Mobile selves*. Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Toohey, K., & Dagenais, D. (2015). Videomaking as sociomaterial assemblage. *Language and Education*, 29(4), 302–316. doi:10.1080/09500782.2015.1006643.
- Tuck, E., & Yang, W. (Eds.). (2014). *Youth resistance, research, and theories of change*. London: Routledge.
- Vasudevan, L., & DeJaynes, T. (2013). *Arts, media and justice: Multimodal explorations with youth*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Vertovec, S. (2007). Super-diversity and its implications. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 30(6), 1024–1054.
- Volk, D., & de Acosta, M. (2001). "Many different ladders, many ways to climb. . ." Literacy events in the bilingual classroom, homes, and community of three Puerto Rican kindergartners. *Journal of Early Childhood Literacy*, 1(2), 193–224.
- Vygotsky, L. (1978). Tool and symbol in child development. In M. Cole, V. John-Steiner, S. Scribner, & E. Soubberman (Eds.), *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes* (pp 19–31). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Language Socialization in Children's Peer and Sibling-Kin Group Interactions

Amy Kyratzis and Marjorie Harness Goodwin

Abstract

This chapter reports on research that examines how children socialize one another to expected ways of thinking, feeling, and forms of social relationships in their peer and sibling-kin groups. First, we review the long period of development, with influences from many fields, that research on the field of children's peer language socialization has gone through. Second, we review key studies of the practices and resources used by children to take stances and position one another in the local social order of the peer or sibling-kin group in three major areas: (1) directives, as resources for building social organization; (2) children's assessments and evaluative commentary that occur in the midst of gossip and dispute activities; and (3) resources children make use of in pretend play, particularly how they take on different "voices" (Bakhtin, *The dialogic imagination: Four essays* (trans: Emerson, C., & Holquist, M.). Austin: University of Texas Press, 1981; Paugh, *Playing with languages: Children and change in a Caribbean village*. New York: Berghahn Books, 2012) to make commentary on associations among social roles, identities, and languages within those pretend realities. We then review some of the work in progress and most recent trends in this research, particularly as they pertain to education. Future directions indicated are for more work on: children's groups in transnational and postcolonial settings; the moral and social orders of children; an increasing emphasis on the role of affect,

A. Kyratzis (✉)

University of California at Santa Barbara, Santa Barbara, CA, USA
e-mail: kyratzis@education.ucsb.edu

M.H. Goodwin

UCLA, Los Angeles, CA, USA
e-mail: mgoodwin@anthro.ucla.edu

embodiment, and multimodal resources; and looking at longer, unfolding trajectories of action in goal-oriented projects that involve cooperation as well as conflict and dispute (Goodwin and Cekaite, *Journal of Pragmatics* 46: 122–138, 2013).

Keywords

Children’s peer language socialization • Children’s moral and social orders
 • Children’s disputes • Directives • Membership categorization analysis • Pretend play • Children’s gossip stories • Affect and embodiment • Cooperation

Contents

Introduction	124
Early Developments	125
Major Contributions	125
Directives	126
Children’s Assessments and Evaluative Commentary	128
Resources for Negotiating Local Social Order in Pretend Play	129
Recent Work on Children’s Peer Interactions: Transnational and Postcolonial Settings ...	130
Work in Progress	131
Problems and Difficulties	132
Future Directions	133
Cross-References	133
Related Articles in the Encyclopedia of Language and Education	134
References	134

Introduction

This chapter explores alternative paradigms that have been used to understand children’s peer language socialization and their moral and identity work in peer group interactions.

A long tradition of studies in language socialization (Ochs and Schieffelin 1984, 2012) has addressed how more knowledgeable participants socialize novices, e.g., in family or parent–child interactions (Goodwin and Cekaite 2013) and, subsequently, as pointed out in Garrett and Baquedano-López’ (2002) review, in teacher–student interactions (see Cekaite et al. 2014; Duff 2008; chapters in Duff and Hornberger 2008, and Duranti et al. 2012, for recent reviews of classroom studies). This process involves adults socializing children or other novices through “interactional displays” to “expected ways of thinking, feeling, and acting” in the sociocultural context or social relationship (Ochs 1986, p. 2).

In contrast, the research that we report in this chapter examines how children socialize one another to expected ways of thinking, feeling, and forms of social relationships in their own peer and sibling-kin groups. In neighborhoods, school yards, and small groups in classrooms, children socialize one another. Through a range of social practices in speech events that they organize themselves (Opie and Opie 1959), child peers, in same- and mixed-age peer groups, negotiate norms,

identities, inclusion, and belonging in the peer group (Goodwin 2006). Moreover, as noted by M. H. Goodwin and Kyratzis (2012), the field has moved away from “Western-influenced notions of ‘peer groups’” (p. 366) towards acknowledging the multi-age groupings of peers and sibling-kin that exist in many societies and settings.

Early Developments

The study of children's peer language socialization has gone through a long period of development, with influences from many fields. As described by Cook-Gumperz and Kyratzis (2001), in the 1970s child discourse work began to explore developmental pragmatics. This “went beyond linguistic competence to what became known as the child's acquisition of communicative competence, which is seen as the knowledge that underlies socially appropriate speech” (p. 590). As Ervin-Tripp and Mitchell-Kernan (1977) argued in the first collection of papers on pragmatic development “many of the speech events in which children engage typically occur among children apart from adults, and they are explicitly taught, in many cases, by children” (p. 7).

Shortly thereafter, Ochs and Schieffelin (1984) developed the paradigm of language socialization, which called for the need to combine micro-analytic accounts of talk, including children's talk, with study of the “social and cultural structures, processes, activities, understandings, and ideologies that give meaning and identity to a community” (Schieffelin and Ochs 1996, p. 252), that is, with long-term ethnography. Sociologists and linguistic anthropologists began to look distinctly at socialization in children's peer groups, and at the cultural activities and social lives of children within these groups (e.g., Corsaro 1985; Eder 1995; Goodwin 1990). These studies were ethnographic, and some, like Corsaro (1985) and Cook-Gumperz and Corsaro (1986), focused on discourse. However, with the exception of Goodwin (1990), studies did not in addition focus on micro-analytic, moment-to-moment analysis of the children's talk. Research in the field of children's peer language socialization which followed these early studies combined ethnography with children's talk-in-interaction.

Major Contributions

The studies we review in this chapter combine ethnography with micro-analysis of children's talk. They make use of the methodology of conversation analysis, which has come to have an increasingly important influence on studies of child discourse and children's interactions (Goodwin 1990, 2006; Goodwin and Kyratzis 2012, 2014; Kyratzis and Cook-Gumperz 2015). Studies that make use of conversation analysis and ethnomethodology for understanding identity examine how participants “make concerns of identity relevant for their business at hand in the interaction” (Deppermann 2007, p. 275; see also Antaki and Widdicombe 1998) in sequences of interaction.

Children, like adults, “make concerns of identity relevant” (Deppermann 2007) during interaction. As they position one another in the local social order through directives, they construct local identities for themselves and take stances. Through making use of assessments to “position those in their local social organization relative to one another and build their local social relations” (Goodwin, 2007b, p. 354), children invoke identity categories in the process. As we have argued elsewhere, “while evaluating group members through story-telling, assessments, insults, or categorizations of person, children take up either common or divergent stances towards [a] target” (Goodwin and Kyratzis 2012, p. 366) or object of “stance” (Du Bois 2007). A crucial point for analysis is how these identity categories are exhibited and oriented to by participants in the sequence of interaction. Through taking stances, children socialize appropriate forms of behavior as well as negotiate their alignments to one another (Goodwin and Kyratzis 2012).

Goodwin and Kyratzis (2012, 2014) reviewed several studies of the practices and resources used by children to take stances and position one another in the local social order of their peer or sibling-kin groups. In this review, we describe a few key studies in three major areas: (1) directives, as resources for building social organization; (2) children’s assessments and evaluative commentary that occur in the midst of gossip and dispute activities; and (3) resources children make use of in pretend play, particularly how they take on different “voices” (Bakhtin 1981; Paugh 2005; Reynolds 2010), and in so doing make commentary on associations among social roles, identities, and languages, within those pretend realities. We then review some of the work in progress and most recent trends in this research, focusing on how they pertain to education.

Directives

A basic resource that children make use of to position those in their local social organization relative to one another is through directives (Goodwin 1990, 2006, 2007b). M. H. Goodwin (1990) observed particular preadolescent boys in the Maple Street boys’ group which she followed in Philadelphia enact leadership positions by using bald directives and refusing the requests of other boys; these other boys directed permission requests to them. Goodwin argued that in examining how children construct different forms of social organization, the analyst should look not only at the directives used by a child proposing to enact a leadership role but at how directive forms are used and taken up in the sequence of interaction: “Positions of leadership . . . are also constituted through the way in which requests from others are responded to, either ratifying or challenging the stance taken by a [child] proposing to act as leader” (Goodwin 1990, p. 103). Kyratzis et al. (2001) illustrated how members of both a girls’ friendship group and a boys’ friendship group followed over time in a preschool classroom enacted a subordinate position to the leader of each group; they did so by agreeing to the leader’s proposals, asking

permission ("Can I try that?"), asking questions which deferred to the leader's knowledge, for example, of how to climb a tree ("Stand right here?"), and making accounts for noncompliance to the leaders ("It's too slippery"). The leaders of both groups, in turn, enacted their leadership position by issuing directives ("Now jump again"), instructing other children ("You get up here and put this way"), and rejecting the proposals and efforts of other children ("No, that's *not what I told you").

As these studies indicate, "positions of power and subordination emerge and unfold in sequences of interaction" (Goodwin and Kyratzis 2012, p. 382). The most recent work on directives has looked closely at this temporal unfolding by focusing on affect and embodiment in directive trajectories (e.g., Goodwin and Cekaite 2013). Griswold (2007) illustrates how 6- to 8-year-old Russian middle-class girls in a peer group enacted a subordinate position to a girl whom they placed in a leadership position. The girls enacted their subordination not only verbally but through a "combination of several sign systems" (p. 311) including using: (1) prosody (whining cries accompanying help requests), (2) forms of embodiment, such as crouched bodily positions, and (3) redirecting their eye gaze away from interactions with the lead girl that were potentially conflictual. This girl, in turn, would often oppose the others' requests and suggestions.

Current studies of directives in children's peer- and sibling-kin groups continue to focus on multimodal expression, embodiment, and the role of affect. Recently, there has been a focus on directive *trajectories*, that is, on how participants orchestrate attention within directive-response sequences situated in larger goal-oriented activities (e.g., getting a child ready for bed), involving "the movement of bodies through social space and transitions from one activity to another" (Goodwin and Cekaite 2013, p. 122; Goodwin and Cekaite *in preparation*). For example, Tulbert and Goodwin (2011), examining the forms of participation through which a 10-year-old sibling organized the nightly tooth-brushing routine of her 18-month old sister, found that the older sibling used a combination of talk, gesture, and embodied action, including physically enveloping her sister's body into a nesting formation, to guide her sister's toothbrushing action (see also Goodwin 2017, regarding apprenticeship of another order, during transgressive sibling play). De León (2015) observed the spontaneous emergence of a "situated learning ecology" within which a Zinacantec Mayan sibling, passing by his younger sibling who was engaged in sawing and cutting a piece of wood with a machete, formed an "ecological huddle" with the sibling through gaze and positioning of his body. The older sibling's "lack of verbal interchanges expressing guidance or criticism" was informative in indicating his "positive assessment of Joel's performance in the cutting task" (p. 175). These studies underscore the crucial role played by embodiment and affect, as well as verbal resources, in peers' and sibling-kin's mutual guidance and collaborative orchestration of activities with one another, as well as in their building of either hierarchical or egalitarian forms of social organization.

Children's Assessments and Evaluative Commentary

Another basic resource that children make use of for social positioning is assessment activity (Goodwin 2007b, Goodwin and Goodwin 1987; Goodwin and Kyratzis 2012). Early sociological and sociolinguistic studies of children's and adolescents' peer groups observed children and adolescents using labels that drew upon ideologies of gender (e.g., labels like “fag”, ‘wimp’, and ‘sissy’) for differentiating participants (e.g., Eder 1995, p. 150; Thorne 1993).

More recent studies have observed children drawing upon a diverse range of ideologies in addition to gender, such as “good” and “bad” friend (Evaldsson 2007; Evaldsson and Svahn 2012), social class (Goodwin 2006), ethnicity, and language group (Deppermann 2007; Tarim 2016; see Goodwin and Kyratzis 2014, for a review). They have also focused on moment-to-moment processes. M. H. Goodwin (1990) argued that the ways in which the protagonists' speech is dramatized during gossip and assessment activity is key to drawing audience alignment as “the teller of the story, as well as her hearers, animates principal figures in the story and offers her commentary upon the unfolding actions and characters” (p. 239). Evaldsson (2002) describes how members of a boys' peer group in a Swedish elementary school were positioned as leaders through displaying “proficiency in repeatedly (a) depicting the deviant character of others and (b) soliciting audience support for particular versions of events” (p. 219). Evaldsson and Svahn (2012), drawing on ethnographic fieldwork and close analysis of an extended gossip event, illustrated how members of a group of girls who were accused by a peer group member, and subsequently their teacher, of having bullied a classmate “orchestrated their own sociopolitical order away from the adults,” rendering the event of tattle-telling to the teacher about bullying “a disastrous move for the victim of the event” (p. 318).

In both M. H. Goodwin's (1990) and Evaldsson's (2002) work, the way in which characters are portrayed and their voices animated through pitch, key, and prosody are key in inviting audience alignment. More recently, work on assessments has focused on displays of affect and positioning of the body as resources for garnering audience alignment and influencing participation. For example, M. H. Goodwin (2007b) describes the relationship work among three girls discussing an incident where one of the girls had been excluded by two other (non-present) peer group members from a game. Two friends had easy face-to-face access to each other to produce celebratory handclaps, whereas a third girl frequently ostracized had to extend her arms over the shoulders of one of the girls in order to have tactile contact with a group member. In their analysis of another example, Goodwin et al. (2012) underscore the role of emotion and multiple modalities (e.g., prosody, positioning of the body, etc.), which “mutually elaborate each other” (p. 23) in the creation of stance and emotion towards the targeted girl, whose action they describe as “disgusting” (p. 21). Loyd (2012) similarly found that emotional stance “conveyed through affective intensity indicated through dramatic pitch contours, vowel lengthening, and raised volume. . . . [as well as] direct eye gaze, body orientation, and physical contact” (p. 334) is very important for inner-city Neapolitan (Quartieri

Spagnoli) girls' peer conflicts. As Bateman (2012) illustrates, close analyses of 4-year-old children's disputes "demonstrate the[ir] sequential, orderly features," as well as the wealth of resources, including physical moves, that children use to "gain intersubjectivity" (p. 288). Such embodied displays of stance and affect are crucial in demonstrating participants' alignment to one another and their emerging talk.

Resources for Negotiating Local Social Order in Pretend Play

Pretend play, as well as other genres of play and performance (e.g., song-games, competitive bragging, and ritualized insults; see Minks 2013; Tetreault 2015), provides many resources that children can make use of to position themselves and others in the local peer or sibling-kin group interaction and make sense of the adult world (see Goodwin and Kyratzis 2007, 2012, 2014). Children "tr[y] on various social identities or "voices" (in Bakhtin's sense) otherwise restricted from them" (Paugh 2005, p. 65, 2012; Bakhtin 1981). Reynolds (2010) demonstrates this with her study of Guatemalan Mayan boys' appropriation of royal speech and caregiver kin registers in pretend play around "el Desafío" performances, street performances commemorating the Spanish reconquest of the Iberian Peninsula and depicting "a moral binary framework where 'good' Christians ultimately triumph over 'evil' non-Christian others (i.e., Muslims), and convert them to Christianity" (p. 467). The children "creatively *do* voicing contrasts" (p. 468) to draw analogies, in this case, between their own unequal positions within the family and those depicted between "el Rey Cristiano" and "el Rey Moro" in the performances. In enacting adult voices and bringing them into new contexts, children are afforded a vehicle for making commentary on, and even challenging, associations among social roles, identities, and languages, within those pretend scenes and realities.

Through enacting characters in pretend play, children can also differentiate their peers in the interaction (see also Ervin-Tripp 1996; Goodwin 1990, 2006; Kyratzis 2004, 2007; Goodwin and Kyratzis 2007, 2012, 2014). For example, a child can assume the role of a mother in pretend play and use particular forms of directives (e.g., bald imperatives delivered loudly with emphatic stress) in order to enact a leadership role (Goodwin 1990) and receive ratification of that role (e.g., through permission requests) from other peers in the role of "children."

In addition, enacting characters in pretend play enables children and teens to evoke negative and positive characteristics of peers and others, and to do so through veiled and humorous means, that is, through exploiting role-register "participation frameworks" and "footings" (Goffman 1981). Tetreault (2015) documents how performing the voice of "the elite white French TV persona" of a show host enabled male and female teens of predominantly Algerian descent in France to assume an ironic footing and exploit the authority of the role to bring peers on stage and (negatively) evaluate their behavior. The performances also illustrated their understanding of "the power relations . . . inherent to the social personae attached to these linguistic registers" (p. 193). Kyratzis (2007) observed how one member of a

friendship triad of preschool girls exploited the footings available to the news reporter register to bring other members on and off the stage and evaluate them, projecting a leadership role. Voicing characters heightens the dramatic quality of the play, soliciting audience alignment (Goodwin 1990).

Recent Work on Children's Peer Interactions: Transnational and Postcolonial Settings

In the past 10 years, research on children's peer language socialization (Goodwin and Kyratzis 2007, 2012, 2014) has expanded to focus on children growing up in transnational and postcolonial settings, this being part of a larger trend in language socialization studies more generally (Duff and Hornberger 2008; Garrett and Baquedano-López 2002; Kyratzis and Cook-Gumperz 2015; Ochs and Schieffelin 2012). Recent research has focused on "how children and teens in everyday peer and sibling-kin group interactions play with and lay claim to social spaces, discourses, and subjectivities in ways that alternatively resist and reproduce dominant discourses that marginalize their local communities (e.g., diaspora communities in transnational societies, indigenous communities in postcolonial societies)" (Goodwin and Kyratzis 2014, p. 521).

In pretend play, children have the power to assign places and roles to the languages in contact in their communities (Schieffelin 2003). For example, Paugh (2012) found that Patwa- and English-speaking children in Dominica in the West Indies used Patwa in imaginary play to depict authoritative, predominantly male, working-class occupations related to the banana field, road, or bush, while English was used to play school. García-Sánchez (2010) examined how members of a neighborhood peer group of Moroccan immigrant girls in Spain used hybrid linguistic practices during play with their dolls. She observed them using Spanish for voicing the dolls in ways evoking "an idealized Spanish high society life style" (p. 542), while reserving Arabic for organizing and making moral commentary on the play. Kyratzis (2010) analyzed hybrid language practices used among a peer group of Spanish- and English-speaking preschoolers of primarily Mexican descent in a bilingual California preschool during an extended episode of birthday party play. The preschoolers associated "English practices with . . . events of U.S. consumer culture . . . and Spanish practices with traditional activities of preparing and serving food" (Kyratzis 2010, p. 580), although flashes of "the 'doing [of] being bilingual'" could also be seen as the girls forged alignments across frames. Minks (2013), studying Nicaraguan Miskitu children's voicing of characters in pretend play, concluded that "kids learn not only that their social worlds are structured by unequal relations of power but also that. . .the status of inclusion/exclusion is open for negotiation" (p. 136). These studies illustrate the ways in which children can work out meanings and tensions among the languages they navigate in their bilingual and bicultural lifeworlds (Zentella 1997), sometimes even changing associations for the languages (Minks 2013; Paugh 2005, 2012; see also Goodwin and Kyratzis 2012; Kyratzis et al. 2010, for further reviews).

Recent work on children's assessments has also focused on children growing up in transnational and postcolonial settings, examining how the children draw on ideologies of social class, ethnicity, and language (Copp Jinkerson 2011; Deppermann 2007; Goodwin 2006; Evaldsson and Cekaite 2010; Evaldsson and Sahlström 2014; Rampton 2006; Tarim 2016; Terceros 2017; see also Goodwin and Kyratzis 2014 for a review) to position one another in the local social order in these settings. A collection of papers edited by Danby and Theobald (2012), for example., examines these processes specifically in disputes of children and young people growing up in a variety of transnational settings. Tarim and Kyratzis (2012), in the same collection, following a peer group of 8- to 12-year-old Turkish-English (and Meskhetian Turkish-English-Russian) speaking girls attending a Turkish Saturday School in Arizona, observed the girls drawing upon an institutional language norm (e.g., "speak Turkish") as a resource for positioning one another during peer disputes. Studies of children's assessments and disputes shed light on the concerns that motivate young people in the variety of types of settings they grow up in today.

Work in Progress

In addition to focusing on transnational and postcolonial settings, recent work and work in progress on language socialization in children's peer- and sibling/kin groups has become directly relevant to education, focusing on how children display current states of knowledge in interaction and create their own environments for learning. Much of this theorizing builds on Charles Goodwin's (2013) work on situated cognition, particularly his ideas about how members of working groups like archaeologists build action and meaning through transforming the material environments they work in and through making visible their embodied knowledge states as they work to achieve joint understanding. Melander (2012), examining how one member of a peer group of first-grade children in Sweden who had recently visited Japan, taught other members how to write numbers in Japanese, illustrated how children's "learning in interaction" could be documented through tracking changes in their publicly exhibited and interactionally consequential knowledge states. A recent edited collection of papers examines how children frame their own situated environments for learning (Kyratzis and Johnson *in press*). For example, papers by de León, Kyratzis, Johnson, and Moore look at temporally unfolding sequences of interaction and make use of line drawings and frame grabs, demonstrating how, through constellations of language, material structures in the environment, and embodied action, children recognize one another's knowledge states and read together (Johnson *in press*). In addition, they can recalibrate their displays of reading to achieve peer attention (Kyratzis *in press*) or otherwise fine-tune one another's attention towards "seeing" objects (de León *in press*) and closing off competing trajectories of action (Moore *in press*) in ways necessary for the completion of complex learning projects in and out of school. Affect and the arrangement of bodies are crucial in children's creating an "intersubjective environment for reading together" (Johnson 2017).

As noted by Cekaite et al. (2014), “the sociolinguistic properties of talk (codes, registers and varieties) serve as relevant markers of children’s identity and social positioning in children’s local peer cultures” (p. 14), rendering these properties a salient site for language and literacy learning among peers, including learning of phonological, metasociolinguistic, and literate/discursive aspects (Cekaite and Aronsson 2014; Evaldsson and Sahlström 2014; Kyratzis 2014). Peer interactions have also been found to be an important site for the learning of school rules, as children appropriate them for organizing their own local social order (Martin and Evaldsson 2012; Köymen and Kyratzis 2014).

Recent work on peer learning has also focused on its moral aspects (Goodwin 2007a). Cekaite (2012), following the language socialization of a Somali student who was a cultural and linguistic novice in a Swedish first-grade classroom, documented how the child’s embodied (“negatively affectively charged”) stances (p. 643) were consequential for the moral ascriptions made to the child by other class members (peers and teachers), eventually leading to the positioning of the student with a “bad subject” identity (as “unwilling” to learn) (p. 661). Cekaite (2013) examined teacher-solicited peer group narratives about schoolyard transgressions as major socializing sites for learning “moral aspects of actions and emotions” (p. 511). Kidwell (2005) examined how toddlers differentiated the gazing actions of classroom caregivers and used the information about their projected interventions to inform whether to continue sanctionable activity. A set of papers in an upcoming special issue edited by Cekaite and Evaldsson (*in preparation*) examines how affective displays are mobilized in everyday adult-child moral encounters. As stated in the issue introduction, the papers specifically focus on “how affective stances index normative expectations, while at the same time carrying out moral work.” Several of the papers (e.g., Cekaite; Melander and Evaldsson; Kyratzis and Köymen) illustrate how child peers in classrooms can exert substantial agency in these exchanges and subvert adult moral orders and discourses.

Problems and Difficulties

In contrast to many studies of children in the field of developmental psychology, the approach encompassed here is ethnographic, allowing tracking of the broader ideologies (e.g., of language, guidance, etc.) that exist in the local society and that children agentively draw upon in negotiating local identities in peer talk (Goodwin and Kyratzis 2012, 2014). Also, we look at children learning in the local settings that are important for them (natural pretend play, gossip events), rather than making use of experiments. Questions that remain open for investigation include knowing how children interact across contexts, especially whether parents really do provide a model for the children acting and learning with one another. For this, we would need to see children interacting with parents as well as peers (e.g., Goodwin and

Cekaite [in preparation](#); Keifert 2012). Another issue raised is whether, and in what ways, one can speak of a “kids’ culture” or culture of relations among child peers and sibling-kin that is unique and different from adult culture (e.g., Corsaro 1985; Keel 2016). As we have argued previously (Goodwin and Kyratzis 2007, 2012, 2014), although the basic interactional resources used among children and adults (e.g., for exclusion, cooperation) are quite similar, children should not be viewed as imitating, or being on the path to becoming adults, but as agents of their own local social and moral orders (see also Schwartzman 2001). In their own social spaces, they continually define and redefine these moral orders through play and assessment and hold one another accountable to the important social categories of the group, categories which may, quite intentionally, be different, or subverted, from those of the adult culture. Much more attention needs to be paid to the affective dimension of children’s interactions, including nurturing, especially in educational settings. A final need in this body of work is to continue to explore children’s peer and sibling-kin groups in a variety of transnational and postcolonial settings, to capture the complexities of modern-day global movement and migration experienced by children and families today.

Future Directions

In summary, the future of work on talk and socialization in children’s peer and sibling-kin groups is a continued focus on: (1) children in transnational and postcolonial settings, (2) the moral and social orders of children and their interactional accomplishment through children’s use of a range of resources (assessments, directives, voicing in pretend play), (3) an increasing emphasis on the role of affect, embodiment, and multimodal resources, and (4) looking at longer, unfolding trajectories of action in goal-oriented projects that involve “transitions from one activity to another” (Goodwin and Cekaite 2013, p. 122) in the analysis of children’s interactions. No longer restricted to disputes and gossip events that temporally unfold on playgrounds and in other settings largely unmonitored by adults, more organized projects such as learning encounters and cooperative tasks, including those supervised by adults, are now being included in the domain of study of children’s peer and sibling-kin group interactions.

Cross-References

- ▶ [Bi- and Multilingual Family Language Socialization](#)
- ▶ [Language Socialization and Multimodality in Multilingual Urban Homes](#)
- ▶ [Language Socialization in Japanese Communities](#)
- ▶ [Language Socialization: An Historical Overview](#)
- ▶ [Pragmatic Socialization](#)

Related Articles in the Encyclopedia of Language and Education

- Hansun Zhang Waring: [Conversation Analytic Approaches to Language and Education](#). In Volume: Research Methods in Language and Education
- Judith Green & Jenna Loo: [Classroom Interaction, Situated Learning](#). In Volume: Discourse and Education
- Silvia Kunitz & Numa Markee: [Understanding the Fuzzy Borders of Context in Conversation Analysis and Ethnography](#). In Volume: Discourse and Education
- Vally Lytra: [Playful Talk, Learners' Play Frames and the Construction of Identities](#). In Volume: Discourse and Education

References

- Antaki, C., & Widdicombe, S. (1998). Identity as an achievement and as a tool. In C. Antaki & S. Widdicombe (Eds.), *Identities in talk* (pp. 1–14). London: Sage.
- Bakhtin, M. (1981). *The dialogic imagination: Four essays* (trans: Emerson, C., & Holquist, M.). Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Bateman, A. (2012). When verbal disputes get physical. In S. Danby & M. Theobald (Eds.), *Disputes in everyday life: Social and moral orders of children and young people, Sociological studies of children and youth* (Vol. 15, pp. 267–295). Bingley: Emerald Group Publishing Limited.
- Cekaite, A. (2012). Affective stances in teacher–novice student interactions: Language, embodiment, and willingness to learn in a Swedish primary classroom. *Language in Society, 41*, 641–670.
- Cekaite, A. (2013). Socializing emotionally and morally appropriate peer group conduct through classroom discourse. *Linguistics and Education, 24*, 511–522.
- Cekaite, A., & Aronsson, K. (2014). Language play, peer group improvisations and L2 learning. In A. Cekaite, S. Blum-Kulka, V. Grover, & E. Teubal (Eds.), *Children's peer talk: Learning from each other* (pp. 129–147). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cekaite, A. & Evaldsson, A-C. (Eds.). (In preparation). The moral character of emotion work in adult-child interactions [Special issue]. *Text and Talk*.
- Cekaite, A., Blum-Kulka, S., Grøver, V., & Teubal, E. (2014). Children's peer talk and learning: Uniting discursive, social, and cultural facets of peer interactions: Editor 's introduction. In A. Cekaite, S. Blum-Kulka, V. Grover, & E. Teubal (Eds.), *Children's peer talk: Learning from each other* (pp. 3–23). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cook-Gumperz, J., & Corsaro, W. (1986). Introduction. In J. Cook-Gumperz, W. A. Corsaro, & J. Streeck (Eds.), *Children's worlds and children's language* (pp. 1–16). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Cook-Gumperz, J., & Kyratzis, A. (2001). Child discourse. In D. Schiffrin, D. Tannen, & H. Hamilton (Eds.), *The handbook of discourse analysis* (pp. 590–611). Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Copp Jinkerson, A. (2011). Interpreting and managing a monolingual norm in an English-speaking class in Finland: When first and second graders contest the norm. *Apples – Journal of Applied Language Studies, 5*(1), 27–48.
- Corsaro, W. A. (1985). *Friendship and peer culture in the early years*. Norwood: Ablex.
- Danby, S., & Theobald, M. (2012). Introduction. In S. Danby & M. Theobald (Eds.), *Disputes in everyday life: Social and moral orders of children and young people, Sociological studies of children and youth* (Vol. 15, pp. xv–xxiv). Bingley: Emerald Group Publishing Limited.

- de León, L. (2015). Mayan children's creation of learning ecologies by initiative and co-operative actions. In R. Mejía-Arauz, M. Correa-Chávez, & B. Rogoff (Eds.), *Children learn by observing and contributing to family and community endeavors: A cultural paradigm, Advances in child development and behaviour* (Vol. 49, pp. 153–180). Waltham, MA: Academic Press.
- de León, L. (in press). Emerging learning ecologies: Mayan children's initiative and correctional directives in their everyday enskilment practices. *Linguistics and Education*.
- Deppermann, A. (2007). Using the other for oneself: Conversational practices of representing out-group members among adolescents. In M. Bamberg, A. De Fina, & D. Schiffrin (Eds.), *Selves and identities in narrative and discourse* (pp. 273–301). Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Du Bois, J. W. (2007). The stance triangle. In R. Englebretson (Ed.), *Stance in discourse: Subjectivity in interaction* (pp. 13–19). Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Duff, P. A. (2008). Language socialization, higher education, and work. In P. A. Duff & N. H. Hornberger (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of language and education, Language socialization* (Vol. 8, 2nd ed.). New York: Springer.
- Duff, P. A., & Hornberger, N. H. (Eds.). (2008). *Encyclopedia of language and education, Language socialization* (Vol. 8, 2nd ed.). New York: Springer.
- Duranti, A., Ochs, E., & Schieffelin, B. B. (Eds.). (2012). *The handbook of language socialization*. Malden: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Eder, D. (1995). *School talk: Gender and adolescent culture*. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.
- Ervin-Tripp, S. M. (1996). Context in language. In D. I. Slobin, J. Gerhardt, A. Kyratzis, & J. Guo (Eds.), *Social interaction, social context, and language: Essays in honor of Susan Ervin-Tripp* (pp. 21–36). Hillsdale: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Ervin-Tripp, S. M., & Mitchell-Kernan, C. (Eds.). (1977). *Child discourse*. New York: Academic.
- Evaldsson, A.-C. (2002). Boys' gossip telling: Staging identities and indexing (unacceptable) masculine behavior. *Text*, 22(2), 199–225.
- Evaldsson, A.-C. (2007). Accounting for friendship: Moral ordering and category membership in preadolescent girls' relational talk. In M. H. Goodwin & A. Kyratzis (Eds.), *Children socializing children: Practices for negotiating the social order among peers* [Special issue]. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 40(4), 377–404.
- Evaldsson, A.-C., & Cekaite, A. (2010). Subverting and reproducing institutionalized norms for language use in multilingual peer groups. *Pragmatics*, 20(4), 587–605.
- Evaldsson, A.-C., & Sahlström, F. (2014). Metasociolinguistic stance taking and the appropriation of bilingual identities in everyday peer language practices. In A. Cekaite, S. Blum-Kulka, V. Grover, & E. Teubal (Eds.), *Children's peer talk: Learning from each other* (pp. 149–168). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Evaldsson, A.-C., & Svahn, J. (2012). School bullying and the micro-politics of girls' gossip disputes. In S. Danby & M. Theobald (Eds.), *Disputes in everyday life* (pp. 297–323). Bingley: Emerald Group Publishing.
- García-Sánchez, I. (2010). Serious games: Code-switching and gendered identities in Moroccan immigrant girls' pretend play'. *Pragmatics*, 20(4), 523–555.
- Garrett, P. B., & Baquedano-López, P. (2002). Language socialization: Reproduction and continuity, transformation and change. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 31, 339–361.
- Goffman, E. (1981). *Forms of talk* (pp. 124–159). Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Goodwin, C. (2007a). Participation, stance and affect in the organization of activities. *Discourse and Society*, 18(1), 53–73.
- Goodwin, C. (2013). The co-operative, transformative organization of human action and knowledge. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 46, 8–23.
- Goodwin, C., & Goodwin, M. H. (1987). Concurrent operations on talk: Notes on the interactive organization of assessments. *IPrA Papers in Pragmatics*, 1(1), 1–52.
- Goodwin, M. H. (1990). *He-said-she-said: Talk as social organization among black children*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

- Goodwin, M. H. (2006). *The hidden life of girls: Games of stance, status, and exclusion*. Malden: Blackwell.
- Goodwin, M. H. (2007b). Participation and embodied action in preadolescent girls' assessment activity. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 40(4), 353–376.
- Goodwin, M. H. (2017). Sibling sociality: Participation and apprenticeship across contexts. *Research on Children and Social Interaction*, 1, 1–26.
- Goodwin, M. H., & Cekaite, A. (2013). Calibration in directive/response sequences in family interaction. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 46, 122–138.
- Goodwin, M. H., & Cekaite, A. (in preparation). *Embodied family choreography: Control, care, and creativity*. London: Routledge.
- Goodwin, M. H. & Kyratzis, A. (2007). Introduction. In M. H. Goodwin, & A. Kyratzis (Eds.), *Children socializing children: Practices for negotiating the social order among peers* [Special issue]. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 40(4), 279–289.
- Goodwin, M. H., & Kyratzis, A. (2012). Peer language socialization. In A. Duranti, E. Ochs, & B. Schieffelin (Eds.), *The handbook of language socialization*. Malden: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Goodwin, M. H., & Kyratzis, A. (2014). Language and gender in children's peer interactions. In M. Meyerhoff & S. Ehrlich (Eds.), *The handbook of language, gender, and sexuality*. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Goodwin, M. H., Cekaite, A., & Goodwin, C. (2012). Emotion as stance. In A. Peräkylä & M-L. Sorjonen (Eds.), *Emotion in interaction* (pp. 16–63). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Griswold, O. (2007). Achieving authority: Discursive practices in Russian pre-adolescent girls' pretend play [Special issue]. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 40(4), 291–319.
- Johnson, S. J. (in press). Multimodality and footing in peer correction in reading picture books. *Linguistics and Education*.
- Johnson, S. J. (2017). Agency, accountability and affect: Kindergarten children's orchestration of reading with a friend. *Learning, Culture, and Social Interaction*, 12, 15–31
- Keel, S. (2016). *Socialization: Parent-child interaction in everyday life*. London: Routledge.
- Keifert, D. (2012). Young children's everyday inquiry: A field study of a young girl's play across contexts. In *Proceedings of the 10th International Conference of the Learning Sciences*, Sydney, 1, 315–322.
- Kidwell, M. (2005). Gaze as social control: How very young children differentiate “the look” from a “mere look” by their adult caregivers. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 38(4), 417–449.
- Köymen, S. B., & Kyratzis, A. (2014). Dialogic syntax and complement constructions in toddlers' peer interactions. *Cognitive Linguistics*, 25(3), 497–521.
- Kyratzis, A. (2004). Talk and interaction among children and the co-construction of peer groups and peer culture. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 33, 625–649.
- Kyratzis, A. (2007). Using the social organizational affordances of pretend play in American preschool girls' interactions. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 40(4), 321–352.
- Kyratzis, A. (2010). Latina girls' peer play interactions in a bilingual Spanish– English U.S. preschool: Heteroglossia, frame-shifting, and language ideology. *Pragmatics*, 20(4), 557–586.
- Kyratzis, A. (2014). Peer interaction, framing, and literacy in preschool bilingual pretend play. In A. Cekaite, S. Blum-Kulka, V. Grover, & E. Teubal (Eds.), *Children's peer talk: Learning from each other* (pp. 129–147). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kyratzis, A. (in press). Peer ecologies for learning how to read: Exhibiting reading, orchestrating participation, and learning over time in bilingual Mexican-American preschoolers' play enactments of reading to a peer. *Linguistics and Education*.
- Kyratzis, A., & Cook-Gumperz, J. (2015). Child discourse. In D. Tannen, H. Hamilton, & D. Schiffrin (Eds.), *The handbook of discourse analysis* (2nd ed., pp. 681–704). Chichester: Wiley.
- Kyratzis, A. & Johnson, S.J. (in press). Multimodal and multilingual resources in children's framing of situated learning activities: An introduction [Special Issue]. *Linguistics and Education*.

- Kyratzis, A., Marx, T., & Wade, E. R. (2001). Preschoolers' communicative competence: Register shift in the marking of power in different contexts of friendship group talk. *First Language, 21*, 387–431.
- Kyratzis, A., Reynolds, J., & Ewaldsson, A.-C. (2010). Introduction: Heteroglossia and language ideologies in children's peer play interactions. In A. Kyratzis, J. Reynolds, & A.-C. Ewaldsson (Eds.), *Heteroglossia and language ideologies in children's peer play interactions* [Special issue]. *Pragmatics, 20*(4), 457–466.
- Loyd, H. (2012). The logic of conflict: Practices of social control among inner city Neapolitan girls. In S. Danby & M. Theobald (Eds.), *Disputes in everyday life: Social and moral orders of children and young people* (pp. 325–353). Bingley: Emerald Group.
- Martin, C., & Ewaldsson, A.-C. (2012). Affordances for participation: Children's appropriation of rules in a Reggio Emilia school. *Mind, Culture, and Activity, 19*, 51–74.
- Melander, H. (2012). Transformations of knowledge within a peer group. Knowing and learning in interaction. *Learning, Culture and Social Interaction, 1*, 232–248.
- Minks, A. (2013). *Voices of play: Miskitu children's speech and song on the Atlantic Coast of Nicaragua. First peoples: New directions in indigenous studies series*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.
- Moore, E. (in press). Managing classroom transgressions: Use of directives in reading practice. *Linguistics and Education*.
- Ochs, E. (1986). Introduction. In B.B. Schieffelin & E. Ochs (Eds.), *Language socialization across cultures* (pp. 1–13). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ochs, E., & Schieffelin, B. B. (1984). Language acquisition and socialization: Three developmental stories. In R. Shweder & R. Levine (Eds.), *Culture theory: Essays in mind, self, and emotion* (pp. 276–320). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- 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. 1–22). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Opie, I., & Opie, P. (1959). *The lore and language of schoolchildren*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Paugh, A. L. (2005). Multilingual play: Children's code switching, role play, and agency in Dominica, West Indies. *Language in Society, 34*, 63–86.
- Paugh, A. L. (2012). *Playing with languages: Children and change in a Caribbean village*. New York: Berghahn Books.
- Rampton, B. (2006). *Language in late modernity: Interaction in an urban school*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Reynolds, J. F. (2010). Enregistering the voices of discursive figures of authority in Antonero children's socio-dramatic play. *Pragmatics, 20*(4), 467–493.
- Schieffelin, B. B. (2003). Language and place in children's worlds. *Texas Linguistics Forum (SALSA), 45*, 152–166.
- Schieffelin, B. B. & Ochs, E. (1996). The microgenesis of competence: Methodology in language socialization. In D. I. Slobin, J. Gerhardt, A. Kyratzis, & J. Guo (Eds.), *Social interaction, social context and language: Essays in honor of Susan Ervin-Tripp* (pp. 251–264). Hillsdale: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Schwartzman, H. B. (2001). Introduction. In H. B. Schwartzman (Ed.), *Children and anthropology: Perspectives for the 21st century* (pp. 1–13). Westport: Bergin and Garvey.
- Tarm, Ş. D. (2016). Learning gender subjectivities through peer language socialization practices in pretend play: The case study of a trilingual child in a Turkish preschool. *International Online Journal of Educational Sciences, 8*(2), 23–35.
- Tarm, Ş. D., & Kyratzis, A. (2012). Challenging and orienting to monolingual school norms in Turkish American children's peer disputes and classroom negotiations at a U.S. Turkish Saturday School. In S. Danby & M. Theobald (Eds.), *Disputes in everyday life: Social and moral orders of children and young people, Sociological studies of children and youth* (Vol. 15, pp. 193–220). Bingley: Emerald Group Publishing Limited.

- Terceros, C. (2017). Cultura de pares y habla conflictiva: La organización interactiva de las disputas y su resolución en niños bilingües quechua-español en Cochabamba, Bolivia. (*Peer culture and conflict talk: The interactive organization of disputes and their resolution among bilingual Quechua-Spanish Children in Cochabamba, Bolivia.*) Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Centro de Investigación y Estudios Superiores en Antropología Social (CIESAS), Mexico
- Tetreault, C. (2015). *Transcultural teens: Performing youth identities in French 'Cités'*. Malden: Blackwell.
- Thorne, B. (1993). *Gender play: Girls and boys in school*. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.
- Tulbert, E., & Goodwin, M. H. (2011). Choreographies of attention: Multimodality in a routine family activity. In J. Streeck, C. Goodwin, & C. LeBaron (Eds.), *Embodied interaction: Language and body in the material world* (pp. 79–92). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Zentella, A.-C. (1997). *Growing up bilingual: Puerto Rican children in New York*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.

Part III

Language Socialization and Schooling

Language Socialization and Schooling

Ariana Mangual Figueroa and Patricia Baquedano-López

Abstract

This chapter reviews language socialization research conducted in schools over time and across the globe. It begins with an overview of early conceptual and empirical research conducted during the field's first 25 years. The focus then shifts to recent work conducted since the year 2005, organized thematically into three areas: first, studies of contact and change in communities where contemporary communicative practices echo historical processes of social and political stratification; second, research highlighting difference within diaspora that provides empirical lessons regarding the tensions produced during interactions among members of different social groups; and third, ideological considerations that draw attention to the underlying beliefs that often shape everyday interaction. The chapter closes with a discussion of existing, at times enduring, challenges and with a call for new directions within school-based language socialization research.

Keywords

Globalization • Immigration • Cultural contact • Diaspora • Ideology • Ethics

A. Mangual Figueroa (✉)

Graduate School of Education, Rutgers University, New Brunswick, NJ, USA

e-mail: amf@gse.rutgers.edu

P. Baquedano-López

University of California, Berkeley, Berkeley, CA, USA

e-mail: pbl@berkeley.edu

© Springer International Publishing AG 2017

P.A. Duff, S. May (eds.), *Language Socialization*, Encyclopedia of Language and Education, DOI 10.1007/978-3-319-02255-0_11

141

Contents

Introduction	142
Earlier Contributions: 1980–2005	143
Recent Studies: 2005–2015	144
Contact and Change	145
Difference and Diaspora	146
Ideological Considerations	147
Problems and Difficulties	149
Future Directions	150
Cross-References	151
Related Articles in the Encyclopedia of Language and Education	151
References	151

Introduction

Language socialization is a theoretical and methodological paradigm that examines the ways participants are socialized *through* language as well as *to* use language (Ochs and Schieffelin 2008). As a field primarily concerned with the linguistic and social development of individuals across the lifespan, language socialization situates schools and other educational institutions as integrated sites for socialization within society rather than as self-contained autonomous settings. Language socialization researchers view educational settings – including schools, churches, community centers, after-school programs, and youth groups – as interdependent and interrelated sites of broader social processes involving the learning of communicative and cultural competence. While schools play a role in reproducing the macro social order, social actors in schools (students, teachers, parents, and others) may also redefine and resist social norms in everyday micro interactions.

Language socialization studies make significant contributions to the field of education by examining these broader dimensions of the socialization process while continuing to address fundamental questions concerning language development. In industrialized Western countries where much of the recent language socialization research in schools is conducted, those demographic, social, and linguistic changes that accompany large-scale mobility have become integral to understanding the micro and macro qualities of learning and schooling. Language socialization studies of student-to-student exchanges, storytelling practices, classroom recitation, and second/foreign/heritage language learning are now largely inflected with concerns regarding the impact of globalization on schooling. This chapter reviews language socialization research conducted in schools over time and across the globe. It begins with an overview of early conceptual and empirical research conducted during the field's first 25 years. The focus then shifts to work conducted since the year 2005, organized thematically into three areas: contact and change, difference in diaspora, and ideological considerations. The chapter closes with a discussion of existing, at times enduring, challenges and with a call for new directions within school-based language socialization research.

Earlier Contributions: 1980–2005

A generative point in the early development of the language socialization paradigm was an interdisciplinary concern with understanding how and why everyday participation in social and institutional practices became habitual and structured by sociohistorical antecedents (Bernstein 1974; Bourdieu 1977; Giddens 1984). At a time when sociolinguists became increasingly concerned with classroom language use (Mehan 1979), Basil Bernstein's (1974) empirical studies of home and school language use in England provided a starting point for understanding the reproductive qualities of the socialization process. Bernstein's studies were innovative because they viewed schools not merely as sites where learning took place but rather as loci for reproducing social inequalities. Heath's (1983) 10-year ethnography of literacy practices in the southeastern USA supported Bernstein's findings, focusing on the ways in which Black and White middle- and working-class children's experiences of language learning at home shaped their relationships with one another and with language in newly desegregated schools. The role of institutions and their effects on social actors was also emphasized by Giddens (1984), who viewed the relationship between the individual (in his words, *the social subject*) and the social structure as recursive – contending that schools, like other social institutions, are sustained through ongoing, purposeful, and agentic human activity. Bourdieu and Passeron (1977) argued that schools reproduced the very social structures that legitimized the institution and the cultural and social norms of the broader society. These insights are especially relevant to studying the heterogeneous and multilingual sites of globalization that schools have become, making the synergy between social theory and the field even stronger.

From its inception, language socialization research has been conducted in situations characterized by cultural contact and rapid social change (Ochs and Schieffelin 2008). Cultural upheaval impacts language use and, for the critical observer, provides an opportunity to understand tacit beliefs and power structures that shape what a language is and who is sanctioned to speak it. In her studies of secondary school classrooms in post-Soviet Hungary, Duff (1995) examined the ways that recitation routines (*felelés*) reflected and enacted broader political, economic, social, and moral changes in the state. She found that, accompanying political and social shifts in Hungary, interlocutors began to display preferences for classroom interactions associated with new democratic values while discourse indexing the prior regime waned. Jaffe's (2001) study of Corsican language revival demonstrated the ways dominant language ideologies organized everyday experience and the language revitalization discourses of language planners. The emerging ethno-regionalist discourses authenticated bilingual practices as constitutive of Corsican identity through a call for mandatory Corsican-French bilingual education in public schools. In her study of Hasidic Jews in New York City, Fader (2001) noted that language ideologies and beliefs about gender roles, assimilation, and religious integrity structured literacy practices for girls and boys across languages, as well as the differential use of Yiddish and English among the two gender groups. She demonstrated the ways in

which schools became arbiters of legitimate linguistic practices, mediating the communities' perceptions of the process of borrowing English words in Yiddish speech.

Another set of early language socialization studies examined the development of subjectivities as intersectional and dynamic. These studies analyzed the ways in which broader social, historical, and political trajectories, such as immigration, religion, and language policy, converge in local schooling practices. Willett (1995) observed the interactions of four kindergarten language learners in the USA – three girls (Maldivian, Palestinian, and Israeli) and one boy (Mexican-American) – revealing that language development intersects with social identity, gender, and class to shape the ways students' academic and social competence are perceived by others. Baquedano-López (1997) compared narrative practices in Spanish-language *doctrina* and English-language catechism classes at a Catholic parish in California and analyzed the ways teachers socialized young immigrant children to particular social identities (as Mexican, Indian, Mexican Catholic, and American) and to their Spanish heritage language. These studies focused on children as central actors who enact their identities and demonstrate their uptake of surrounding social and cultural cues, contributing important conceptual and methodological tools for the continued study of learning within and across learning contexts.

Recent Studies: 2005–2015

Building on language socialization research that began in the 1990s – which shifted from comparative fieldwork conducted across societies to fieldwork taking place within heterogeneous multilingual societies (Garrett and Baquedano-López 2002) – recent studies have examined schooling experiences of communities undergoing contemporary processes of language and cultural contact in their home countries as well as those of immigrant groups entering new social contexts in diaspora. By focusing on the opportunities and challenges that arise when different linguistic and cultural communities meet in schools, the studies reviewed here are uniquely positioned to demonstrate how and when “verbal practices and repertoires are not devoid of value within the social hierarchies of class and race” (Baquedano-López and Mangual Figueroa 2011, p. 555). We organize this recent work thematically into three areas: first, studies of contact and change in communities where contemporary communicative practices echo historical processes of social and political stratification; second, research highlighting difference within diaspora that provides empirical lessons regarding the tensions produced during interactions among members of different social groups; and third, ideological considerations that draw attention to the underlying beliefs that often shape everyday interaction. In keeping with these themes, we draw the reader's attention to a 2015 special issue of the *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* in which the editors intervened in the larger debates over language and schooling known as the “language gap” by “offering ethnographically informed descriptions of language socialization processes within micro- and macro-level contexts” (Avineri and Johnson 2015, p. 68). The research in this special issue, and in the paragraphs that follow, straddle macro and

micro scales of interaction to show how social and institutional structures intertwine with the everyday experiences of learners in schools and communities.

Contact and Change

A series of studies focused on language socialization in North America demonstrate how, in moments of cultural contact, dichotomous categories often taken for granted in educational settings are destabilized. In a study of elementary-aged Chinese heritage language learners' and their teachers' interactions, He (2003) found that speakers activate particular social and cultural frames of reference when being socialized into a heritage language community that differ from the English mainstream children encounter in school. Through a focus on "multi-performance" – the moments in which heritage language speakers employ "original, creative utterances with structural transformations and transpositions that are impossible in mono-language" – she urges us to look beyond the study of communication in one *or another* language but instead to locate interlocutors' communicative resources across languages (He 2015, p. 315). Similarly, Abdi's (2011) research with students of Latino-heritage attending secondary school in Vancouver, Canada, calls for educators to think beyond static conceptions of competence that presume a one-to-one correspondence between fluency and identity. She showed that a teacher's assumptions about students' oral proficiency and authentic ethnic heritage was, in fact, limiting and alienating to Latino students who demonstrated communicative competence across domains of literacy.

These nuanced perspectives on cultural competence in heritage language settings demonstrate the agential role that children and adults play in educational settings and question traditional assumptions about who wields power in school settings. In a critical ethnographic study in Hawaii, Talmy (2008) described the ways that long-term English language learners resisted learning English. He argued against the notion that language socialization practices produce expected outcomes, showing how these students not only resisted and disengaged from curricular activities but also socialized their teachers to enact "ESL teacher identities." In response to student disengagement, teachers produced their own form of pedagogical detachment – reducing assignments, extending deadlines, and not issuing sanctions for noncompliance. Guardado's (2009) study of parents' and children's participation in Boy and Girl Scout activities that he describes as a "voluntary group . . . with school-like characteristics" underscores the significant roles that both adults and children play in language instruction (p. 107). Despite an intended goal of resisting English dominance by socializing children to speak Spanish in the scout troop, parent-led activities sometimes reinforced the centrality of English while the children questioned its prominence. Taken together, these studies attune us to the significance of unexpected interactional patterns, and these scholars urge us to closely examine these anomalies rather than discarding them as exceptional moments in a coherent and linear socialization processes.

Studies of settings characterized by language contact resulting from colonization and expansion have documented language shift and the processes by which social

hierarchies are mapped onto multiple codes (Field 2001; Garrett 2005; Howard 2009; Makihara 2005; Meek 2007; Moore 2004). Garrett (2005) demonstrated how novel language practices across domains of social life shifted to the use of English and the acceptance of monolingual norms in a context characterized by contact among three codes: local St. Lucia Afro-French creole Patwa or Kwéyòl from the island's French occupation period, the vernacular English from the British colonial period (heavily influenced by Kwéyòl), and standard English as the national language. Moore (2004) studied Fulfulde children who learned French and Koranic Arabic at two different school sites in Cameroon. Her comparison of the socialization practices at home and at the two school sites showed that the practice of *guided repetition* in the public French school and in Koranic instruction was evident in language socialization practices. Moore concluded that these practices were "realized in different ways, for the languages, texts, institutional settings and identities involved are rooted in socially, culturally, and historically distinct traditions" (pp. 457–458).

Difference and Diaspora

Baquedano-López et al. (2005) outlined a theory of adaptation that focuses on tension and change within heterogeneous classroom spaces to show how the negotiation of expert and novice roles in classrooms provides evidence of broader, contested notions of time, space, and development in school-based learning. Mökkönen (2015) considered the ways in which state education policy is negotiated by children and adults in multilingual classroom interactions and the ways in which children's displays of communicative competence affirm, question, or challenge the pedagogical mandates embedded in English-only policies. Focusing on the experiences of two newcomer students from France and Italy attending a Finnish elementary school, Mökkönen argued that immigration and other large-scale processes shape students' dispositions and willingness to sanction or disrupt routine schooling practices. These studies highlight the tensions produced between teachers and students in daily classroom interaction – conflicts that are productive sites for examining role-taking, conflict and resolution, and stakeholders' underlying beliefs about the purpose of schooling.

The focus of recent language socialization research in schools centers on immigrant families' practices as they grapple with the new affordances of schooling in diaspora as well as the constraints of immigration and language policy. These studies highlight the preconceived, and limiting, roles that schools have historically offered immigrant parents. Howard and Lipinoga (2010) identified how parent and teacher roles were co-constructed during parent–teacher conferences in a primary school, examining the discursive resources used in narrowing the set of interactional possibilities for Latino immigrant parents within schools. Hernandez (2013) focused on the experiences of Latino youth and families attending public middle schools in California and the way in which language education policy traveled across home and school sites. She ultimately questioned whether attention to the home-school

mismatch (an earlier, enduring language socialization concern) contributes to social and educational change or reproduces enduring ideologies and practices that further inequality. Mangual Figueroa et al.'s (2015) analysis of interactions between pre-service teachers and immigrant families during role-plays simulating traditional parent–teacher interactions demonstrated the ways in which teachers' ideologies regarding families' communicative competence constrained the possibility for rich exchange between these two groups. McConnochie and Mangual Figueroa's work (2017) draws our attention to elementary school learners growing up in Latino immigrant households in the USA, centering teachers as key actors in framing student competence and demonstrating how school-based evaluations are taken up at home in ways that shape family stances toward literacy and achievement. In an ongoing study of immigrant indigenous students and families from Yucatan at a Northern California elementary school, Baquedano-López and Borge Janetti (in press) examine teachers' responses to a new immigrant student population that re-evaluate the long-standing (and US based) category of “Latino” against emerging discourses of indigeneity at the school.

Finally, García-Sánchez (2014) and Mangual Figueroa (2011) focused on populations whose very presence is marked as linguistically, racially, and culturally different – and in some cases undesirable – while also remaining integral to the social and economic history of the society. These populations evoke a breach in the routine, as demographic change and the presence of immigrant populations renders existing schooling processes untenable and unjust. Focusing on Muslim children and families living in rural Spain and undocumented children living in mixed-status families in the USA, respectively, these researchers tracked the ways in which geopolitical processes of surveillance and (in)visibility, linked to national borders and processes of exclusion, show up in everyday schooling and socialization practices (see chapter “Language Socialization and Immigration in Europe” by García-Sánchez and Nazimova, this volume). These studies have shown that breakdowns in routine interactions are informed by and are indexical of broader power relations within society. Related to these studies investigating the effects of social asymmetries in interactions across educational settings, we now turn to research that examines language ideologies that may lead to and arise out of those asymmetries.

Ideological Considerations

Language socialization researchers have also studied schools as sites of change and/or reproduction focusing on one of two areas: the role of ideologies in structuring school practices (Fader 2001; Field 2001; Jaffe 2001) and the ways in which language learners in diaspora respond to school and language ideologies by developing their own in-community beliefs about language and learning. Language ideologies are understood here as the moral and political dimensions of beliefs that individuals and groups hold about their language, how it should be used, and to what ends (Schieffelin et al. 1998). This line of research has examined ideologies of language in settings in which two languages have been in ideological contestation – namely, those undergoing

processes of language shift or demographic change – because in these settings it is possible to witness users choosing one language over another and developing indexical relationships to those languages. Schools, within such a framework, become one of the primary sites in which the legitimacy of one language or another and the identities associated with each are contested.

Within this framework, language socialization studies of ideology have demonstrated how practices within and across school and community sites reflect ideological positionings derived from but also potentially altering the social structure. Avineri (2012) described how a “metalinguistic community” is formed – a term used to denote the process of being socialized to language through reflexive commentaries about the code and what it indexes. In the Jewish community that Avineri studied across US college campuses and community events, building metalinguistic community may have had more to do with cultivating a shared cultural, political, geographic identity than actually demonstrating communicative competence in the Yiddish language. Kattan (2010) also found that the metalinguistic aspect of language socialization among *shlichim* – families who take up the charge of serving as emissaries in the USA to recruit Jewish families to return to Israel – was made visible when families co-constructed norms about who was an authentic community member (in his case evidenced by being a speaker of Hebrew) at home and in school. While being careful not to overgeneralize the findings of language socialization research conducted in diasporic Jewish communities, we are compelled to highlight three shared concerns emerging in this area. These concerns – the movement of individuals in families and institutions across multiple sites and national borders; the triangulation of ideological becoming across historical, contemporary, and real-time scales; and the significance of authenticity and belonging in historically persecuted communities – are shared by other language socialization researchers who study language ideology in schools.

Ideology circulates not only through ideas, but it is also embodied in the actions, literacy practices, and the “body language” of students and teachers. (See chapter “Language Socialization Through Textbooks” by Curdt-Christiansen, this volume, for a discussion of the ways in which ideologies circulate through printed educational materials as well.) Sterponi’s (2007) study of clandestine reading in US elementary classrooms where traditional reading habitus is evidenced by individual silent reading is a good example of this work. In the classroom that she observed, children subverted the teacher’s directions to read individually, instead finding covert ways of reading together “under the desk” in a collaborative literacy practice that was beyond the teacher’s disciplinary gaze. Cekaite’s (2012) study of one Somali first grader’s schooling experiences in Sweden demonstrated how the students’ socialization to being a “bad subject” through focus on “willingness” to participate in individual seat work was evident in linguistic and embodied practices. She found that conflicting ideologies of learning and development can negatively impact a student’s sense of self, her relationship to her peers and teachers, and her standing in the school. While this work focused explicitly on ideology, it also relates closely to research on difference and diaspora reviewed in the previous section of this chapter. The research reviewed here is especially important because it

demonstrates how immigrant communities and individuals experience the crisis that may accompany arriving in a new land. The research also shows what is at stake in students' educational experiences and rejects mainstream ideologies that frame immigrants as problems to be managed. Through this work, we learn that ideology becomes more visible as subjects are compelled to make it explicit in socializing children or novices and as they are called upon to defend it when they encounter newness across languages and national borders.

Problems and Difficulties

As we mentioned in the introduction to this chapter, the language socialization paradigm has provided a productive and creative means by which to examine the role of schools in the acquisition and reproduction of linguistic and cultural competence. Many of the studies reviewed in this chapter have provided evidence for the role of language in the constitution of society, including its educational institutions. Just as recent work has complicated understandings of home and school as separate, bounded spaces for learning, so too must we continue to trouble the artificial boundaries of what counts as local, because they are likely to include community, language, geopolitical, and even historical configurations. This is especially imperative in the context of globalization in which moments of cultural contact in diaspora contexts can lead to new social configurations not previously evident in the empirical literature available to researchers. We must continue to verify empirically grounded phenomena with community members' emic perceptions (see Baquedano-López and Mangual Figueroa 2011, for a similar discussion related to the concept of speech community in contexts of immigration). By learning from participants' own metalinguistic insights regarding the ideological underpinnings of their everyday practices, language socialization researchers can write against monolithic views of one identity and one ideological point of view. We must remain diligent to ensure that our findings do not reify static categories of identity or culture, trends that the field has been working against since its inception.

While language socialization studies have generally equated demonstrable changes in displays of communicative competence with learning, it may be necessary – as language socialization studies increasingly contribute to education research – to offer a more acutely defined relationship between competence and learning. Consistent with language socialization research to date, researchers must continue to develop frameworks that render visible the complex and ever-changing nature of social activity and structure. As Kulick and Schieffelin (2004) suggest, one of the biggest contributions that language socialization can make is a “processual account of how individuals come to be particular kinds of culturally intelligible subjects” (p. 351). By situating this account within the study of everyday activities, researchers can focus on the situated and shifting terms of the interactions that take place therein (Ochs 2002). In so doing, language socialization research has the potential to show how habitus is acquired, how competence is more varied (and at times contradictory), and why learning is not always a linear process.

Future Directions

We propose a set of methodological considerations which can further engage with our conceptual work given the new empirical evidence reviewed above, in the hopes of amplifying the insights language socialization studies can make to educational research and to the study of language in culture. Language socialization originated with a commitment to understanding social and individual development. The paradigm, after all, engages theoretically and methodologically with developmental change longitudinally over the entire lifespan of both the individual and the community. We now consider the ways in which we, as language socialization researchers, situate ourselves as social actors within and alongside the communities that we study.

Language socialization scholars would benefit from returning to early work not only for its crucial repositioning of language as the center of socialization (evident in the oft-cited *to* and *through* construction coined by Ochs and Schieffelin and cited at the outset of this chapter) but also for its methodological insights and links to social theory. In the opening chapter of her book on the language socialization practices of the community of Falefaa in Samoa, Ochs (1988) describes a challenge she faced in data collection early in the field, which resulted from her ignorance about the very speech forms that she intended to study. She explains her purpose in recounting the dilemma: “not to convey the hazards of cross-cultural research and ways to overcome them . . . rather, to communicate to my readers, . . . the theoretical import of this methodological crisis” (p. 2). We take two lessons from Ochs: first, to engage in a reflexive fieldwork practice in which the researcher continually works to challenge prevailing deficit notions of historically marginalized communities. In Ochs’ case, she critically reflected on her own misunderstanding of the social setting rather than assuming that her participants were to blame for their miscommunication. Second, Ochs calls upon us to develop an integrated view of method and theory where dilemmas or discoveries in one necessarily lead to changes in another. Through early reflections during the formative period of language socialization research, Ochs (1979) gained new insights into the study of childhood interaction by rethinking the efficacy of traditional transcription notation for representing communication between young interlocutors.

Moving forward, in many of the sites where language socialization research has been conducted, immigration and demographic change resulting from globalization continues to be viewed as a crisis, and its attending social anxiety regarding integration (racial, class-based, linguistic, and ability-related) has been encoded in language, impacting policies aimed at shaping socialization in schools and communities. We must recognize the unique privilege we have as ethnographers and continue to consider the ethical dimensions of our research. As the communities we study face ongoing struggles to integrate into society and also find strength in joining social movements taking place on a global scale, we are responsible for situating ourselves within these larger phenomena instead of finding a comfortable distance through the study and representation of communities at either the macro or micro end of the social continuum. At the time of writing, shortly after the

inauguration of Donald Trump as the 45th president of the USA, we call upon our fellow language socialization researchers to continue to develop ways of listening to and aligning with historically marginalized groups with a shared goal of sustaining those human rights and language practices upon which we all depend for survival. Our call for more engaged ethnographic approaches – and the critical perspective that we relay throughout this chapter – is undertaken in the spirit of identifying new and productive research trajectories tied to the social exigencies of everyday life and learning.

Cross-References

- ▶ [Heritage Language Learning and Socialization](#)
- ▶ [Language Socialization and Immigration in Europe](#)
- ▶ [Language Socialization, Language Ideologies, and Language Shift Among School-Aged Children](#)
- ▶ [Language Socialization in Children’s Peer and Sibling-Kin Group Interactions](#)
- ▶ [Language Socialization Through Textbooks](#)
- ▶ [Language Socialization: An Historical Overview](#)
- ▶ [Multilingual Socialization and Education in Non-Western Settings](#)

Related Articles in the Encyclopedia of Language and Education

- David Bloome and Sanghee Ryu: [Literacies in the Classroom](#). In Volume: Literacies and Language Education
- Jasmine Ching Man Luk: [Classroom Discourse and the Construction of Learner and Teacher Identities](#). In Volume: Discourse and Education
- Judith Green: [Classroom Interaction, Situated Learning](#). In Volume: Discourse and Education
- Elizabeth Birr Moje: [Theory and Research on Literacy as a Tool for Navigating Everyday and School Discourses](#). In Volume: Discourse and Education
- Angela Reyes and Stanton Wortham: [Discourse Analysis Across Events](#). In Volume: Discourse and Education
- Massimiliano Spotti and Sjaak Kroon: [Multilingual Classrooms at Times of Superdiversity](#). In Volume: Discourse and Education

References

- Abdi, K. (2011). ‘She really only speaks English’: Positioning, language ideology and heritage language learners. *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, 67(2), 161–189.
- Avineri, N. R. (2012). *Heritage language socialization practices in secular Yiddish educational contexts: The creation of a metalinguistic community*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles.

- Avineri, N., & Johnson, E. (Eds.). (2015). Invited forum: Bridging the “language gap”. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology*, 21(1), 66–86.
- Baquedano-López, P. (1997). Creating social identities through *doctrina* narratives. *Issues in Applied Linguistics*, 8(1), 27–45.
- Baquedano-López, P., & Borge Janetti, G. (in press). The Maya diaspora Yucatan-San Francisco: New Latino educational practices and possibilities. In P. Portes & S. Salas (Eds.), *Latinization and K-12 communities: National perspectives on regional change*. Albany: SUNY Press.
- Baquedano-López, P., & Mangual Figueroa, A. (2011). Language socialization and immigration. In A. Duranti, E. Ochs, & B. B. Schieffelin (Eds.), *Handbook of language socialization* (pp. 536–563). Malden: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Baquedano-López, P., Solís, J., & Kattan, S. (2005). Adaptation: The language of classroom learning. *Linguistics and Education*, 16, 1–26.
- Bernstein, B. (1974). *Class, codes, and control, Vol. 1: Theoretical studies towards a sociology of language*. London: Routledge/Kegan Paul.
- Bourdieu, P. (1977). *Outline of a theory of practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bourdieu, P., & Passeron, J. (1977). *Reproduction in education, society, and culture* (trans: Nice, R.). London: Sage.
- Cekaite, A. (2012). Affective stances in teacher-novice student interactions: Language, embodiment, and willingness to learn in a Swedish primary classroom. *Language in Society*, 41, 641–670.
- Duff, P. A. (1995). An ethnography of communication in immersion classrooms in Hungary. *TESOL Quarterly*, 29(3), 505–537.
- Fader, A. (2001). Literacy, bilingualism, and gender in a Hasidic community. *Linguistics and Education*, 12(3), 261–283.
- Field, M. (2001). Triadic directives in Navajo language socialization. *Language in Society*, 30(2), 249–263.
- García-Sánchez, I. M. (2014). *Language and muslim immigrant childhoods: The politics of belonging*. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Garrett, P. B. (2005). What a language is good for: Language socialization, language shift, and the persistence of code-specific genres in St. Lucia. *Language in Society*, 34(3), 327–361.
- Garrett, P. B., & Baquedano-López, P. (2002). Language socialization: Reproduction and continuity, transformation and change. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 31, 339–361.
- Giddens, A. (1984). *The constitution of society: Outline of the theory of structuration*. Berkeley/Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Guardado, M. (2009). Speaking Spanish like a boy scout: Language socialization, resistance, and reproduction in a heritage language Scout troop. *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, 66(1), 101–129.
- He, A. W. (2003). Novices and their speech roles in Chinese heritage language classes. In R. Bayley & S. Schecter (Eds.), *Language socialization in bilingual and multilingual societies* (pp. 128–146). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- He, A. (2015). Literacy, creativity and continuity: A language socialization perspective on heritage language classroom interaction. In N. Markee (Ed.), *The handbook of classroom discourse and interaction* (pp. 304–318). Hoboken: Wiley.
- Heath, S. B. (1983). *Ways with words: Language, life, and work in communities and classrooms*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Hernandez, S. J. (2013). *When institutionalized discourses become familial: Mexican immigrant families interpreting and enacting high stakes educational reform*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of California, Berkeley.
- Howard, K. M. (2009). “When meeting *Khun* teacher, each time we should pay respect”: Standardizing respect in a Northern Thai classroom. *Linguistics and Education*, 20(3), 254–272.
- Howard, K., & Lipinoga, S. (2010). Closing down openings: Pretextuality and misunderstanding in parent-teacher conferences with Mexican immigrant families. *Language & Communication*, 30(1), 33–47.

- Jaffe, A. (2001). Authority and authenticity: Corsican discourse on bilingual education. In M. Heller & M. Martin-Jones (Eds.), *Voices of authority: Education and linguistic difference* (pp. 269–296). Stamford: Ablex Publishing.
- Kattan, S. (2010). *Language socialization and linguistic ideologies among Israeli emissaries in the United States*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of California, Berkeley.
- Kulick, D., & Schieffelin, B. B. (2004). Language socialization. In A. Duranti (Ed.), *A companion to linguistic anthropology* (pp. 349–368). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Makihara, M. (2005). Rapa Nui ways of speaking Spanish: Language shift and socialization in Easter Island. *Language in Society*, 34, 727–762.
- Mangual Figueroa, A. (2011). Citizenship and education in the homework completion routine. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly*, 4(3), 263–280.
- Mangual Figueroa, A., Suh, S., & Byrnes, M. M. (2015). Co-constructing beliefs about parental involvement: Rehearsals and reflections in a family literacy program. *Linguistics and Education*, 31, 44–58.
- McConnochic & Mangual Figueroa, A. (2017). Socializing figured worlds of standardized academic literacy during homework completion routines. *Linguistics and Education*, 38, 68–78.
- Meek, B. (2007). Respecting the language of elders: Ideological shift and linguistic discontinuity in a Northern Athapascan community. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology*, 17(1), 23–43.
- Mehan, H. (1979). *Learning lessons*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Mökkönen, A. C. (2015). Newcomers navigating language choice and seeking voice: Peer talk in a multilingual primary school classroom in Finland. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly*, 44(2), 124–141.
- Moore, L. C. (2004). *Learning languages by heart: Second language socialization in a Fulbe community (Maroua, Cameroon)*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles.
- Ochs, E. (1979). Transcription as theory. In E. Ochs & B. B. Schieffelin (Eds.), *Developmental pragmatics* (pp. 43–72). New York: Academic.
- Ochs, E. (1988). *Culture and language development: Language acquisition and socialization in a Samoan village*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Ochs, E. (2002). Becoming a speaker of culture. In C. Kramsch (Ed.), *Language acquisition and language socialization: Ecological perspectives* (pp. 99–120). New York: Continuum Press.
- Ochs, E., & Schieffelin, B. B. (2008). The theory of language socialization. In A. Duranti, E. Ochs, & B. B. Schieffelin (Eds.), *The handbook of language socialization* (pp. 1–21). Malden: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Schieffelin, B. B., Woolard, K. A., & Kroskrity, P. V. (Eds.). (1998). *Language ideologies: Practice and theory*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Steponi, L. (2007). Clandestine interactional reading: Intertextuality and double-voicing under the desk. *Linguistics and Education*, 18, 1–23.
- Talmy, S. (2008). The cultural productions of the ESL student at Tradewinds High: Contingency, multidirectionality, and identity in L2 socialization. *Applied Linguistics*, 29(4), 619–644.
- Willett, J. (1995). Becoming first graders in an L2: An ethnographic study of L2 socialization. *TESOL Quarterly*, 29(3), 473–503.

Multilingual Socialization and Education in Non-Western Settings

Leslie C. Moore

Abstract

Studies of multilingual socialization and education in non-Western settings have yielded important insights that expand our understanding of both language socialization and the learning and teaching of and in additional languages. Early work focused on discontinuities between school and home in multilingual communities in postcolonial settings. In the years since, three core and interrelated domains within language socialization theory have been illuminated by research in non-Western settings: the nature of competence, the relationship between language ideologies and language socialization practices and outcomes, and the interactional construction of subjectivities. Language socialization theory and our understanding of the learning and teaching of additional (often multiple) languages will be enriched not only by greater diversity of research settings, but also by greater diversity of perspectives brought by researchers from different backgrounds. More work in non-Western settings will be crucial for the further development of tools for the analysis of linguistic and educational practice, policy, and ideology in contexts where colonialism, forced migration, and “modernization” have left their mark. Language socialization studies in multilingual non-Western settings have contributed to the field of second language acquisition by showing how the learning and teaching of additional languages may be conceptualized, organized, and realized in culturally specific ways that may differ significantly from those common in Western contexts. More detailed accounts of individual learners’ development of language capabilities over time will deepen our understanding of language-educational interactions and outcomes as socio-cultural phenomena, in which participants are shaped by and are shaping the larger systems of cultural meaning and social order in which the language

L.C. Moore (✉)
The Ohio State University, Columbus, OH, USA
e-mail: moore.1817@osu.edu

education is embedded. This chapter discusses these research developments, opportunities, and issues.

Keywords

Cameroon • Caribbean • Competence • Dominica • Islamic • Japan • Language ideologies • Mauritius • Multilingualism • Muslim • Postcolonialism • Schooling • Second language acquisition • Second/foreign language education • Subjectivities • Taiwan • Thailand • Zambia

Contents

Introduction	156
Early Developments	157
Major Contributions	158
Competence	159
Language Ideologies	160
Socializing Subjectivities	162
Problems and Difficulties	164
Future Directions	165
Cross-References	166
Related Articles in the Encyclopedia of Language and Education	166
References	166

Introduction

Language socialization research documents and theorizes the diversity of cultural paths to linguistic and sociocultural competence. From this theoretical perspective, linguistic and social development are viewed as interdependent and inextricably embedded in the contexts in which they occur (Schieffelin and Ochs 1986). The paradigm was first formulated by linguistic anthropologists Elinor Ochs and Bambi Schieffelin, both of whom had conducted extensive fieldwork in small-scale non-Western societies (Ochs in Madagascar and Western Samoa; Schieffelin in Papua New Guinea). In these communities they observed patterns of child-caregiver interactions and child language development that challenged some assumptions about first language acquisition based on research conducted almost exclusively with white middle-class Europeans and North Americans (such as the universality and necessity of Baby Talk). Their discoveries demonstrated the need for a cross-cultural and interdisciplinary perspective on linguistic and social development, one that placed sociocultural context at the center of analysis.

Many language socialization studies have since been conducted in educational settings in which participants are learning and teaching (in) additional languages. But while there are a number of studies that examine second/foreign language education in mainstream, immigrant, and aboriginal minority communities in North America, Europe, and Australia, only a handful of studies have been conducted in non-Western societies (Duff 2012). Yet such settings are rich sites for exploring the social, cultural, and political nature of additional language learning and

teaching. Non-Western societies have undergone dramatic changes as the result of colonialism, nation building, missionization, Western-style schooling, migration, war and conflict, and accelerated integration into the global economy (Watson-Gegeo and Gegeo 1992). The results are complex, dynamic, and sometimes highlight conflicting arrays of linguistic and cultural practices and ideologies, with people participating in multiple speech communities and multiple schooling traditions.

While few in number, studies of multilingual socialization and education in non-Western settings have yielded important insights that expand our understanding of both language socialization and the learning and teaching of and in additional languages. This chapter surveys published research in which language socialization theory is an explicit and developed part of the conceptual framework and methodology (cf., Garrett 2008), the use of two or more languages is examined, and classrooms and/or other contexts of formal instruction are focal research sites. The distinction between second language and foreign language is a problematic one in multilingual postcolonial contexts, where linguistic repertoires are often very fluid and many people rarely use the “official” language outside the classroom. Thus, the term *additional language* is used here to refer to languages other than the learner’s first language(s), while acknowledging that in multilingual homes and communities, the line between first and additional languages may be unclear, even contentious. The term *non-Western* is used here to refer to Africa, Asia, Oceania (excluding Australia and New Zealand), the Middle East, Latin America and the Caribbean (cf. Reagan 2005). An ambiguous and residual category, non-Western can nonetheless be a useful term in that it draws attention to settings where additional language learning and teaching may be organized and experienced in ways that differ from patterns in ideology, practice, and language development found in and exported from Europe and North America.

Early Developments

While many of the early language socialization studies were conducted in non-Western settings, the focus was on socialization into and through one language (Garrett 2007). One exception was research conducted in the Solomon Islands by Karen Watson-Gegeo and David Gegeo, who studied (in addition to Kwara’ae family and community settings) teaching-learning interactions in primary school classrooms and adult education workshops in which the languages of instruction were additional languages for the learners. Watson-Gegeo and Gegeo (1992) found the English-language instruction in a rural primary school to be highly discontinuous with Kwara’ae children’s linguistic, social, and cultural experiences in their community. The researchers argued that this discontinuity led not only to low levels of school success among village children, but also to increasing rejection by youth of traditional Kwara’ae systems of knowledge and leadership. In their study of adult education workshops, Gegeo and Watson-Gegeo (1999) examined how workshop

leaders' use of English and/or Solomon Islands Pijin, Western participation formats, and materials that "embody always Anglo-European rather than indigenous cultural models and expectations" (p. 28) resulted in workshops that undermined rural development efforts by alienating villagers and failing to connect with Kwara'ae concepts and values that were relevant to those efforts.

Discontinuity between school and home/community and its adverse effects was further examined in Moore's (1999) study in the Mandara Mountains of northern Cameroon. Moore documented communicative and socialization practices that reflected and reinforced a multilingual norm among the montagnard (traditionally mountain dwelling) groups. From birth, children of this community were socialized into the learning and use of multiple languages. At school, however, montagnard children had very little success in learning French, the language of instruction. Moore identified several aspects of classroom practice that prevented children from applying to the learning of French the language learning skills and strategies they had developed in their multilingual home environment. In particular, the French-only policy of Cameroonian schools failed to make use of – in fact, punished – the language learning competencies children brought to school. This study illustrates how language education policy and practice rooted in a monolingual norm may have negative consequences for the language learning and academic success of children growing up in communities with norms of individual and societal multilingualism.

These early studies reflect a wider interest at the time among anthropologists of education in identifying and understanding differences between home and school with respect to communicative patterns, cognitive and learning styles, and the values and beliefs associated with particular ways of learning and knowing. Language socialization studies of language education in multilingual settings have enriched this larger body of research by illuminating historically and locally organized practices for teaching, learning, and doing things with additional languages in postcolonial settings, as well as the impact of those practices on individuals and communities.

Major Contributions

Research on multilingual socialization and language education has expanded our understanding of how learning and knowing are defined differently across socialization contexts, how values and beliefs related to language shape and are shaped by linguistic and educational processes, and how individuals learn to use communicative resources available in their community in culturally intelligible and strategic ways. In this section, three core and interrelated domains within language socialization theory are discussed that have been illuminated by research in non-Western settings: the nature of competence, the relationship between language ideologies and language socialization practices and outcomes, and the interactional construction of subjectivities.

Competence

Language socialization research takes an ethnographic and holistic view of competence and the practices through which it is developed. As Garrett and Baquedano-López (2002) state, research in this paradigm is “concerned with all of the knowledge, practices, and orientations that one needs in order to function as – and, crucially, to be regarded by others as – a competent member of (or participant in) a particular community or communities” (p. 345). Studies of additional-language education conducted in non-Western settings have proven particularly fruitful for recognizing and understanding cultural variation in the ways competence is conceived, constructed, and developed over time.

In a study of language socialization of children into two languages in a rural Muang community (Thailand), Howard (2003, 2009) found that children were socialized into a local norm for classroom communicative competence that included syncretic language practices. Despite the fact that Standard Thai (ST) was the official school language (and a symbol of Thai identity and national unity), kindergarten children did not need to produce only or even mostly ST to be regarded as using language appropriate for the classroom. Rather, they were instructed to speak politely in their native language Kam Muang (KM) and to use the honorific particles of ST. Howard observed that this local norm of communicative competence reflected wider community perceptions that the use of particular honorific particles marked the boundary between speaking ST and speaking KM. Howard argued that the village classroom norm of code-mixing emerged from two modes of teaching and caregiving rooted in two core values of Muang culture: an ethos of accommodation underlay a non-interventionist mode, while an ethos of respect underlay an interventionist mode. Adults were expected to accommodate children, gauge the readiness of individual children to understand new knowledge, and avoid pressuring them to perform beyond their abilities. On the other hand, children were expected to develop competence in community practices of respect from a very early age. Thus, village teachers accepted children’s code-mixing as a sign that they were not yet ready to use ST forms, while they explicitly corrected children when they failed to display respect using ST honorific particles during highly ritualized classroom activities.¹ This research illustrates how classroom norms of additional-language competence in a multilingual community can be shaped by beliefs about language as well as cultural values that extend beyond language.

Language socialization research is concerned with “much more than linguistic competence in the generativist sense” (Garrett and Baquedano-López 2002, p. 345), yet most work on the teaching and learning of additional languages has focused on the development of generative language skills (i.e., the ability to produce and

¹When Howard (2010) later conducted research in a more privileged urban school, she found that the urban teachers did not allow syncretic language practices but instead rigorously corrected any use of KM. For them, their “role in socializing children into standardized speech styles trumped the principle of accommodation” (p. 326).

understand novel utterances). In a Fulbe community (Cameroon), Moore (2006) explored in Qur'anic and public schools the organization and meanings of additional-language instruction in which the goal was reproductive competence, the ability to reproduce texts accurately without understanding their lexico-semantic content. In French language lessons in the first year of primary school, children learned to perform from memory mundane dialogues designed to project children into generative competence in French sometime in the future, but which most children were not expected to comprehend. In Qur'anic school, children learned to memorize and recite sacred texts, the faithful reproduction of which, without comprehension, was a highly valued – and for most Fulbe, sufficient – form of competence in Arabic (Moore 2013). In both settings, the body was crucial to the display and recognition of communicative competence. In French lessons, children's co- and re-production of gestures by the teacher at the appropriate point in a dialogue was interpreted by the teacher as signs of (nascent) understanding of linguistic forms. In Qur'anic schools, children's eye gaze, pointing, and body positioning were all carefully monitored by teachers as indicators of developing decoding skills and internalization of and respect for the sacred text and those with greater knowledge of it (Moore 2008). Moore (2016) observes that community conceptualizations of Arabic competence and learning trajectories were being transformed by Islamic resurgence movements in the region, which promoted generative competence in Arabic to expand direct access to the Qur'an and participation in translocal Islamic discourses. This work illustrates how interactional and ideological construction of additional-language competence is achieved locally, influenced by wider social and cultural processes.

Language Ideologies

Language ideologies are in play in all educational contexts. The ideas with which people “frame their understanding of linguistic varieties and the differences among them, and map those understandings onto people, events, and activities that are significant to them” (Irvine and Gal 2000, p. 35) influence language curricula, materials, and interaction. Language ideologies may concern language acquisition, the contextual use of language, and the values of different forms of language (Riley 2012). Language ideologies are highly salient in situations of language and culture contact, wherein local and state ideologies are often in conflict, community members manage competing interests and ideologies, and new ideologies (and their associated practices) arise. This makes educational contexts in non-Western settings productive sites in which to explore the variety and complexity of language ideologies and their relationship with language socialization practices and outcomes.

In Dominica (Caribbean), Paugh (2005, 2012) examined schooling as an agent of language socialization and a significant influence on the language ideologies of community members. She found many of the ideologies about the community language (Patwa) and the language of the state and school (English) that have been documented in postcolonial settings around the world. Teachers and parents

expressed the belief that English was better adapted and necessary for personal and community development, while Patwa was “holding back” the village. Concerned that the use of Patwa would interfere with children’s acquisition of English and lead them to mix the two languages, teachers discouraged the use of Patwa in the classroom and at home. While parents agreed that this was important for their children’s success, Paugh found that they code-switched frequently when speaking to children and in their presence. While English had replaced Patwa as the primary language of the community, Patwa was believed to be better for emotionally expressive speech functions and was associated with the highly valued qualities of boldness, self-sufficiency, and independence. Children created opportunities to use Patwa among themselves, and their use of Patwa and English reflected a sophisticated grasp of the ideological complexity in their community, wherein both languages were needed to participate fully in village life.

Language pedagogies can productively be understood as constellations of ideologies about language and communication, language acquisition, human learning and development, specific languages and the people who speak them. In Auleear Owodally’s (2014) study of language socialization in a Mauritian preschool, she examined young children’s socialization into local multilingualism and into English as the main language of education and literacy. Focusing on three routine activities (circle time, language activity, and mathematical activity), she identified several English language teaching practices that socialized children into awareness of English, French, and Kreol as distinct languages that had different values and were to be used for different functions in the classroom. Teachers avoided using Kreol for academic purposes, employing the language only in informal social exchanges with children. They used English and elicited use by children in ways that positioned English forms as translation of French words or as linguistic forms to be repeated without comprehension. Children were socialized to see English “as a language they learn through French and with respect to French” through classroom routines in which French functioned as the language of instruction and communication while English was treated as a subject to learn (p. 31). These patterns of language use socialized children not only into the linguistic hierarchy of the classroom, but also into an understanding of English language learning as a process of assembling “a compendium of vocabulary items” and formulaic language (p. 34).

Language socialization researchers have examined the role of language ideologies in Japanese language learning by Westerners in the context of language immersion programs (study abroad and homestay)² in Japan. In her study of dinnertime talk between American college students and their Japanese host families, Cook (2006) found these conversations to be an “opportunity space” (p. 145) for participants to be socialized into, challenge, reexamine, and transform stereotypical folk beliefs about Japanese and Westerners. She observed that the ideology of *nihonjinron* (theories on the Japanese) was reflected in dinner table discussions of topics such as language,

²For more discussion of research on language socialization in study abroad, see chapter “Language Socialization in Study Abroad” by Celeste Kinginger (this volume).

social customs, and gender roles, and that “part of being Japanese is constituted by participating in the discourse of *nihonjinron*” (p. 147). Siegal’s (1996) earlier research on Western women studying Japanese in Japan showed how ideologies shaped the women’s language learning use and their teachers’ instructional practices. Some women resisted using Japanese “women’s language” because they saw these linguistic practices as expressions of gender ideologies that clashed with the women’s own values and sense of self, while the Japanese teachers refrained from correcting their inappropriate language use because the teachers did not expect Westerners to understand Japanese customs.

The role of language ideologies in the language socialization of adult language learners has also been explored in rural Taiwan. Lin (2015) examined Mandarin language education provided by the Taiwanese government for two populations that were regarded as problems for the community: elders from linguistic minorities, historically displaced within Taiwan, and transnational marriage immigrants from less developed nations in Southeast Asia, or “foreign brides”. Through an analysis of classroom discourse and public discourses concerning these two groups, Lin shows how a Mandarin-monoglot ideology informed these interconnected discursive practices and how these practices constructed and conflated elders and foreign brides as childlike and illiterate “icons of the nonmodern” (p. 77). Lin connects this linguistic othering of linguistic minority elders and foreign brides to the larger project of producing “Taiwan’s modern 21st-century identity” in an era of globalization and transnational migration (p. 83).

Socializing Subjectivities

A central concern of language socialization research is the development of locally intelligible subjectivities, or ways of being in the social world (Garrett 2007; Kulick and Schieffelin 2004). Guided by more competent interlocutors as they engage in cultural/linguistic practices, novices come to view particular behaviors, perceptions, and affective stances as appropriate to particular goals, settings, and identities. National, ethnic, religious identities are constructed and maintained in everyday interactions, and they may also be contested and transformed (Garrett and Baquedano-López 2002). Just as situations of language and culture contact bring language ideologies into high relief, these situations call our attention to the diversity of subjectivities that are brought into being through language practices. Much of the research in non-Western settings has been explicitly comparative, investigating language socialization in two or more cultural contexts to yield insights into the communicative processes through which participants teach and learn ways of feeling, thinking, and behaving that are (or come to be) associated with the language(s).

Meacham (2007) examined English language education in two public high schools in Tokyo, Japan. Comparing two communities of learning – one located in an elite liberal arts high school, one in a technical high school – she found that language practices in the two settings were quite different and that they socialized

two very different types of English-speaking Japanese subject. At the technical high school, students were socialized through what Meacham calls “empathetic participant frameworks” to view English as imposing or intruding. Through word choice and the structure of her elicitations, the teacher positioned students as problematic recipients of English in need of emotional support. Lessons were primarily listening activities, and when participants did produce English, it was frequently filtered through Japanese phonology. In contrast, at the liberal arts high school, students were socialized into English through an analytical participant framework, in which they kept Japanese and English separate in class, stressing word-for-word translations and maintaining English phonology when English words were inserted into Japanese utterances. In texts and activities, English was framed as an expressive tool students needed to master for the purpose of representing Japan to outsiders. English education in the two schools constructed two distinct and social class-linked “types of Japanese citizens with particular national communicative roles: defensive receivers versus active tellers” (p. 214).

Moore’s (2006, 2008) study of Fulbe children’s language socialization in Qur’anic and public schools in Maroua, Cameroon (discussed above in the section on Competence) examined the formation of culturally distinct subjectivities through rote learning in this urban community in which multiple languages were used. Moore found that lessons in both schooling traditions had the same overall organizational structure, which she calls “guided repetition” (Moore 2012). This language socialization practice was used to teach and learn not only additional-language knowledge and skills, but also preferred ways of being in the social worlds in which Arabic and French were privileged. Guided repetition was accomplished in different ways in the two school contexts in order to achieve different intellectual and moral effects. Qur’anic schooling was meant to socialize children into traditional Fulbe and Muslim values of self-control, respect for religious authority and hierarchy, and submission to the word of God. The practice of guided repetition in the Qur’anic context emphasized strict discipline, reverent renderings of the text, and deference to teacher and text. At public school, in contrast, children memorized and acted out dialogues crafted to teach not only French, but also “modern” ways of acting, feeling, and thinking. Guided repetition in the classroom was often playful, and teachers used exuberant praise, liberal manipulation of the text, and rapid expert-novice role shifts to encourage students to emulate the educated, Francophone, and Cameroonian characters in the dialogues.

In a rural community in the Mandara Mountains (about 50 kilometers north of Maroua, Cameroon), Moore (2004) compared two sociocultural groups with very different linguistic profiles. The Wandala were largely monolingual, and competence in multiple languages was considered a noteworthy achievement. In contrast, the montagnards had a high level of multilingualism and regarded multilingual competence as normal and essential. Moore identified several features of montagnard social life that sustained their norm of multilingualism, including exogamy that created bilingual households, early exposure to playmates who spoke other languages, and the practice of having children carry memorized messages in a language they did not

yet speak or understand (well). Montagnards saw multilingual interaction as an opportunity for active participation in conversations in an additional language and a resource for learning new language forms. Participants in Moore's study described and/or demonstrated several strategies associated with effective language learning, such as planning and rehearsing anticipated language tasks, identifying and focusing on specific difficulties they had, and seeking private help from friends. The socio-cultural organization of montagnard children's linguistic environment fostered the development of a culturally distinctive type of additional-language learner and user for whom multilingualism was fundamental.

Language socialization researchers study how novices come "to recognize and inhabit distinct identities and positions within a social system" (Howard 2012, p. 68). Focusing on peer socialization, Clemensen (2015) examined how the children of a Hang'ombe community in rural Zambia re-worked the language practices of school in out-of-school contexts in order to position themselves within their peer group as educated and thus possessing greater power and status. Teachers perceived the children of this community as academically weak and indifferent, hampered by their parents' lack of education and their "alleged inproficiency in English", the main language of school instruction (p. 248). Clemensen found that, within the peer group, children deployed the topics, communicative patterns, and English vocabulary of schooling in ways that reflected their interpretations of schooling and academic language as having considerable significance in their social world. Social, intellectual, and moral superiority could be asserted and negotiated by means of school-based language practices, such as the exact measuring of time and the use of technical English terms. Clemensen's analysis of children's use of school language across contexts in a non-Western postcolonial setting sheds light on how they make sense of and enact the roles, statuses, and identities in their rapidly changing social world.

Problems and Difficulties

Through the creation and comparison of richly contextualized accounts of language education in non-Western settings, language socialization researchers have generated new understandings of how additional-language teaching and learning are shaped by the social, cultural, and linguistic systems in which they are embedded. However, many more studies are needed if we hope to document and theorize the full range of ways in which humans are apprenticed into additional languages (cf., Duff 2012). While language socialization research in language education contexts in Western settings has expanded in recent years (including studies with immigrant and diasporic communities with roots in other regions of the world), fewer new studies have been conducted in non-Western settings. A related issue is that most of the research in non-Western settings has been conducted by researchers who are not only based at universities in the West but are also Westerners raised and educated in Western settings. Language socialization theory and our understanding of language education and the development of additional languages will be enriched not only by

greater diversity of research settings, but also by greater diversity of perspectives brought by researchers from different backgrounds.

Language socialization researchers seek to identify community norms, preferences, and expectations with regards to language competence and its development; to examine how they are locally enacted and negotiated; and to understand their cultural meanings and social histories. However, as Baquedano-López and Kattan (2008) point out, language socialization as a field “has yet to fully develop a principled way to document and analyze the complexities of historical processes that impinge on current practices” (p. 90). Many of the studies discussed above explicitly investigate language education as being shaped by historical forces, making connections between local linguistic and educational practices and ideologies, broader public discourses, and the residues of colonialism, forced migration, and “modernization”. More and continuing work in non-Western settings will be crucial for the further development of conceptual and methodological tools for the analysis of language socialization in contexts of (past) oppression, violence, and displacement.

Future Directions

Language socialization approaches are receiving more attention in second language acquisition (SLA) research (Kramsch and Whiteside 2007; Steffensen and Kramsch, this issue), and SLA as a field is undergoing a multilingual turn (cf. May 2014; Ortega 2013). These trends make it all the more vital that language socialization research on multilingualism and language education continues to expand beyond European and North American settings. Such work can make important contributions to interdisciplinarity and critical awareness of monolingual and monocultural bias in SLA research. Existing language socialization studies in multilingual non-Western settings have shown how language education and the development of additional languages may be conceptualized, organized, and realized in culturally specific ways, with teachers’ and learners’ conduct organized by and expressive of values and beliefs that sometimes differ significantly from those common in Western language education contexts. However, there is a need for more detailed accounts of individual learners’ development of language capabilities over time (cf. Duff and Talmy 2011). Studies spanning multiple years or levels of language education will be essential to understanding the relationship between socioculturally organized interactional patterns and developmental outcomes of language socialization practices such as guided repetition or the non-interventionist mode of Muang teachers (e.g., how do these practices shape the retention of students in language classes and students’ retention of their multilingual repertoires?). Such work will deepen our understanding of language education interactions and outcomes as sociocultural phenomena, in which participants are shaped by and are shaping the larger systems of cultural meaning and social order in which the language education is embedded.

Cross-References

- ▶ [Language Socialization, Language Ideologies, and Language Shift Among School-Aged Children](#)
- ▶ [Language Socialization in Children's Peer and Sibling-Kin Group Interactions](#)
- ▶ [Language Socialization in Francophone Communities](#)
- ▶ [Language Socialization in Japanese Communities](#)
- ▶ [Language Socialization in Korean Transnational Communities](#)
- ▶ [Language Socialization: An Historical Overview](#)
- ▶ [The Ecology of Second Language Acquisition and Socialization](#)

Related Articles in the Encyclopedia of Language and Education

- Ulrike Jessner: [Multicompetence Approaches to Language Proficiency Development in Multilingual Education](#). In Volume: [Bilingual and Multilingual Education](#)
- Anna Verschik: [Language Contact, Language Awareness and Multilingualism](#). In Volume: [Language Awareness and Multilingualism](#)
- Adrian Blackledge and Angela Creese: [Language Education and Multilingualism](#). In Volume: [Language Policy and Political Issues in Education](#)
- Elizabeth Moje: [Theory and Research on Literacy as a Tool for Navigating Everyday and School Discourses](#). In Volume: [Discourse and Education](#)
- Kasper Juffermans and Ashraf Abdelhay: [Literacy and Multilingualism in Africa](#). In Volume: [Literacies and Language Education](#)
- Feliciano Chimbutane: [Multilingual Resources in Classroom Interaction: Portuguese and African/Creole Languages in Monolingual and Bilingual Education Programs](#). In Volume: [Discourse and Education](#)
- Claire Kramsch: [Applied Linguistic Theory and Second/Foreign Language Education](#). In Volume: [Second and Foreign Language Learning](#)

References

- Auleear Owodally, A. M. (2014). Socialized into multilingualism: A case study of a Mauritian pre-school. In J. Conteh & G. Meier (Eds.), *The multilingual turn in languages education: Opportunities and challenges* (pp. 17–40). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Baquedano-López, P., & Kattan, S. (2008). Growing up in a multilingual community: Insights from language socialization. In P. Auer & L. Wei (Eds.), *Handbook of multilingualism and multilingual communication* (pp. 69–99). Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Clemensen, N. (2015). Staging an educated self: Linguistic displays of schooling among rural Zambian children. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly*, 46(3), 244–259.
- Cook, H. M. (2006). Joint construction of folk beliefs by JFL learners and Japanese host families. In M. A. DuFon & E. Churchill (Eds.), *Language learners in study abroad contexts* (pp. 120–150). Buffalo: Multilingual Matters.
- Duff, P. (2012). Second language socialization. In A. Duranti, E. Ochs, & B. Schieffelin (Eds.), *Handbook of language socialization* (pp. 564–586). New York: Blackwell.

- Duff, P., & Talmy, S. (2011). Language socialization approaches to second language acquisition: Social, cultural, and linguistic development in additional languages. In D. Atkinson (Ed.), *Alternative approaches to SLA* (pp. 95–116). London: Routledge.
- Garrett, P. B. (2007). Language socialization and the (re)production of bilingual subjectivities. In M. Heller (Ed.), *Bilingualism: A social approach* (pp. 233–256). New York: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Garrett, P. B. (2008). Researching language socialization. In K. A. King & N. H. Hornberger (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of language and education (2nd ed.)*, Vol. 10, *Research methods in language and education* (pp. 189–201). Berlin: Springer.
- Garrett, P., & Baquedano-López, P. (2002). Language socialization: Reproduction and continuity, transformation and change. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 31, 339–361.
- Gegeo, D. W., & Watson-Gegeo, K. A. (1999). Adult education, language change, and issues of identity and authenticity in Kwara'ae (Solomon Islands). *Anthropology & Education Quarterly*, 30(1), 22–36.
- Howard, K. M. (2003). Socializing respect at school in northern Thailand. *Working Papers in Educational Linguistics*, 20(1), 1–30.
- Howard, K. M. (2009). “When meeting *Khun* teacher, each time we should pay respect”: Standardizing respect in a northern Thai classroom. *Linguistics and Education*, 20(3), 254–272.
- Howard, K. M. (2010). Social relationships and shifting languages in northern Thailand. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 14(3), 313–340.
- Howard, K. M. (2012). “I will be a person of two generations”: Temporal perspectives on sociolinguistic change in northern Thailand. *International Multilingual Research Journal*, 6(1), 64–78.
- Irvine, J. T., & Gal, S. (2000). Language ideology and linguistic differentiation. In P. V. Kroskrity (Ed.), *Regimes of language: Ideologies, politics, and identities* (pp. 35–63). Santa Fe: School of American Research.
- Kramsch, C., & Whiteside, A. (2007). Three fundamental concepts in second language acquisition and their relevance in multilingual contexts. *The Modern Language Journal*, 91(S1), 907–922.
- Kulick, D., & Schieffelin, B. (2004). Language socialization. In A. Duranti (Ed.), *A companion to linguistic anthropology* (pp. 349–368). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Lin, S. (2015). Circulating discourses of minority education: The linguistic construction of modernity in globalizing Taiwan. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly*, 46(1), 71–87.
- May, S. (Ed.). (2014). *The multilingual turn: Implications for SLA, TESOL and bilingual education*. New York: Routledge.
- Meacham, S. (2007). The educational soundscape: Participation and perception in Japanese high school English lessons. *Mind, Culture, and Activity*, 14(3), 196–215.
- Moore, L. C. (1999). Language socialization research and French language education in Africa: A Cameroonian case study. *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, 52(2), 329–350.
- Moore, L. C. (2004). Second language acquisition and use in the Mandara Mountains. In G. Echu & S. Gyasi Obeng (Eds.), *Africa meets Europe: Language contact in West Africa* (pp. 131–148). New York: Nova Science.
- Moore, L. C. (2006). Learning by heart in Qur'anic and public schools in northern Cameroon. *Social Analysis: The International Journal of Cultural and Social Practice*, 50(3), 109–126.
- Moore, L. C. (2008). Body, text, and talk in Maroua Fulbe Qur'anic schooling. *Text & Talk*, 28(5), 643–665.
- Moore, L. C. (2012). Language socialization and repetition. In A. Duranti, E. Ochs, & B. Schieffelin (Eds.), *The handbook of language socialization* (pp. 209–226). Malden: Blackwell.
- Moore, L. C. (2013). Qur'anic school sermons as a site for sacred and second language socialisation. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 34(5), 445–458.
- Moore, L. C. (2016). Change and variation in family religious language policy in a West African Muslim community. *Language Policy*, 15(2), 125–139.
- Ortega, L. (2013). SLA for the 21st century: Disciplinary progress, transdisciplinary relevance, and bi/multilingual turn. *Language Learning*, 63(Supplement 1), 1–24.

- Paugh, A. L. (2005). Multilingual play: Children's code-switching, role play, and agency in Dominica, West Indies. *Language in Society*, 34(1), 63–86.
- Paugh, A. L. (2012). *Playing with languages: Children and change in a Caribbean village*. New York: Berghahn Books.
- Reagan, T. (2005). *Non-Western educational traditions: Indigenous approaches to educational thought and practice* (3rd ed.). Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Riley, K. (2012). Language socialization and language ideologies. In A. Duranti, E. Ochs, & B. Schieffelin (Eds.), *The handbook of language socialization* (pp. 493–514). Malden: Blackwell.
- Schieffelin, B., & Ochs, E. (1986). Language socialization. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 15, 163–191.
- Siegal, M. (1996). The role of learner subjectivity in second language sociolinguistic competency: Western women learning Japanese. *Applied Linguistics*, 17(3), 356–382.
- Watson-Gegeo, K. A., & Gegeo, D. W. (1992). Schooling, knowledge, and power: Social transformation in the Solomon Islands. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly*, 23(1), 10–29.

Language Socialization, Language Ideologies, and Language Shift Among School-Aged Children

Kathryn M. Howard

Abstract

Language socialization research seeks linkages between the local level at which culturally significant activities are constructed by participants, the social structures and institutional settings of a community, and larger political and economic processes of globalization, modernization, and social change. Many language socialization studies conducted in multilingual societies have explored the interconnections between the process of language socialization and widespread processes of language change, maintenance, and shift. In order to illuminate language ideologies and how they operate in societies with which our readers may not be familiar, this chapter examines various factors in the process of language socialization outside of North America that underlie an ongoing process of language shift (see chapter “Bi- and Multilingual Family Language Socialization” by Fogle and King, this volume, for research on North American settings): the role of language ideologies as they change over time; the role of schooling, language-of-instruction policies, and the complex dynamics surrounding these policies; the interplay between home language policies and children’s language use; and the role of peers and siblings in school-aged children’s language socialization, including the creation of covert and subaltern language ideologies that impact this process of language shift.

Keywords

Language socialization • Language shift • Peer interaction • Schooling • Language ideologies

K.M. Howard (✉)
Teacher Education and Foundations Department, California State University, San Bernardino,
CA, USA
e-mail: khoward@csusb.edu

Contents

Early Developments	170
Major Contributions	172
Work in Progress	174
Problems and Difficulties	177
Future Directions	178
Cross-References	179
Related Articles in the Encyclopedia of Language and Education	179
References	179

Language socialization research examines how novices are socialized into communities of practice across the life course, including how they are socialized to use language appropriately in culturally significant activities, and how they are socialized through language into local values, beliefs, theories, and conceptions of the world (Ochs and Schieffelin 1984). Adopting an ethnographic, discourse analytic approach, this research has illuminated the local, contingent, and contested nature of language socialization as it occurs through language in moment-by-moment interactions between social actors who construct their social worlds together through discursive action. Language socialization research seeks linkages between this local level at which culturally significant activities are constructed by participants, the social structures and institutional settings of a community, and larger political and economic processes of globalization, modernization, and social change. The goals, trajectories, and practices of language socialization vary across cultures as local conceptions and theories of language, childhood, child development, personhood, teaching, and learning vary. Many language socialization studies conducted in multilingual societies have explored the interconnections between the process of language socialization and widespread processes of language change, maintenance, and shift. This chapter examines the role of language ideologies, schooling, home-school connections, and peer/sibling groups in school-aged children's language socialization and the impact of this process on language shift in multilingual communities outside North America. This geographical focus on research conducted in diverse societies with which readers may be less familiar aims to highlight language ideological processes that may be distinct from those in North America and also to illuminate commonalities.

Early Developments

Much of the early, pioneering work on language socialization examined small-scale monolingual societies, focusing in particular on caregiver-child interactions in the home (Ochs 1988; Schieffelin 1990). These early studies laid the groundwork for later research on more linguistically heterogeneous communities by examining how children come to master multiple language practices, language varieties, registers and genres, as well as the social, political, moral, and aesthetically meaningful loading of this linguistic repertoire (Clancy 1986; Ochs 1988; Schieffelin 1996). This emphasis on the socially distributed character of a community's linguistic

repertoire and cultural knowledge has provided a useful lens into the dynamic process of cultural and linguistic reproduction and transformation in situations where two or more codes are spoken, as well as the role of various socializing institutions and settings in this process.

A major focus of language socialization research in multilingual settings has been to examine how language ideologies – “shared bodies of commonsense notions about the nature of language in the world” (Rumsey 1990) – are contested, negotiated, and transformed in conjunction with other processes of social change, including language change and language shift. During the process of language socialization, community members transmit information to novices about cultural norms and expectations regarding how to use language appropriately, what it means to speak a language, what it means to learn a language, and how different codes and varieties construct and index particular social identities and roles, and these messages are inherently laden with unequal power relations. Such language ideologies also underlie language socialization practices that may impact language shift. While sociolinguistic research has often attributed language shift to macrosociological factors such as migration, industrialization, modernization, and the workings of government institutions (such as public schools), language socialization researchers argue that the analysis of everyday social practices yields a more nuanced understanding (Gal 1978; Kulick 1992). As Kulick (1992) notes, “to evoke macrosociological changes as a ‘cause’ of shift is to leave out the step of explaining how such change has come to be interpreted in a way that dramatically affects everyday language use in a community” (p. 9).

In his groundbreaking study of the small and isolated village of Gapun in Papua New Guinea, Don Kulick (1992) explored how language ideologies mediate the process of language socialization and how these ideologies underlie children’s declining use of the local vernacular, Taiap, in favor of Tok Pisin, an important national language of New Guinea. In Gapun, each of these language varieties has become associated with particular images of social persons through larger processes of modernization and globalization (Kulick 1998). His study showed that “positive and highly valued aspects of the self”—including *hed* (a bold, independent side of the self) and *save* (a cooperative, social side of the self)—“come to be bound to expression through a particular language” (1992, p. 262). Specific types of discursive and communicative practice are tied to these modes of the self in children’s everyday interactions with others, including language choice: *hed* became linked to undesirable characteristics such as stubbornness, backwardness, and selfishness, while *save* was linked to sociality, modernity, and sophistication. Kulick (1992) showed that despite their desire for children to learn the village vernacular, Taiap, caregivers used the regional lingua franca, Tok Pisin, rather than the vernacular, to emphasize a point or to control their children, which positioned Tok Pisin as the language of adult authority and control. Caregivers in Gapun also ignored or criticized their children’s use of the vernacular, which had the effect of discouraging its use by children. Thus, community notions of how their language was tied to personhood led to a process of language shift in which the use of vernacular speech genres and styles became more restricted. Local theories regarding the teaching and

learning of languages, in which adults blamed their children for willfully rejecting the vernacular and downplayed the caregivers' role, were also shown to play a role in language shift.

Major Contributions

Following Kulick's findings, many language socialization studies in multilingual societies have explored how school-aged children's acquisition of the local vernacular is impacted by language ideologies that underlie language socialization practices, including the speaking practices of adults to which children are exposed, adult responses to children's use of the community's languages, and restrictions on children's language use in the home. These language ideologies include evaluations of the relative status and prestige accorded to different language varieties, local theories about children's ability to learn various language varieties, the attribution of responsibility for teaching and/or learning these varieties, and how identity and personhood are linked to various codes in the community's linguistic repertoire.

Language ideologies are rooted in particular social positions, vary across social domains, and change over time. Not only may they be consciously held ideas that are expressed in explicit discourses, but they may also be implicitly embodied in, and constituted by, social practice (Schieffelin, Woolard and Kroskrity 1998). Because ideologies render certain practices invisible, the linkage between community evaluations of language varieties and the process of language shift is not straightforward. A key finding of language socialization research in multilingual settings has been that there is often a gap between explicit discourses valorizing a particular language variety and the implicit evaluation of these varieties constituted by everyday socialization practices. While adult discourses often stigmatize one language variety and disfavor its use by and to children, children's interactions with others may implicitly reflect competing evaluations of that language variety through practices that forge indexical linkages to desired social positions and affective displays. That is, explicit discourses may valorize a standard or national language, while socialization practices value the vernacular for alternative uses such as adult authority and control or affective displays. Paugh (2013), for example, found that adults in Dominica promoted a purist English language ideology when they talked about language while engaging in practices that associated the vernacular (Patwa) with adult domains of authority and interaction that children valued. Similarly, Garrett (2005) found that although caregivers told children to use only English, their interactions with children socialized them to curse and to assert themselves in the vernacular, Kweyol.

Beyond language ideologies of how language is positioned in the social world, language socialization studies across cultures have also explicated the role of a community's theories of child development, learning, caregiving, and teaching in children's socialization (Schieffelin and Ochs 1986). Studies conducted in multilingual societies have illustrated that commonly held conceptions of how languages are learned, in which order, and with what degree of difficulty are reflected in a range of socialization practices and outcomes. Communities vary in the degree of

responsibility that is placed on the learner versus the caregiver in acquiring a language, and different languages are associated with distinct processes of acquisition. Often children, rather than parents or teachers, are believed to be primarily responsible for learning (or failing to learn) a declining vernacular. Community members in many societies believe that the vernacular is acquired naturally by children and with little effort, therefore children who fail to acquire it are thought to be willfully rejecting it. Such theories of language development, in turn, underlie adults' failure to recognize the role that their socialization practices play in disfavoring the vernacular (Garrett 2003; Paugh 2013; Riley 2007; Sandel 2003). For example, Augsburger (2004) showed a dynamic similar to that found by Kulick (1992) in Oaxaca, Mexico: in a context in which children's use of Zapotec in the home is suppressed or forbidden, the responsibility for failing to learn this language is placed squarely on the learner, and adults blame children who do not acquire it for their lack of desire to do so.

In many language communities, there is a commonly held assumption among parents and teachers alike that the language of schooling requires more effort to learn than the vernacular, leading to a common family practice of restricting or forbidding the use of the vernacular in the home, often due to a theory that it will interfere with children's acquisition of the more prestigious language variety. Some families consequently adopt the strategy of using only the school's language with children in the home (Garrett 2005; Howard 2012; Jaffe 1999; Paugh 2013). Such suppression of the vernacular at home is often influenced by school language policies (Howard 2010; King and Fogle 2006; Luykx 2003; Moore 2006). Schools are powerful socializing agents in promoting monolingualism and purist language ideologies among parents in their communities (Jaffe 1999; Riley 2007). Furthermore, adults who had, in their childhood, been subject to draconian language policies forbidding their use of the vernacular at school may, in turn, perceive that their own difficulties in school resulted from their family's use of the vernacular at home, as shown in the Northern Thai case in Howard (2012). Thai parents may believe they can help their children to succeed in school and in the larger society and facilitate their early acquisition of the school's language at home by addressing children only in that language variety. Some caregivers may adopt baby talk registers from the more dominant language variety while maintaining the vernacular for other home uses (Luykx 2003, Riley 2007).

Family language policies suppressing the use of the vernacular sometimes lead to problematic language use and interaction in the home. At times, the language spoken at home may in fact be a nonstandard variety of the language of instruction that is misrecognized as the standard language (Garrett 2003, 2012), or the caregivers who have adopted a prestigious language variety for home interaction may not possess adequate proficiency in the language to foster effective communication (Sandel 2003). In some contexts, local forms of knowledge, such as storytelling, indigenous knowledge, or local traditions, are not openly shared with children because elder caregivers are not comfortable speaking about these topics in the more prestigious language, yet they feel they should avoid speaking to children in the stigmatized vernacular or home language (Augsburger 2004).

Language ideologies are constantly shifting and in flux for a variety of reasons, so community members' changing conceptualizations of the intersections between language and social life can lead to changes in the dynamics of language socialization. Sandel (2003), for example, showed that a shift in beliefs about language learning has led to a shift in Mandarin-only family language practices in rural Taiwanese homes. He showed that while parents in this setting had once suppressed the vernacular for similar reasons, they had come to believe that children's exposure to Mandarin through media and the schools would be sufficient for acquiring it and were increasingly making conscious efforts to speak the vernacular (Tai-gi) with children in the home. A number of studies have documented language and cultural revival movements aimed, in part, at promoting and reinvigorating the vernacular (Howard 2012; Makihara 2005; Riley 2007). These movements frequently articulate purist language ideologies regarding perceived inauthentic uses of the vernacular while denigrating syncretic, hybrid varieties often employed by youth. For example, Riley (2007) showed how the leaders of this movement represented the educational elite who were laminating French-influenced regimentation of language onto 'Enana, their vernacular in the Marquesas.

Instructional practices at school may also transform caregivers' treatment of the vernacular in the home leading, for example, to explicit, school-like instruction of the vernacular in the home. Watson-Gegeo and Gegeo (1992) found, in the Solomon Islands, that "many of the interactional routines parents and other caregivers use with young children are similar in form and function to those used by white middle class, American parents and evaluated by American educators as essential for developing preschool skills" (p. 21). Riley (2007) showed that adults in the Marquesas believe that children require explicit instruction not only in French, but also in the vernacular, 'Enana. Caregivers in her study used syncretic socialization practices at home, including explicit modeling, prompting, and guided performance to "teach" children the "proper" uses of both languages. Moore (2006) found among the families in her study that school instructional practices had been "diffused" into the home setting among the Fulbe in Cameroon. The practice of "guided repetition," used pervasively both in the Koranic school setting and in public school French language instruction, had filtered into the socialization of traditional folk tales in the home. Whereas children traditionally learned folktales in the vernacular (Fulfulde) through intent observation of their performance by adults over time, caregivers had begun using guided repetition as a means of eliciting performances from children.

Work in Progress

Language socialization studies in the multilingual societies reviewed here have focused their analysis largely on home and community settings. Whereas there is a wealth of research on bilingual language use in classrooms in North America and Europe, the close analysis of classroom interaction at school has not been a major focus of most language socialization studies in other societies (although many

include some description of a limited number of participant observations in the classroom). Discourse analytic research on how children use both the language of instruction and the vernacular in social interactions at school and with their peers in a broader range of societies would greatly contribute to our understanding of the process of language maintenance and shift in multilingual communities.

Some research has shown, for example, that children's classroom interactions in the language of instruction at school may be problematic. Teachers in these settings may not be fluent or well trained in these languages, especially in rural settings, so their use of the language of instruction in the classroom may be formulaic and decontextualized and characterized by rote repetition, choral response, formulaic talk with predictable rhythms, intonation, and exaggerated gestures, as well as language that lacks authentic meanings and functions (Chick 1996; Hornberger and Chick 2001; Kulick 1992; Moore 1999; Watson-Gegeo 1992; Watson-Gegeo and Gegeo 1992). These stilted interactional styles prevent the children's active participation in the classroom, such as asking questions, creatively using the materials being taught, or using the language for expressive purposes (Kulick 1992; Watson-Gegeo 1992; Watson-Gegeo and Gegeo 1992). Some authors attribute these language practices to a "banking" model of education in which learning by rote memorization dominates. Chick and Hornberger (Chick 1996; Hornberger and Chick 2001), however, note that this style of interaction is a social practice allowing both teachers and students to save face in cases where engaging in more spontaneous and communicative dialogue would expose their lack of competence in the language of instruction. These "safe-talk" practices also hinder learning and "contribute to the continuing marginalization of language minorities in social and policy contexts of long-term oppression" (Hornberger and Chick 2001, p. 52).

Few traditional language socialization studies outside of North America have examined whether and how the local vernacular, rather than the language of instruction, is used in school and how teachers treat its use by children. Children are often explicitly told to use the language of instruction, and they are sometimes reprimanded or their speech is corrected by teachers when they use the vernacular (Jaffe 1999; Howard 2009a). Nonaka (2004, 2012), for example, documented how Thai Sign Language acquired by children in recently implemented schools for the deaf had come to threaten a previously vibrant indigenous sign language (Ban Khor Sign Language) in northeastern Thailand. Nonetheless, in many contexts, a child's vernacular may be used at school in a variety of ways, even when not officially sanctioned. For example, Howard's (2009a) research in a Northern Thai village school showed that although school policy promotes Standard Thai as the language of instruction, the vernacular (Kam Muang) is used by both teachers and students in a number of hybrid language practices that reflect competing models of conduct, including accommodation, respect, and social hierarchy. Standard Thai is associated with the display of formality and respect, whereas the vernacular is understood to be a language of intimacy or in-group membership.

Children's interactions in their peer groups are sites whose impact on language socialization and language shift are beginning to emerge (see chapter "Language

Socialization in Children's Peer and Sibling-Kin Group Interactions" by Kyratzis and Goodwin, this volume). The language varieties and styles that children use in peer and sibling interactions and the particular ways they deploy their linguistic repertoires may have profound implications for language change, maintenance, and shift. As school-aged children's social networks expand, they bring new language practices into their interactions at home, especially for interaction with their siblings. These new sibling language practices in turn have an impact on how caregivers interact with children at home. Many assume that children are simply aligning with the dominance and prestige that the school accords the language of instruction. However, the findings of language socialization research suggest that this process is mediated by language use in peer groups: It is the language practices of the peer group, rather than those of the school per se, that seem to be adopted by school-aged children. Children whose vernacular is privileged at home may establish the school's language as a peer code, often teasing and reprimanding their peers for using the vernacular (Riley 2007). Makihara (2005) showed that, although many children on Easter Island are already Spanish dominant, those children who are dominant in the vernacular, Rapa Nui, rapidly switch to Spanish when they enter preschool because it is the language of their peers. Even when adults continued to address children in Rapa Nui, the children did not reciprocate and responded instead in Spanish or syncretic Spanish/Rapa Nui. When this happened, adults often accommodated to their children by switching to these same language varieties.

Conversely, where the family language policy suppresses the vernacular at home, children in some communities adopt and deploy the vernacular in their peer groups to varying degrees, sometimes as the preferred medium of interaction (Fader 2009; Paugh 2005; Riley 2007). Children and adults sometimes position the school language in opposition to the language of peer interaction, constructing a subaltern prestige for the vernacular or another syncretic variety of language. For example, Riley's research in French Polynesia in 1993 showed an age-graded distinction in which young children spoke French almost exclusively, rather than 'Enana, while youth and adults were bilingual in both languages. When she returned in 2000, however, she discovered that the same younger children had since grown up and now recognized a "cool," subversive prestige in the use of the French-'Enana syncretic variety, Charabia (2007).

Recent studies point to the importance of carefully analyzing how children use language within their peer groups. Children often use syncretic varieties of language and multiple code-mixing or code-switching practices, which are differentiated from adult uses of language in other domains (Garrett 2012; Howard 2009b; Makihara 2005; Paugh 2013; Riley 2007). Children's social worlds are actively constructed by children themselves, who are managing the contingencies of childhood in moment-by-moment interactions. Paugh (2005) found that, although children in Dominica were more proficient in English than the vernacular (Patwa), they used Patwa among siblings and peers to enact adult roles in play, to intensify their speech, to assert control, and to make moral evaluations of each other. Howard (2007, 2009b) showed that Northern Thai children, who privilege the vernacular (Kam Muang) in their

playgroups, construct and inhabit hierarchical or symmetrical social relationships with their playmates through their use of person reference and how they deploy formulaic, Standard Thai genres (songs, riddles, jokes, and advertising jingles) in hybrid, code-mixed genre performances. As Muang children grow older, they interact in syncretic language varieties that are lamented by adults as “inauthentic” Kam Muang and strongly associated with urban youth. Thus the language practices of different groups within a language community may be informed by very distinct conceptualizations of their linguistic repertoires.

Problems and Difficulties

Work at the intersection of language socialization and language ideologies has provided a wealth of information on how children are socialized and the interconnections between these processes in a broad range of societies. Both language socialization and language shift, however, constitute major areas of investigation in their own right, so researchers face a complex challenge when trying to understand the connection between them. Because scholarly information concerning the process of language shift in a given community can be difficult to obtain, language socialization researchers face the challenge of conducting research on both of these domains. There is a need to rigorously engage in research that provides adequate information about both language socialization and language shift while at the same time drawing connections between these phenomena. The classic language socialization paradigm incorporating microanalysis of language practices into thorough ethnographic research provides an important tool for making such connections.

Another problem for research on language socialization and language shift is one of scale. A typical ethnographic study is conducted over 1 or 2 years, while language shift takes place across generations. Although language shift can be studied through a cross-sectional methodology, such an approach contradicts ethnographers' interest in the historicity and situated nature of human experience. Any investigation of language shift should therefore ideally also include longer-term study of a particular generation across the life course in order to examine the process of language shift as it occurs at a particular moment in history, among a particular group of speakers, and the role of human action in building, resisting, transforming, and transmitting cultural practices and ideologies that underlie language shift over time, as Riley (2007) demonstrated.

Language socialization research is ambivalent about the effect of home language policies on children's success in school. In many cases, these studies report that children's school-based achievement does not seem to improve after the implementation of home language policies, fostered by the schools, that suppress the use of the vernacular by and to children at home (Garrett 2005). In other cases, however, children's school success does seem to show improvement after the implementation of such policies (Jaffe 1999). Some possible factors behind this discrepancy are suggested by the research findings, such as variability in adults' proficiency in the

language of instruction, both at home (Garrett 1999; Sandel 2003) and at school (Watson-Gegeo and Gegeo 1992; Hornberger and Chick 2001), the nature of language use in peer groups, or the treatment of the vernacular at school. Language socialization research highlights the mediating role of language ideologies – local interpretations of language, language use, and language acquisition – in the language practices of a community. Psycholinguistic and educational research on bilingualism would benefit from a language socialization perspective on the culturally rooted nature of language acquisition, language change, and language shift. In order to foster dialog between these two fields, language socialization researchers should more explicitly address questions of school performance and bilingualism.

Future Directions

The large majority of language socialization studies outside the USA have been conducted in rural villages where the language of instruction is rarely spoken at home or in the community. Some multi-site studies have shown that rural settings contrast with urban settings where children are more likely to be exposed to the school's language before entering school (Howard 2012). Future research should explore in more detail how dynamics in rural versus urban settings impact the process of language socialization. Another area for further study that may be obscured in village studies is that of class-differentiation in language socialization processes. While some studies hint at class distinctions, more systematic investigation across societies is needed.

Whereas classic language socialization research in multilingual/bidialectal North American settings focused in large part on home-school discontinuities (Heath 1983), research outside of North America has focused mainly on the home setting. In order to better connect these two bodies of research (and thus to enhance our insight into North American processes of education as well as education in international settings), future work should examine the school setting in more detail (see chapter “Language Socialization and Schooling” by Mangual Figeruoa and Baquedano-López, this volume). Research on language use among children has also demonstrated the crucial role that children play as agents of social and linguistic reproduction and change, through their active linguistic and discursive production of their social worlds. Furthermore, recent research has begun to explore how children take up or resist the social positions available to them, such as García-Sánchez' (2014) study of Muslim childhoods in Spain as they navigate a social landscape of difference and belonging. Language socialization studies in the future should examine these multiple sites in which children participate as agents in the culturally significant activities of their community, through the medium of a complex repertoire of linguistic varieties, and mediated by multiple and competing norms, values, and expectations of how to think, speak, and act in the world. Language socialization research must do more to investigate how these activities are situated within broader global/world systems and cultural flows, with multiple ideological frameworks at play across different scales of time and space (Blommaert 2010).

Cross-References

- ▶ [Bi- and Multilingual Family Language Socialization](#)
- ▶ [Heritage Language Learning and Socialization](#)
- ▶ [Language Socialization and Schooling](#)
- ▶ [Language Socialization in Children's Peer and Sibling-Kin Group Interactions](#)
- ▶ [Language Socialization in Francophone Communities](#)
- ▶ [Language Socialization: An Historical Overview](#)
- ▶ [Multilingual Socialization and Education in Non-Western Settings](#)

Related Articles in the Encyclopedia of Language and Education

- Leanne Hinton: [Learning and Teaching Endangered Indigenous Languages](#). In Volume: Second and Foreign Language Learning
- Anna Verschik: [Language Contact, Language Awareness and Multilingualism](#). In Volume: Language Awareness and Multilingualism
- Thomas Ricento: [Researching Historical Perspectives on Language, Education and Ideology](#). In Volume: Research Methods in Language and Education
- Leena Huss: [Researching Language Loss and Revitalization](#). In Volume: Research Methods in Language and Education
- Leanne Hinton: [Language Endangerment and Revitalization](#). In Volume: Language Policy and Political Issues in Education

References

- Augsburger, D. (2004). Language socialization and shift in an Isthmus Zapotec community of Mexico. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.
- Blommaert, J. (2010). *The sociolinguistics of globalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Chick, J. K. (1996). Safe-talk: Collusion in apartheid education. In H. Coleman (Ed.), *Society and the language classroom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Clancy, P. (1986). The acquisition of communicative style in Japanese. In B. Schieffelin & E. Ochs (Eds.), *Language socialization across cultures* (pp. 213–250). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Fader, A. (2009). *Mitzvah girls: Bringing up the next generation of Hasidic Jews in Brooklyn*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Gal, S. (1978). Peasant men can't get wives: Language change and sex roles in a bilingual community. *Language in Society*, 7, 1–16.
- García-Sánchez, I. (2014). *Language and Muslim immigrant childhoods: The politics of belonging*. Malden: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Garrett, P. B. (1999). Language Socialization, convergence, and shift in St. Lucia, West Indies. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, New York University, New York.
- Garrett, P. B. (2003). An "English Creole" that isn't: On the sociohistorical origins and linguistic classification of the vernacular English of St. Lucia. In M. Aceto & J. William (Eds.), *Contact Englishes of the eastern Caribbean* (pp. 155–210). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

- Garrett, P. B. (2005). What a language is good for: Language socialization, language shift and the persistence of code-specific genres in St. Lucia. *Language in Society*, 34, 327–361.
- Garrett, P. B. (2012). Language socialization and language shift. In A. Duranti, E. Ochs, & B. B. Schieffelin (Eds.), *The handbook of language socialization* (pp. 515–535). Malden: Wiley Blackwell.
- Heath, S. B. (1983). *Ways with words: Language life and work in communities and classrooms*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hornberger, N., & Chick, J. K. (2001). Co-constructing school safetime: Safetalk practices in Peruvian and south African classrooms. In M. Heller & M. Martin-Jones (Eds.), *Voices of authority*. Westport: Ablex Publishing.
- Howard, K. (2007). Kinterm usage and hierarchy in Thai children's peer groups. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology*, 17(2), 204–230.
- Howard, K. (2009a). "When meeting Mrs. Teacher each time we should show respect": Standardizing respect in a northern Thai classroom. *Linguistics and Education*, 20(3), 254–272.
- Howard, K. (2009b). Breaking in and spinning out: Repetition and de-calibration in Thai children's play genres. *Language in Society*, 38(3), 339–363.
- Howard, K. (2010). Social relationships and language shift in Northern Thailand. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 14(3), 313–340.
- Howard, K. (2012). "I will be a person of two generations": Temporal perspectives on sociolinguistic change in Northern Thailand. *The International Multilingual Research Journal*, 6(1), 64–78.
- Jaffe, A. (1999). *Ideologies in action: Language politics on Corsica*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- King, K. A., & Fogle, L. (2006). Bilingual parenting as good parenting: Parents' perspectives on family language policy for additive bilingualism. *Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 9(6), 695–712.
- Kulick, D. (1992). *Language shift and cultural reproduction: Socialization, self and syncretism in a Papua New Guinean village*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kulick, D. (1998). Anger, gender, language shift and the politics of revelation in a Papua New Guinean village. In K. A. Woolard & P. V. Kroskrity (Eds.), *Language ideologies: Practice and theory* (pp. 87–102). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Luykx, A. (2003). Weaving languages together: Family language policy and gender socialization in bilingual Aymara households. In R. Bayley & S. R. Schecter (Eds.), *Language socialization in bilingual and multilingual societies*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd..
- Makihara, M. (2005). Rapa Nui ways of speaking Spanish: Language shift and socialization on Easter Island. *Language in Society*, 34, 727–762.
- Moore, L. C. (1999). Language socialization research and French language education in Africa: A Cameroonian case study. *The Canadian Modern Language Review/La Revue Canadienne des Langues Vivantes*, 56, 329–350.
- Moore, L. C. (2006). Changes in folktale socialization in a Fulbe community. *Studies in African Linguistics, Supplement*, 11, 176–187.
- Nonaka, A. (2004). The forgotten endangered languages: Lessons on the importance of remembering from Thailand's Ban Khor sign language. *Language in Society*, 33, 737–767.
- Nonaka, A. (2012). Language socialization and language endangerment. In A. Duranti, E. Ochs, & B. B. Schieffelin (Eds.), *The handbook of language socialization* (pp. 610–630). Malden: Wiley Blackwell.
- Ochs, E. (1988). *Culture and language development*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ochs, E., & Schieffelin, B. B. (1984). Language acquisition and socialization: Three developmental stories. In R. A. Shweder & R. A. LeVine (Eds.), *Culture theory: Essays on mind, self, and emotion* (pp. 276–320). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Paugh, A. L. (2005). Multilingual play: Children's code-switching, role play, and agency in Dominica, West Indies. *Language in Society*, 34, 63–86.
- Paugh, A. L. (2013). *Playing with languages: Children and change in a Caribbean village*. New York: Berghahn.

- Riley, K. C. (2007). To tangle or not to tangle: Shifting language ideologies and the socialization of *charabia* in the Marquesas, French Polynesia. In M. Makihara & B. B. Schieffelin (Eds.), *Consequences of contact: Language ideologies and sociocultural transformations in Pacific societies* (pp. 70–95). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Rumsey, A. (1990). Wording, meaning and linguistic ideology. *American Anthropologist*, 92, 346–361.
- Sandel, T. L. (2003). Linguistic capital in Taiwan: The KMT's Mandarin language policy and its perceived impact on language practices of bilingual Mandarin and Tai-gi speakers. *Language in Society*, 32, 523–551.
- Schieffelin, B. B. (1990). *The give and take of everyday life: Language socialization of Kaluli children*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Schieffelin, B. B. (1996). Creating evidence: Making sense of written words in Bosavi. In E. Ochs, E. Schegloff, & S. Thompson (Eds.), *Interaction and grammar* (pp. 435–460). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Schieffelin, B. B., & Ochs, E. (1986). Language socialization. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 15, 163–191.
- Schieffelin, B. B., Woolard, K., & Kroskrity, P. (Eds.). (1998). *Language ideologies: Practice and theory*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Watson-Gegeo, K. A. (1992). Thick explanation in the ethnographic study of child socialization: A longitudinal study of the problem of schooling for Kwara'ae (Solomon Islands) children. *New Directions for Child Development*, 58, 51–66.
- Watson-Gegeo, K. A., & Gegeo, D. W. (1992). Schooling, knowledge, and power: Social transformation in the Solomon Islands. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly*, 23, 10–29.

Heritage Language Learning and Socialization

Agnes Weiyun He

Abstract

Heritage language learning and socialization take place both at home informally and in the classroom, as well as in other sites. A language socialization (LS) perspective on family/classroom discourse conceptualizes the home and the classroom as meeting places where experts and novices come to negotiate and create multiple, dynamic, and sometimes contradictory knowledge and skills, in addition to values and norms and senses and sensibilities. LS considers the home and the classroom as spaces for that negotiation and co-creation involving many stages through the lifespan. While parents and teachers often act as experts and children and students as novices, the reverse is also possible and perhaps pervasive, especially in the contexts of immigration and language shift. A language socialization perspective considers the home and classroom experience as potential sites to bring about transformative practices and preferences in participants. It is in those moment-by-moment give-and-take situations between the children/students and their parents/teachers that socialization becomes a vivid, lived, family and classroom experience. In other words, in the heritage language home and classroom, socialization takes place both *toward* and *through* constantly and locally reenacted, redefined, and reconstructed meanings of “heritage language and culture.”

In this chapter, I highlight (a) insights from language socialization for our understanding of the processes of heritage language learning and maintenance and of the symbiotic social and cultural processes that accompany heritage languages, (b) the new research questions that HL learning brings to the language socialization paradigm, and (c) current challenges and future directions.

A.W. He (✉)

Stony Brook University, Stony Brook, NY, USA

e-mail: agnes.he@stonybrook.edu

Keywords

Heritage language • Language and identity • Language and culture • Language and socialization

Contents

Introduction	184
Early Developments	185
Major Contributions	188
Challenges and Future Directions	190
Cross-References	192
Related Articles in the Encyclopedia of Language and Education	192
References	192

Introduction

While current scholarship has problematized the notion of “heritage language” both on the basis of “heritage” learners’ own orientations toward such a notion (Blackledge and Creese 2008) and in terms of lifespan development of the “heritage” speaker (He 2011, 2014), the term “heritage language” (hereafter HL) has conventionally referred to an immigrant, indigenous, or ancestral language that a speaker has a personal relevance and desire to (re)connect with (Fishman 1991; Valdés 2001; Wiley 2001). In the USA, Canada, and the UK, the term “heritage language” has often been used synonymously with “community language,” “home language,” “native language,” and “mother tongue” to refer to a language other than English used by immigrants and their children. Accordingly, a heritage speaker is someone who is raised in a home where a nonmainstream language is spoken and who is to some degree bilingual in the home language and in the mainstream language (Valdés 2001, p. 38) but whose home language does not typically reach native-like proficiency in adulthood (Benmamoun et al. 2010). HL speakers have most likely been exposed to the HL since birth and may have used the HL during the initial years in their life and on and off subsequently but have never developed the full range of phonological, morphological, syntactic, pragmatic, and discourse patterns which will enable them to use the HL with the scope and sophistication characteristic of and comparable to native speakers’ usage. Van Deusen-Scholl (2003) characterizes heritage language learners as “a heterogeneous group ranging from fluent native speakers to nonnative speakers who may be generations removed but who may feel culturally connected to a language” (p. 221). She distinguishes heritage learners from learners with a heritage motivation. The former are those who have achieved some degree of proficiency in the home language and/or have been raised with strong cultural connections, while the latter are “those that seek to reconnect with their family’s heritage through language, even though the linguistic evidence of that connection may have been lost for generations” (Van Deusen-Scholl 2003, p. 222).

In this chapter, I follow the definitions proposed by Valdés (2001) and Van Deusen-Scholl (2003) and consider heritage language learners as those who have

an ethnolinguistic affiliation to their heritage but may have a broad range of proficiency in oral or literacy skills. I highlight the following three dimensions: (a) insights from language socialization for our understanding of the processes of heritage language learning and maintenance and of the symbiotic social and cultural processes that accompany heritage languages, (b) the new research questions that HL learning brings to the language socialization paradigm, and (c) current challenges and future directions.

Early Developments

Grounded in ethnography, language socialization, as a branch of linguistic anthropology, focuses on the process of becoming a culturally competent member through language use in social activities. As formulated by Ochs and Schieffelin (Ochs 1996; Ochs and Schieffelin 2008; Schieffelin and Ochs 1986, 1996), language socialization (hereafter LS) is concerned with (1) how novices are socialized to use language and (2) how novices are socialized to be competent members in the target culture through language use. LS is based on the principle that language and culture are reflexively and systematically bound together and mutually constitutive of each other. This approach offers a synthesis between cognitivist and sociocultural approaches that allows a reconsideration of cognition as originating in social interaction and shaped by cultural and social processes, not just mental ones (Watson-Gegeo 2004). LS focuses on the language used by and to novices (e.g., children, language learners) and the relations between this language use and the larger cultural contexts of communication – local theories and epistemologies concerning social order, local ideologies and practices concerning socializing the novices, relationships between the novice and the expert, the specific activities and tasks at hand, and so forth.

Work using LS as a theoretical framework has focused on analyzing the organization of communicative practices through which novices acquire sociocultural knowledge and interactional competence and on the open-ended, negotiated, contested character of the interactional routine as a resource for growth and change (Duranti et al. 2011). In this line of work, both the forms of language (e.g., word order, morphological structure, prosody, orthography, turn-taking patterns) and the sociocultural contexts of language use become important research objects and sites. As an analytical perspective, LS enables us to provide a robust account of the nature of HL learning and HL use; as an everyday practice, language socialization shapes the ends and means of the moment-by-moment interactions through which HL learning and use become possible. For example, drawing on data from community-based weekend Chinese heritage language schools for children and university-level Chinese language classes specifically designed for students with a Chinese heritage background, He (2015) argues that the teaching and learning of heritage literacy itself afford a semiotic space for the participants to negotiate the appropriation, adaptation, or abandonment of heritage culture in the classroom and that emergent and creative language use and language choice in the classroom, in

turn, provide the communicative foundations for continuity and change in participant identities and communities.

Guided by LS, we are able to reconceptualize heritage language development by addressing several key questions. First, what does it mean to know a heritage language? LS considers language acquisition and socialization as an integrated process. Linguistic meanings and meaning making are therefore necessarily embedded in cultural systems of understanding. An account of linguistic behavior must then draw on accounts of culture. Accordingly, to know a heritage language means not merely to have a command of the lexico-grammatical forms in both speech and writing but also to understand or embrace a set of norms, preferences, and expectations that are shared, upheld, and actively promoted by expert members of the community and that relate linguistic structures to context.

Because in the HL context of immigration and globalization these norms undergo constant challenges and changes, existing heritage language socialization research has examined social reproduction as well as social change. For example, Baquedano-López (2001) highlights the sociohistorical dynamics between ethnic, religious, and racial difference in moral education for children in catechism classes called “doctrina” in a church in Los Angeles. Lo (2004) demonstrates how expressions of epistemic stance relate to moral evaluations by looking at cases in which teachers at a Korean heritage language school in the USA claim to read their students’ minds with a high degree of certainty. Lo argues that Korean heritage language learners are socialized to portray their access to the thoughts and sensations of other individuals differently depending upon who these individuals are. If the individuals are perceived as morally worthy, then the access is portrayed as distant; if they are perceived as morally suspect, then the access is presented as self-evident. Fader (2011) shows that socialization into Hasidic morality does not preclude American children and young adults from making conscious moral choices. She posits that language socialization into morality, authority, praising, and shaming must be considered in the context of historical and political changes in these notions over time and space. Li and Zhu (2010) highlight a distinct connection between language socialization and interculturality as evidenced by the use of hybrid language forms and culturally rich, linguistically complex address terms in intergenerational discourse in Chinese heritage language-speaking households in the UK.

Second, how does heritage culture relate to a heritage language? From an LS perspective, heritage language learners’ acquisition of linguistic forms requires a developmental process of delineating and organizing contextual dimensions in culturally sensible ways. A language socialization model views learners as attuned to certain indexical meanings of grammatical forms that link those forms to, for example, the social identities of interlocutors and the types of social events. This model relates a learner’s use and understanding of grammatical forms to complex yet orderly and recurrent dispositions, preferences, beliefs, and bodies of knowledge that organize how information is linguistically packaged and how speech acts are performed within and across socially recognized situations. Just as foreign or second-language learners may have varying degrees of investment in learning across

space and time (Norton 2000), HL learning is often motivated by neither strictly instrumental nor integrative goals; learner motivations are derived not merely from pragmatic or utilitarian concerns but also from the intrinsic cultural, affective, and aesthetic values of the language (Bayley and Schecter 2003; Byon 2003; Doyle 2013; Lee 2002; Tsu 2010). Unlike mother tongue acquisition in a monolingual environment, the HL is in constant competition with the dominant language in the local community. How do HL learners position themselves vis-a-vis mainstream culture/language? With LS, we can examine how different displays of and reactions to certain acts and stances construct different identities and relationships. It also allows us to examine the construction of multiple yet compatible/congruent identities, blended and blurred identities in multilingual, multicultural, immigrant contexts.

Third, what constitutes evidence of learning? LS research has looked for culturally meaningful practices across settings and situations. LS views language acquisition as increasing competence in both the formal and functional potential of language. Within this model, HL learners can be viewed as acquiring repertoires of language forms and functions associated with contextual dimensions (e.g., role relationships, identities, acts, events) over developmental time and across space (He 2006, 2011, 2014). Language socialization has also made a significant contribution to our understanding of language choice, language shift, and the associated intercultural and transcultural adjustments in identities and communities (Zhu 2008). From an LS perspective, the simultaneous existence of two or more languages within a given community invariably entails discursive and social contestation. As new members are socialized to use language, they are socialized into explicit and implicit knowledge of these connotations and nuances as well as the situated preferences in coping with them. For example, they may designate one language to a particular domain or a particular interlocutor or develop proficiency in a particular language as a means of expanding their identity options (or refusing to do so to maintain allegiance to a particular group, community, country, or culture). As heritage language speakers are characteristically engaged in varying degrees of hybrid, syncretic language practices drawing upon their “multi-competence” (Cook 1995), there is sufficient reason to problematize implicit assumptions about the discreteness and boundedness of language systems (Canagarajah 2007; Hornberger 2004). In this context, He (2013) shows that by pushing and breaking perceptible linguistic boundaries, HL speakers celebrate their multi-competence, traverse invisible cultural and identity boundaries, and employ and enjoy both languages at all ages and proficiency levels in transient and transcendent *multi-performances*, which in turn can become a rich resource for heritage language socialization across the lifespan.

The last (but not the least) important question to consider is the route by which HL is acquired and socialized. The transmission of HL takes place in not merely formal settings (e.g., classrooms) but also, and perhaps more importantly, informally (e.g., across generations at homes and in communities) and across the lifespan. Both the propositional contents of messages conveyed in the HL and the ways in which HL is used (e.g., how HL instructors or parents communicate with the HL learner) have a direct impact on how HL learners perceive the language and its associated

culture. Hence, everyday interaction in the classroom and in households plays a crucial role in heritage language acquisition and heritage cultural development. With LS, we may view interaction as language practices which serve as lifelong resources for socializing social and cultural values, identities, and communities. LS foregrounds language use and makes visible the role language plays in constructing the common but complex HL worlds across the lifespan. By focusing on the process, not merely the product, of how learning takes place through everyday discursive practices and interactions between and among all participants over time, LS enables us to grasp HL development in a way that is interdependent with HL speakers' shaping and reshaping of their sociocultural worlds.

As mentioned previously, HL learning and socialization take place both at home informally and in the classroom and other sites. A language socialization perspective on family/classroom discourse does not aim to evaluate teaching or learning by focusing on the parent's/teacher's or the child's/students' verbal behavior independently. Rather, it conceptualizes the home and the classroom as a meeting place of experts and novices who come to negotiate and create multiple, dynamic, and sometimes contradictory knowledge and skills, values and norms, and senses and sensibilities (Kayam and Hirsch 2014; Pillai et al. 2014). It considers the home and the classroom as spaces for that negotiation and co-creation along a series of stages across the lifespan. While parents and teachers often act as the experts and the children and student as novices, the reverse is also possible and perhaps pervasive, especially in the context of immigration and language shift, where the children and students in the HL household and classroom, for example, may well be more expert in the English language than their HL parents and teachers or even possess higher levels of oral proficiency in the HL than their teachers. An LS perspective considers the home and classroom experience as potential sites to bring about transformative practices and preferences in participants. It is in those moment-by-moment give-and-take situations between the children/students and their parents/teachers that socialization becomes a vivid, lived family and classroom experience. In other words, in the HL home and classroom, socialization takes place both *toward* and *through* constantly and locally reenacted, redefined, and reconstructed meanings of "heritage language and culture."

Major Contributions

HL research has also contributed to moving LS forward with its specific new questions and new challenges. The field of HL research has grown significantly over the last decade, both in terms of the richness of the content and in terms of the diversity of research methodologies, parallel to the social turn (Block 2003) and the multilingual turn (Ortega 2014) in the broader field of applied linguistics. Sociocultural factors, which have always held predominant places in the LS paradigm, have become even more foundational and pervasive resources in our exploration of the routes and rates of heritage language development. We continue to ask the following questions:

- What are the decisive factors for the success of HL development and maintenance?
- What is the role of learner attitudes, motivations, and social networks?
- What are the reasons for resistance to or embracement of the HL?
- What is the impact of the political history, geography, demography, and social status of the HL?
- What is the role of classroom cultural and interactional practices in shaping the HL development trajectory?
- What are the factors (e.g., amount of input, years of schooling, parental educational levels, gender) that determine HL learners' literacy development?
- How does the status of the learners' home varieties of their HLs (e.g., various dialects in Chinese, varieties of Spanish) impact their HL development?
- What is the role of language ideologies in HL maintenance or attrition?
- How does HL learning engage learners' identities and expand learners' identity choices?
- What conditions of globalization, cultural and linguistic diversity, and familial/individual aspirations motivate HL learners?
- What role does the HL play in cultural (re)imaginings and identity (re)constructions?

To address these complex questions, qualitative, interactionally enriched ethnography that has characterized LS research continues to be widely employed. Furthermore, in the last decade, efforts have been made to use longitudinal narrative inquiry as a research method to ground the learner's language experience in the context of immigrant lives across generations and across geographies (He 2011, 2014; Pavlenko 2001). There has been an expansion of the contexts and the population that current HL socialization researchers investigate. The research subjects have included not only children in immigrant households but also their parents and grandparents and their peers. The settings have included not only the home but also weekend or evening community language schools, Sunday schools, K-16 HL classrooms, and study-abroad experiences for returnees (e.g., Petrucci (2007); Yang and Wong (2014); Zhang and Slaughter-Defoe (2009)).

Consequently, recent HL research has brought about a re-specification of many constructs central to language socialization.

- *The socializer*: In LS research, the socializer has conventionally been conceptualized as the expert, a constant and steady source of knowledge and expertise. Heritage language socialization (HLS), however, has problematized this notion and drawn our attention to the fact that the socializer may indeed be uncertain, tentative, and in some cases needing guidance and advice. This is a fairly common situation in the context of language socialization in new immigrant households, where the parents and caregivers are in fact novices in terms of the mainstream language and culture.
- *The socializee*: The HL socializee is complex in a number of ways. First, instead of being a completely passive and receptive learner, the socializee exerts a fair

amount of authority and agency. Second, their identities need to be understood with respect to multiple domains, including imagined communities (Kellman 2000), linguistic hegemony and holism (Kramsch 2010), and social class (Lindenfeld and Varro 2008). Wong and Xiao (2010), for example, explore the identity constructions of Chinese HL students from dialect backgrounds. Their experiences in learning Mandarin as a “HL” – even though it is spoken neither at home nor in their immediate communities – highlight how identities are produced, processed, and practiced in our postmodern world. These HL learners face different, and at times difficult, tasks in learning Mandarin, as they live under the influences of two cultural systems with conflicting values and practices. Only a nuanced understanding of the “socializee” can lead to an explanation of how HL learning may engage, transform, and expand learners’ identity options in simultaneously existing multiple speech communities.

- *The goals of socialization:* From an LS perspective, the indexical relationship between language and sociocultural dimensions of language use (including identity) is achieved through a two-step process. Ochs (1990) argues that *affective and epistemological dispositions* are the two contextual dimensions that are recurrently used to constitute other contextual dimensions. Consistent with this line of thought, many researchers have focused on heritage language as intricately woven with learner identity formation or transformation. As stated previously, LS highlights the dual process of socialization to use the language and socialization through language use. In addition to these two, HLS adds a third dimension: the socialization of heritage language ideology (Avineri 2014). In that domain the goal is not the mastery of language skills per se but a metalinguistic awareness of the heritage language and cultural community that embodies both a nostalgia of the past and an aspiration of global citizenry in the future. Similarly, in an ethnographic study of a Punjabi Sikh religious education program in the USA, Klein (2013) examines how different linguistic codes that constitute Punjabi heritage languages are tied to Sikh notions of moral personhood and ethno-religious community. Klein’s analyses of the prayer classes and discussion classes reveal a view of heritage language as moral action that represents and socializes transnational and generational continuity and ethno-religious identification.

Challenges and Future Directions

Given the relatively short history of HL research, the body of work we now have is rich, if not yet focused or coherent. In general, the challenges facing HL research are twofold: the comparability of studies and the continuity among various research endeavors.

A number of empirical studies have documented the various formal and functional aspects of heritage language socialization, as reviewed in the previous sections. These studies are, however, hardly comparable because they deal with different subgroups of HL learners. As HL learners are a heterogeneous population that encompasses learners from a wide range of backgrounds, some studies looked at developmental traits in learners who have minimal proficiency in the HL, whereas

others focused on maintenance issues in the case of highly proficient HL learners, and still others examined both subgroups. This makes it hard for empirical investigations to be replicable and comparable.

Another consequence of HL being a new research area is that researchers (empirical or theoretical) have not yet built productively upon each other's work. In addition to the problem of incomparable data at different language proficiency levels, there is also the issue of comparisons/contrasts between HL socialization in different languages (Armenian, Chinese, Hebrew, Japanese, Korean, Spanish, etc.) and different sites (home, school, church, workplace, etc.). Therefore, scholars need to engage critically with existing (and emerging) theories, models, and empirical research in order to build upon one another's strengths and insights and create a more robust understanding of HLS.

HL socialization research needs to expand its focus from individual language learners to other co-participants as well. It will be important to realize that expert guidance in HL socialization may be from multiple sources and may be conflicting and contested. The HL learner is engaged in multiple speech events in multiple settings for multiple purposes. The learning of an HL, for example, takes place through the learner's interactions with multiple participants including language instructors, parents, grandparents, siblings, and peers, each of whom positions the learner in unique speech and social roles and each of whose reactions and responses to the HL learner help to shape the path of the learner's language development. Future HL socialization research will highlight the co-constructed, interactive nature of HL socialization activities.

Complementarily, future HL research will take a more dialectical, dialogical, and ecological perspective on socialization, in the sense that the process will be viewed as reciprocal. HL learners are not merely passive, uniform recipients of socialization. As the HL learner's allegiances and competencies evolve, the language choices and competencies of their parents, siblings, neighbors, and friends will also change, subsequently and/or concurrently. In other words, it is important to keep in mind that HL learners contribute to the HL socialization process of the very people who socialize them to use the HL. Heritage language learning has the potential to transform all parties involved in the socialization process.

Overall, heritage language research will be increasingly informed by different bodies of disciplinary knowledge, including but not limited to developmental psychology, formal and functional linguistics, linguistic and cultural anthropology, discourse analysis, second-language acquisition, and bilingualism. It can also be expected that heritage language research will contribute to the very disciplines that have served as its source for fundamental theoretical constructs, research methods, units of analysis, etc. For example, heritage language learning provides fertile ground for us to reconsider dichotomous concepts such as native language versus target language, native speech community versus target speech community, instrumental versus integrative motivation, and basic interpersonal communication skills versus cognitive academic language proficiency. Finally, HL research will challenge us to reevaluate our units of analysis from single snapshots of one-on-one, unidirectional interactional processes to trajectories of growth and change over space and time for all participants.

Cross-References

- ▶ [Language Socialization and Schooling](#)
- ▶ [Language Socialization in Latino Communities](#)
- ▶ [Language Socialization: An Historical Overview](#)
- ▶ [The Ecology of Second Language Acquisition and Socialization](#)

Related Articles in the Encyclopedia of Language and Education

- Terrence Wiley: [Policy Considerations for Promoting Heritage, Community, and Native American Languages](#). In Volume: *Language Policy and Political Issues in Education*
- Margaret Gearon: [Community Language Learning in Australia](#). In Volume: *Second and Foreign Language Learning*
- Olga Kagan: [Issues in Heritage Language Learning in the United States](#). In Volume: *Second and Foreign Language Learning*
- Numa Markee: [Understanding the Fuzzy Borders of Context in Conversation Analysis and Ethnography](#). In Volume: *Discourse and Education*
- J. Hellerman and T. Jakonen: [Interactional Approaches to the Study of Classroom Discourse and Student Learning](#). In Volume: *Research Methods and Language and Education*
- B. Norton: [Language, Identity, and Investment in the 21st Century](#). In Volume: *Language Policy and Political Issues in Education*

References

- Avineri, N. (2014). Yiddish: A Jewish language in the diaspora. In T. Wiley, J. Kreeft-Peyton, D. Christian, S. K. Moore, & N. Liu (Eds.), *Handbook of heritage, community, and Native American languages in the United States: Research, educational practice, and policy* (pp. 263–271). New York: Routledge.
- Baquedano-López, P. (2001). Creating social identities through doctrina narratives. In A. Duranti (Ed.), *Linguistic anthropology: A reader* (pp. 343–358). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Bayley, R., & Schecter, S. (Eds.). (2003). *Language socialization in bilingual and multilingual societies*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Benmamoun, E., Montrul, S., & Polinsky, M. (2010). White paper: Prolegomena to heritage linguistics. National Heritage Language Resource Center. <http://www.international.ucla.edu/media/files/HL-whitepaper.pdf>. Accessed 10 Sept 2015.
- Blackledge, A., & Creese, A. (2008). Contesting ‘language’ as ‘heritage’: Negotiation of identities in late modernity. *Applied Linguistics*, 29(4), 533–554.
- Block, D. (2003). *The social turn in second language acquisition*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.
- Byon, A. (2003). Language socialization and Korean as a heritage language: A study of Hawaiian classrooms. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, 16(3), 269–283.

- Canagarajah, S. (2007). Lingua franca, multilingual communities, and language acquisition. *The Modern Language Journal*, 91(S1), 923–939.
- Cook, V. (1995). Multi-competence and the learning of many languages. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, 8(2), 93–98.
- Doyle, C. (2013). To make the root stronger: Language policies and experiences of successful multilingual intermarried families with adolescent children in Tallinn. In M. Schwartz & A. Verschik (Eds.), *Successful family language policy: Parents, children and educators in interaction* (pp. 145–175). Dordrecht: Springer.
- Duranti, A., Ochs, E., & Schieffelin, B. (Eds.). (2011). *The handbook of language socialization*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Fader, A. (2011). Language socialization and morality. In A. Duranti, E. Ochs, & B. Schieffelin (Eds.), *The handbook of language socialization* (pp. 321–340). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Fishman, J. A. (1991). *Reversing language shift: Theoretical and empirical foundations of assistance to threatened languages*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- He, A. W. (2006). Toward an identity-based model for the development of Chinese as a heritage language. *Heritage Language Journal*, 4(1), 1–28.
- He, A. W. (2011). Heritage language socialization. In A. Duranti, E. Ochs, & B. Schieffelin (Eds.), *The handbook of language socialization* (pp. 587–609). Oxford: Blackwell.
- He, A. W. (2013). The world is a collage: Multi-performance by Chinese heritage language speakers. *The Modern Language Journal*, 97(2), 304–317.
- He, A. W. (2014). Heritage language development and identity construction throughout the life cycle. In T. G. Wiley, J. K. Peyton, D. Christian, S. C. K. Moore, & N. Liu (Eds.), *Handbook of heritage, community, and Native American languages in the United States: Research, policy, and educational practice* (pp. 324–332). New York: Routledge.
- He, A. W. (2015). Literacy, creativity, and continuity: A language socialization perspective on heritage language classroom interaction. In N. Markee (Ed.), *Handbook of classroom interaction* (pp. 304–318). Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Hornberger, N. (2004). The continua of biliteracy and the bilingual educator: Educational linguistics in practice. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 7(2&3), 155–171.
- Kayam, O., & Hirsch, T. (2014). Socialization of language through family language policy: A case study. *Psychology of Language and Communication*, 18(1), 53–66.
- Kellman, S. G. (2000). *The translingual imagination*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- Klein, W. (2013). Heritage language socialization and language ideologies in a Sikh education program. *Heritage Language Journal*, 10(1), 36–50.
- Kramsch, C. (2010). *The multilingual subject*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Lee, J. S. (2002). The Korean language in America: The role of cultural identity in heritage language learning. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, 15(2), 117–133.
- Li, W., & Zhu, H. (2010). Voices from the diaspora: Changing hierarchies and dynamics of Chinese multilingualism. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 205, 155–171.
- Lindenfeld, J., & Varro, G. (2008). Language maintenance among fortunate immigrants: The French in the United States and Americans in France. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 189, 115–131.
- Lo, A. (2004). Evidentiality and morality in a Korean heritage language school. *Pragmatics*, 14(2/3), 235–256.
- Norton, B. (2000). *Identity and language learning: Gender, ethnicity and educational change*. Harlow: Pearson Education.
- Ochs, E. (1990). Indexicality and socialization. In J. W. Stigler, R. Shweder, & G. Herdt (Eds.), *Cultural psychology: Essays on comparative human development* (pp. 287–308). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ochs, E. (1996). Linguistic resources for socializing humanity. In J. J. Gumperz & S. L. Levinson (Eds.), *Rethinking linguistic relativity* (pp. 407–437). New York: Cambridge University Press.

- Ochs, E., & Schieffelin, B. (2008). Language socialization: A historical overview. In P. Duff & N. Hornberger (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of language and education* (Language socialization, Vol. 8, pp. 3–15). New York: Springer.
- Ortega, L. (2014). Ways forward for a bi/multilingual turn in SLA. In S. May (Ed.), *The multilingual turn: Implications for SLA, TESOL and bilingual education* (pp. 32–53). New York: Routledge.
- Pavlenko, A. (2001). “In the world of the tradition, I was unimagined”: Negotiation of identities in cross-cultural autobiographies. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, 5(3), 317–344.
- Petrucci, P. (2007). Heritage scholars in the ancestral homeland: An overlooked identity in study abroad research. *Sociolinguistic Studies*, 1(2), 275–296.
- Pillai, S., Soh, W., & Kajita, A. S. (2014). Family language policy and heritage language maintenance of Malacca Portuguese Creole. *Language & Communication*, 37, 75–85.
- Schieffelin, B., & Ochs, E. (1986). Language socialization. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 15, 163–191.
- Schieffelin, B., & Ochs, E. (1996). The microgenesis of competence. In D. Slobin, J. Gerhardt, A. Kyratzis, & J. Guo (Eds.), *Social interaction, social context, and language* (pp. 251–264). Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Tsu, J. (2010). *Sound and script in Chinese diaspora*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Valdés, G. (2001). *Learning and not learning English: Latino students in American schools*. New York: Teacher’s College Press.
- Van Deusen-Scholl, N. (2003). Toward a definition of heritage language: Sociopolitical and pedagogical considerations. *Journal of Language, Identity, and Education*, 2(3), 211–230.
- Watson-Gegeo, K. A. (2004). Mind, language, and epistemology: Toward a language socialization paradigm for SLA. *The Modern Language Journal*, 88(3), 331–350.
- Wiley, T. G. (2001). On defining heritage languages and their speakers. In J. K. Peyton, D. A. Ranard, & S. McGinnis (Eds.), *Heritage languages in America: Preserving a national resource* (pp. 29–36). Washington, DC: Delta Systems/Center for Applied Linguistics.
- Wong, K. F., & Xiao, Y. (2010). Diversity and difference: Identity issues of Chinese heritage language learners from dialect backgrounds. *Heritage Language Journal*, 7(2), 153–187.
- Yang, X., & Wong, K. F. (2014). Exploring heritage language anxiety: A study of Chinese heritage language learners. *The Modern Language Journal*, 98(2), 589–611.
- Zhang, D., & Slaughter-Defoe, D. T. (2009). Language attitudes and heritage language maintenance among Chinese immigrant families in the USA. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, 22(2), 77–93.
- Zhu, H. (2008). Duelling languages, duelling values: Codeswitching in bilingual intergenerational conflict talk in diasporic families. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 40(10), 1799–1816.

Language Socialization Through Textbooks

Xiao Lan Curdt-Christiansen

Abstract

Textbooks, as one of the primary and basic teaching and learning resources in education, provide a cornerstone for knowledge transmission, literacy education, enculturation, and socialization. By their very nature, textbooks contain not only subject knowledge but also social norms and cultural values and ideologies. Although language socialization through textbooks may depend on how they are employed in various contexts, this chapter reviews mainly studies of language textbooks' cultural content as a means of socialization. The chapter starts with a review of the early developments of textbook content used for literacy education in different sociocultural contexts. It then provides a discussion of the major contributions to the field with a focus on cultural knowledge embedded in foreign language textbooks. This is followed by an overview of recent developments in language textbook analysis, including the critical analysis of ideological representations involved in the politics of content selection. Lastly, challenges for the field are outlined, and future directions are indicated as reflected in evolving educational systems and political environments.

Keywords

Critical discourse analysis • Cultural production • Culture • Ideology • Literacy • Socialization • Textbooks

Contents

Introduction	196
Early Developments	196
Major Contributions	199
Socialization Through First-Language and Heritage Language Textbooks	200

X.L. Curdt-Christiansen (✉)
University of Bath, Bath, UK
e-mail: x.l.curd-Christiansen@reading.ac.uk

Socialization Through English Foreign Language (EFL) Textbooks	201
Work in Progress	204
Problems and Difficulties	205
Future Directions	207
Cross-References	208
Related Articles in the Encyclopedia of Language and Education	208
References	208

Introduction

Textbooks, as one of the primary and basic teaching and learning resources in education, provide a cornerstone for knowledge transmission, literacy education, enculturation, and socialization. By their very nature, textbooks contain not only subject knowledge but also social norms, cultural values, and ideologies. Textbooks influence student readers to a high degree with regard to how they perceive and construct various forms of social meaning and may thus help them to be accepted by a given community or society or, alternatively, may position them as “Other” (Apple 1979; Curdt-Christiansen 2008; Duff 2008, 2015). By exposing student readers to culturally and ideologically embedded content knowledge, school textbooks serve as instruments of socialization that are normally designed to help students to become competent members of a cultural and linguistic community.

Socialization through textbooks encompasses almost all disciplines, including history, psychology, sociology, mathematics, and science (Esquinca 2012; Khine 2013). This chapter, however, focuses on textbooks used in the field of language and literacy education with an emphasis on language textbooks’ cultural content as a form and means of socialization. The chapter starts with a review of the early developments of textbooks used for literacy education in different sociocultural contexts. It then provides a discussion of the major contributions to the field with a focus on cultural knowledge embedded in foreign language textbooks. This is followed by an overview of recent developments in language textbook analysis, including critical analyses of ideological representations, and the politics of “selective processes” (Williams 1989) – the selection of what is to be included in textbooks and for what purposes. Lastly, challenges for the field are outlined, and future directions are indicated, reflecting evolving educational systems and political environments.

Early Developments

While a focused study of language socialization through textbooks has not been in the center of language socialization research, the study of socialization through texts has existed for centuries (see Gammage 1982; Gee 1990; Graff 1987). Indeed, as long as both literacy and education have existed, textbooks, in some shape or form, have been used. Textbooks for literacy education have always tended to contain

sociocultural knowledge and ideological beliefs to shape the learners' worldview and socialize them into "socially acceptable" individuals (Gee 1990; Luke 1988). Harvey Graff's (1987) work on the history of literacy, for example, traced the development of universal literacy education in Sweden back to the seventeenth century, after Christianity had been adopted as the state religion. Stimulated by the Reformation and Lutheran Protestantism, Sweden promoted its religious practices through literacy education that was mediated by a textbook – the Bible. It was through studying the Bible that the common citizen learned to read and write, acquired linguistic forms, deciphered the meaning of Christian culture, and decoded religious norms. The Bible served as a handbook for individual households, providing them with religious rules and guidelines for Christian (i.e., moral) behavior. In the process of literacy learning, religious, social, and political ideologies were transmitted, and individuals were inducted into the specific domain of Christianity, socialized into religious beliefs, their social roles, and their identities as Swedes and Christians.

Literacy textbooks containing religious content continue to play a major role in many contemporary societies as well (see chapter ► [“Multilingual Socialization and Education in Non-Western Settings”](#) by Moore, this volume). Luke's (1988) seminal analysis of the beginning readers' textbook, *Fun with Dick and Jane*, revealed an explicit relationship between religious practice and literacy education through textbooks. *Dick and Jane* was a set of basal readers, the most widely selling textbooks employed during the inter- and post-war period in North America. Comprising 33 stories, the textbooks were church-sanctioned and portrayed a “generic, middle class possible world” of North American children (Luke 1988, p. 166). Through discourse analysis, Luke showed how overt and covert ideological underpinnings construct social relations and Christian ethos in these books. Overtly the series was designed to achieve “scientific” goals of reading instruction, as the lexical density and sentence-level syntax were controlled and sequenced to allow reading skills to develop gradually. More covertly, the moral and cultural contents were constructed through narratives and story grammar as Dick and Jane engaged in playing and problem solving with their families and friends. It was under the auspices of playing that “a possible world of seemingly natural social relations, orientations to action, and linguistic and behavioural norms” were established (Luke 1988, p. 173). Luke's study highlighted the important role textbooks play in the institutionalized context of socialization when children try to make meaning with words through the portrayed version of culture, beliefs, and social understandings in a fictional form of reality.

As one of the aims and objectives of schooling is to instill cultural values desired by a given society, textbooks such as *Dick and Jane* were rarely questioned regarding their implicit cultural values and ideological content. Indeed, before the 1970s, knowledge embedded in school curricula was largely regarded as neutral. After the 1970s, researchers began to question the selection of knowledge in school textbooks. Michael Apple, one of the most influential education theorists, asked the critical question: What knowledge and whose knowledge should be included and excluded in schooling? His influential work in *Ideology and Curriculum* (Apple 1979),

Official Knowledge (Apple 1993), and *The Politics of the Textbook* (Apple and Christian-Smith 1991) provided a critical analysis of the hegemonic processes of textbook production. Apple drew particular attention to the dangers of ideological indoctrination in textbooks as a medium of forceful socialization. In a similar vein, Allan Luke reminded us in his books *Literacy, Textbooks, and Ideology* (Luke 1988) and *Language, Authority and Criticism: Readings on the School Textbook* (De Castell et al. 1989) that textbooks contain systematic presentations of ideas, values, and ideologies that serve particular interests and sociopolitical purposes. In other words, textbooks, with their legitimized knowledge, facilitate the processes of socialization in schooling to confirm and conserve existing social roles, norms, and values and thus perpetuate existing social structures.

This critical approach to examining textbook construction and use led to a paradigm shift in language education. As a result, approaches to language teaching as well as textbook content and its analysis have undergone radical changes. While acknowledging that culture and language are inextricably linked, scholars have in recent decades begun to question whose culture should be included, how different cultures should be presented, and what values and ideologies should be promoted (Dendrinos 1992; Kramsch 1987, 1993). Importantly, language educators and scholars began to understand that cultural content in language textbooks plays a powerful role in shaping learner identity and socializing learners into certain ways of acting, doing, and valuing.

Increasing attention to cultural awareness in language teaching prompted language researchers and language teachers to look into whether the role of culture is to assimilate learners into becoming a member of the target language society. The emphasis of textbooks before the 1970s was on teaching the “high culture” – Culture with capital C – of the target language, including the study of literature, art, and music (Kramsch 1987, 1993). In the 1970s, educators began to argue that successful foreign/second language learning should include a more sociological approach to the culture of the target language speakers – culture with a lower-case c – including values, customs, and day-to-day undertakings (Nostrand 1991; Seelye 1974). Nostrand (1991) developed a nine-level model to help learners acquire the feelings, beliefs, and thought processes of target language speakers. Seelye (1974) wrote the first textbook on teaching small “c” culture, entitled *Teaching Culture: Strategies for foreign language educators*.

Kramsch (1993) raised a fundamental question in her book, *Context and Culture in Language Teaching*: “Does cultural competence include the obligation to behave in accordance with the social conventions of a given speech community?” (p. 181). The question called for a re-examination of cultural elements as a means of socializing language learners into competent members of a target language community. In the context of teaching English as a second or foreign language, researchers questioned whether it is valid to talk about a “target language culture,” given that English is a global language, used for wider social and political communicative purposes in various contexts worldwide (Byram 2012; Kumaravadivelu 2008; see chapter ► “[The Ecology of Second Language Acquisition and Socialization](#)” by Steffensen and Kramsch, this volume). Learning English as well as other foreign

languages, thus, should develop learners' inter- or cross-cultural competence in interpreting cultures and ideologies represented in textbooks but not necessarily lead to assimilation.

Dendrinos (1992) took a critical approach to examining culture and ideology in English language teaching (ELT) materials. In her book, *The ELT Textbook and Ideology*, she drew on critical discourse analysis (CDA) as an analytical and theoretical framework to illustrate how gender roles, social norms, and, most importantly, power relations are established through discourse in textbooks. Her analysis of ideologies in ELT materials represents an important strand of study of textbooks in the field of foreign and second language acquisition, because ideologies are typically "organized from a particular point of view" (Hodge and Kress 1993, p. 6) and can have powerful socialization effects on language learners.

As is evident in this brief review, early research in the field of language socialization through textbooks began to question cultural topics in textbooks and the role of culture and ideology in the process of language and literacy acquisition. In the next section, I discuss studies that have contributed to the field with regard to developing cultural awareness through textbook contents, and how language acquisition entails socialization into particular social beliefs and ideological orientations.

Major Contributions

Following Apple's and Luke's critical analyses of textbooks, discussed above, studies of textbooks have been conducted by language educators and linguists from various different language backgrounds – first language, heritage language, and English as foreign/second language. Most of the studies are informed by critical theories of language learning (Fairclough 2001; Pennycook 2001; Williams 1989; Woolard 1998) and guided by discourse analysis and CDA as frameworks for analyzing various types of textbooks.

As part of socialization through education, textbooks not only reflect the goals and purposes in a given curriculum effort, they also embody certain official knowledge that is sanctioned by the authorities. Deciding what knowledge should be included is what Williams (1989) called "the selective tradition":

From a whole possible area of past and present, in a particular culture, certain meanings and practices are selected for emphasis and certain other meanings and practices are regulated or excluded. Yet, within a particular hegemony, and as one of its decisive processes, this selection is presented and usually passed off as 'tradition.' (p. 58)

Williams suggested that the construction of textbooks is a process of ideological selection where the dominant class decides what knowledge and cultural values should be transmitted to successive generations of school children. By serving such pedagogical ends and when used in the classrooms, textbooks function as cultural artifacts and mediational devices in assimilating and socializing children into state-authorized political beliefs and cultural values.

Socialization Through First-Language and Heritage Language Textbooks

When examining textbooks designed for native speakers, such as language arts textbooks, researchers have focused largely on political ideologies embedded in the contents. Liu (2005), for example, studied a set of Chinese language arts textbooks used for primary school children nationwide in China in the 1990s and early 2000s. He focused particularly on the discursive construction of cultural knowledge in these texts. By analyzing narrative structures, story grammar, and textual devices in the textbooks, he pointed out that “the selective versions of cultural values and beliefs are constructed in a manner congruent with the interest of the government and its cultural elite” and “the discourses position the child reader to conform and to be self-restrained and obedient citizens” (Liu 2005, p. 29). By explicitly emphasizing the value of patriotism and compliance and omitting readings that encourage children’s interest and curiosity, the government implicitly socializes children into becoming non-critical thinkers.

Kowalski (2008) studied the representations of linguistic and ethno-cultural diversity in Poland’s national school curricula and textbooks against the background of the European Union’s multi-ethnic and multilingual policy. She found that there was a disjunction between the policy discourse of multicultural education and the reality of education practice regarding ethnic minority representations. Using content analysis, she compared Poland’s pre- and post-1989 education policy, national school curricula, and textbooks to identify the changes in curricular content, discourse, strategies, and ideological goals. The analysis of pre-1989 textbooks revealed that ethno-cultural diversity was portrayed as a threat to national unity, and, as a result, ethnic minorities were characterized as *others*, aliens, even enemies. Although the post-1989 textbooks changed the narratives of minorities as being the source of interethnic conflicts, the representations of minority groups remained “unfavourable, inciting feelings of resentment and distrust” (Kowalski 2008, p. 374). Similarly, Weninger and Williams (2005) analyzed spelling, reading, and literature textbooks from the first and fourth grade in Hungary and noted that minorities received almost no mention in Hungarian school textbooks, and when they were mentioned, it was done in stereotypical ways. These studies suggest that ethnic or national minorities in each case were perceived as cultural “others” that could disrupt social cohesion. Thus, a strong assimilationist ideology underlies the political construction of textbooks.

Research into heritage language textbooks has shown that there is typically a strong alignment of cultural contents with the textbooks used in the students’ ancestral countries. Curdt-Christiansen (2008) studied a set of textbooks used for literacy education of primary school children in a Chinese heritage language school in Montreal, Quebec. Her analysis revealed similar cultural elements in textbooks used in China. Concepts such as obedience, diligence, respect for authorities and elders, modesty, perseverance, and filial piety were found in stories, fairy tales, fables, and other text genres in the textbooks. These texts served as a framework for

providing children with literacy resources, and they also socialized readers into particular practices and values. She highlighted that “becoming literate is a process of becoming a knower of a particular culture,” and “reading the *words* entails a socialization process for Chinese children that includes apprenticing certain ways of acting, doing, valuing and being in the *world*” (Curd-Christian 2008, p. 96, italics in the original).

In the context of heritage language education, textbooks can also provide cultural references for validating learner identities. Leeman and Martinez (2007) examined textbooks for Spanish heritage language learners in the USA from 1979 and 2000. They observed that the ideological orientation in the earlier textbooks emphasized “family knowledge, inheritance, and student ownership of language” (p. 48). However, the representation of Spanish had, according to them, shifted toward a more commodification-oriented ideology in the later textbooks, where Spanish speakers were portrayed as global economic competitors. These texts were therefore being used to socialize students into new roles as resource contributors in the USA.

Socialization Through English Foreign Language (EFL) Textbooks

In recent years, many studies on textbooks of English as a second/foreign language have emerged in association with the role of English in globalization. Although these studies do not directly focus on language socialization, they nonetheless contribute to related discussions by analyzing the appropriateness or inappropriateness of cultural contents, gender, and social roles and overt or covert ideologies in either locally or internationally produced textbooks (Gray 2010; Shin et al. 2011).

As English has become a required subject in many countries over the past several decades, the cultural contents of textbooks have become a contentious topic. What types of culture should be included (Yuen 2011), how cultural groups should be represented (Yamada 2010), and in what ways cultural representation should support the social identities of the learners (Gray and Block 2014) have been major concerns among researchers and education practitioners in English language education.

Auerbach and Burgess’ (1985) study of English as a second language (ESL) materials for newly arrived adult immigrants in the USA and Canada showed that neither the situations depicted nor the communication structures reflected the reality of immigrants’ lives. Typical problems encountered by immigrants, such as employment and communication, were omitted in the texts. For example, in negotiation of housing rentals, texts depicting migrant tenants forced to accept poor conditions were omitted, whereas tenants’ responsibilities for sanitation and upkeep were discussed at length. Critically, immigrant job seekers were portrayed as low-wage workers who had little knowledge of how to dress for interviews and what to write in job applications. The authors argued that the “hidden curriculum” in these materials implicitly socialized immigrants into subservient social roles and emphasized the hierarchical relations between the dominant class and immigrants.

Also studying ESL textbooks used for immigrants in Canada, Gulliver (2011) found that “banal nationalism” was constructed through repetition of the symbols of Canadian identity and established Canadian tropes. Through stories of nationally recognized individuals as well as discussions of maps, currency, nationalized images, geography, routine deixis, and landmarks, student readers were “positioned as those who need to know [the] Canadian facts and values” (p. 121) and socialized into the Canadian way of life, thus facilitating the process of cultural integration and construction of a Canadian identity.

Much research has focused on representations of various types of culture in EFL textbooks. Yuen (2011) studied how foreign cultures were represented in two English language textbooks used by Hong Kong secondary schools. He found that neither the breadth nor the depth of the cultural content reflected the status of English as an international language. Wu’s (2010) study of *College English*, used in Chinese universities, demonstrated that cultural content for developing intercultural competence was largely absent, as small “c” cultural elements in the texts constituted a very small percentage of the total material. Similarly, Lee’s (2009) analysis of Korean high school EFL textbooks showed not only an unbalanced representation of local and western culture but also inequality in the ways in which positive descriptions were used in sentences and paragraphs about non-westerners and westerners. Although we do not have direct evidence of how teachers actually *used* the textbooks in their teaching, these analyses indicate that textbooks are potential means of socialization, providing affordances or constraints for students to become members of the target language community through various linguistic and cultural practices while affirming their own identities. Their engagement with textbooks suggests that the processes of becoming competent English speakers entail ideologically shaped forms of language education that reflect particular beliefs and attitudes toward different cultures.

Another major concern in the field of textbook analysis is gender and social roles as manifested in dialogues and narratives. Studying ESL materials, Sunderland (1992) pointed out that the representation of gender can potentially affect students as language learners and users in three ways:

1. Female characters who play restricted social, behavioral, and linguistic roles are disempowering for female students because they are portrayed with limited cognitive and communicative capacity.
2. The fact that female characters have marginal roles can make female learners feel marginalized, thus demotivated in learning.
3. The gender-biased models of language practice in textbooks can become models of language practice in classrooms, thus socializing language learners into particular gender-based social and linguistic roles.

Such representations of gender have been found in textbooks produced both internationally and locally. Taki (2008) examined ELT textbooks used in Iran. He found that while there were female and male characters projecting social

relationships, such as wife-husband, customer-seller, colleagues, and supervisor-subordinate in internationally produced ELT materials, there was little representation of female characters in locally produced textbooks. He concluded that “not making the social roles of the speakers or their relations in the locally produced ELT textbooks explicitly can also be indicative of a certain ideology” (p. 138). Although his analysis did not emphasize how social relations were presented in a hierarchical order, he highlighted that a “cultureless” language and the absence of females in textbooks can negatively affect female learners’ self-confidence and learner identity, leading to disempowerment.

As technology and publication practices have progressed at an unprecedented pace in recent years, textbooks have been transformed from black and white print to more complex, colorful, multimodal texts. Semiotic analysis of textbooks has not only focused on visual effects on learners but also on interactions between visual images and words as means of socializing (Chen 2010; Weninger and Kiss 2013). Chen’s (2010) study focused on how multimodal resources, such as illustrations and labeling of illustrations and dialogue balloons, co-created meaning for EFL learners in China. Weninger and Kiss (2013) looked at EFL textbooks written by and for Hungarians from critical discourse and social semiotic perspectives. Their analysis focused on how political and cultural ideologies surface in visual and textual content, and how these multimodal resources engendered meaning potential in the classroom. These studies indicate that a semiotic approach to studying cultural meaning potential in textbooks has important implications for learners, as it provides a method that complements research examining cultural representations through either textual or visual content. The interactions between the linguistic structures and visual interpretations take socialization to a different level, making linguistic denotation and cultural connotation more obvious and direct.

With changes in the role of culture in language education, the cultural content in English language teaching has been challenged as either projecting orientalist or essentialist ideologies (Curdt-Christiansen 2015a). Byram and Masuhara (2013) contend that the descriptions of “other cultures” as simplified imply that “there is an underlying common core of values, beliefs and behaviours in a given country” (p. 145). To counter such an essentialist or orientalist view of culture, ESL/EFL textbooks are beginning to incorporate multicultural elements. However, researchers have found that the notion of multiculturalism is biased, and the cultural representations are unbalanced, focusing more on European or western cultures than on those of Asia and Africa (Yamada 2010; Sherman 2010). These representational biases are operationalized by including or excluding countries (Yamada 2010), describing character origins (Wang and Phillion 2009), and showing speaker identities (Sherman 2010). These analyses indicate that the construction of linguistic competence is accompanied by foregrounding speaker identities as native or non-native, male or female, European or non-European. Consequently, learner identity is associated with and shaped by culturally biased views toward what native or non-native, male or female, and European or non-European speakers say and do.

Work in Progress

The study of socialization through textbooks has expanded and evolved steadily over the last several decades. While most of the studies appear in journals of English language teaching and learning with a focus on textual analysis, a few edited volumes and books are available that deal directly or indirectly with language socialization. These include a monograph by Gray (2010) and edited volumes by Harwood (2014) and Curdt-Christiansen and Weninger (2015). The work of these scholars is characterized by three major theoretical and methodological trends.

The first is their critical view on the role of textbooks in socializing learners into a particular worldview. Their work pays particular attention to the current political and economic climate, and they consider globalization an important part of their critical evaluation of the teaching materials. For instance, in studying four recent and not so recent bestselling EFL textbooks, Gray (2010) found that while there was gradual progression toward multiculturalism and cosmopolitanism in the texts, there was also a discourse of consumerism and aspiration to succeed that students were being socialized into. He and his colleagues (Gray 2010; Gray and Block 2014) argued that commercially produced ELT textbooks overwhelmingly focus on consumerism and the lifestyles of a cosmopolitan middle class that celebrates a neoliberal ideology. The worldwide connections seem to have created a group of global people with common middle class traits and aligned identities (Gray and Block 2014).

The second trend is the increasing number of studies that examine the cultural content and ideologies in textbooks, covering not only those in different geopolitical contexts for different levels of English learners but also textbooks of various other languages in different countries. In their edited book *Language, Ideology and Education: The Politics of Textbooks in Language Education*, Curdt-Christiansen and Weninger (2015) questioned the underlying purpose of language education by examining textbooks covering a variety of other languages, such as Chinese, Arabic, Spanish, Hebrew, and Japanese. Setting out to uncover the ideological underpinnings, the authors looked into how semiotic tools and textual devices, such as the voices of imagined characters, serve as socialization agents in the disparate educational contexts of the contributing authors – in Asia, Europe, America, and the Middle East and in countries such as Columbia, Singapore, Israel, Greece, and the USA. The authors highlighted that “learning a language, whether dominant or non-dominant, is an ideological engagement; representations and ways of being made available to learners . . . position learners *vis-à-vis* the worlds they encounter through languages” (Curdt-Christiansen and Weninger 2015, p. 1).

The third trend involves examining cultural content for developing intercultural awareness and intercultural competence (Byram 2012). Against the backdrop of recent developments in transnational, multilingual and sociopolitical environments, this move has brought to the forefront the notion of culture as a fluid, changing, adaptable, and plural construct. Curdt-Christiansen (2015b), for instance, explored cultural dimensions and their related representations in EFL primary textbooks in China. She identified competing ideologies between cultural globalization and local context and, as a result, conflicts between traditional culture and global culture. She

argued that language teaching through textbooks is not an innocent educational activity as it involves socialization practices. Byram and Masuhara (2013) also contend that socialization practices have “underlying assumptions we have about what is ‘right’ or ‘wrong’” (p. 147). Therefore, language learning through textbooks may invoke interpretations and misinterpretations of what are considered the “right” ways to think, feel, and behave. While textbooks represent culturally recognized and socially accepted official knowledge that may socialize students into ideologically shaped ways of being in the world, it is important to juxtapose different cultural and ideological perspectives and to understand that cultural values are socially constructed. In this regard, Curdt-Christiansen (2015b) argues that studying a language “should take into consideration the complex and conflicting nature of language education to develop students’ critical language awareness and foster their critical analytical abilities” (p. 89). In this sense, language learners are not passive receivers of socialization endeavors, but active agents involved in a dynamic system of socialization through language learning experiences (see Future Directions below).

Problems and Difficulties

Decades of research into language teaching have shown that textbooks can play an important role in language socialization, both in formal educational contexts and out-of-classroom situations, because they serve as primary sources for literacy education in national language learning contexts and are possibly the only materials for foreign language education in many parts of the world (Harwood 2014; Curdt-Christiansen and Weninger 2015). While this area of research has continued to grow, several challenges remain.

Firstly, most research into textbook analysis explores the sociocultural knowledge embedded in texts and the influential roles it plays for student learners. However, this socialization role, as Kalmus (2004) observes, is largely implicit. As socialization often takes place through textual experiences in social interactions, it is important to know how textbooks are used or mediated by teachers and others, what cultural knowledge has been transmitted, and how students react to the content of the texts. For the past decades, most of the textbook research has focused on textual analysis, granting texts the power to project meaning onto learners. While texts do potentially exert a socializing influence on learners, just as TV and mass media have an influence on children, it is the interpretive processes through discussion in classrooms or other forms of engagement with such texts that provide evidence of actual language socialization. However, only a few studies have examined how teachers and students construct meaning through textbooks.

Tok (2010) conducted a textbook evaluation from teachers’ perspectives. Although the study focused on teachers, there is very little information about how teachers perceive the role of textbooks in socialization. Horii’s (2015) study of English textbooks (*Eigo Nooto*) used in Japanese primary schools also looked at teachers’ interpretations. She pointed out that, although teachers were aware of the

power of cultural socialization, they had little space and time to go beyond what the textbooks offered to provide students with in-depth interpretations of different cultures involved in multicultural education.

Equally important is the view from the students in terms of how they perceive the textbooks as socialization agents and how they accept or reject these messages or incorporate them into their existing beliefs, values, and ideologies. As students come from different social, ethnic, and cultural backgrounds with various previous socialization experiences, they may have vastly different interpretations of the same text. Acknowledging that school textbooks tend to offer much less space for “open-ended” meaning-making, critical textual analysis may assume that student readers are passive recipients of socialization and therefore have little voice in projecting agentive positions in textbook interpretations. This observation suggests that the study of textbooks as socialization media should take into account the relationships between the text, the individual students, and the social context within which the text is used as well as the results of those interactions.

The second and related challenge concerns how to record socialization processes and provide concrete evidence of socialization. In other words, analysis of socialization should focus on both the content of the textbooks and the process by which students acquire (or contest) knowledge, values, beliefs, and attitudes from those texts. In Kalmus’ (2004) words, research on textbook socialization should take the form of “audience-cum-content analysis, with its distinction between potential and actualised meaning” (p. 474) or between the “virtual” and the “realized” text (Eco 1979).

The realization of the abovementioned analysis, thus, involves ethnographic classroom studies that focus on how textbooks are used in classrooms. Duff (2009) studied classroom discourse to understand how teachers and students established rules for participation as part of school-based socialization. She studied a social studies class in a Canadian high school where the teacher socialized students through particular types of feedback into what they considered appropriate behavior in educational contexts, such as being quiet and attentive. Although the choice of relevant current events from news media (i.e., suitable types of newspaper or related texts for in-class presentation and discussion in relation to social studies) was often commented on by teachers in the context of students’ presentations on current events, the study did not deal directly with socialization through the official course textbook.

The final, related challenge concerns textbook research methodology. For the past decades, as noted above, most research has centered on textbook analysis where researchers provide critical scrutiny of texts that represent certain cultural groups and highlight the crucial role of textbooks as instruments of ideology and socialization. Weninger and Kiss (2015) note that there are three main methodological approaches: the prevailing content analysis approach, a critical discourse analysis approach, and a multimodal analytical approach. While these approaches have shed much light on how culture is conceptualized and what potential role it plays in language education, they rely heavily on a priori categories. Given that culture is fluid, changing, and

adaptable, and new forms and new ways of cultural representation emerge with rapidly changing digital technology, an interdisciplinary approach to textbook research and socialization is needed. As such, textbook research is not only about counting the number of cultural categories or the potential effects on student learners; rather, it is about how teachers and students make sense of these cultural elements and how their sense-making is an ongoing dialectical and dynamic process and a continuous interaction between texts and individuals.

Future Directions

The study of language socialization emphasizes the role of language in use as the primary medium through which culture is represented, interpreted, and transformed. To enhance our understanding of the textbook as another medium of socialization requires a systematic observation across different contexts of how students interpret, accept, reject, and transform the textbook ideologies in constructing their own knowledge. Rivers (1968), for example, reminded us almost five decades ago that “the importance of the textbook cannot be overestimated. It will inevitably determine the major part of the classroom teaching and the students’ out-of-class learning” (p. 475).

As Duff (2008) succinctly points out, “Research that examines the intertextuality, interdiscursivity, and hybridity of language practices to a greater extent will also complement existing studies” (p. 268) in language socialization. Thus, interdisciplinary research into how individuals use and transform different cultural knowledge acquired through textbooks (and other media) in their daily lives will be welcome. Ethnographic studies, for example, can reveal not only how individuals react to different ideological perspectives in classrooms but also how they use acquired linguistic and cultural knowledge outside schools. Classroom observational studies, observational studies across different academic subjects, and individual case studies, methods typically used in other domains of language socialization research, will yield important insights into the social, cognitive, and discursive complexities of ideologically shaped ways of being in the world.

Finally, the constant evolution of political and cultural environments surrounding the production and use of textbooks requires researchers to work closely with educators and textbook writers to understand some of these tensions and factors. The nature of textbook content often entails competing ideologies between cultural globalization and local context. Reconciling these ideological conflicts requires educators and textbook writers to “[become] aware of assumptions, values and attitudes of self and others beneath utterances and behaviours” (Byram and Masuhara 2013, p. 151). There is an urgent need for researchers to look into how textbook research can develop students’ as well as educators’ intercultural awareness and their ability to understand diverse cultures and their role in the (re)production of cultural knowledge.

Cross-References

- ▶ [Heritage Language Learning and Socialization](#)
- ▶ [Language Socialization and Schooling](#)
- ▶ [Language Socialization, Language Ideologies, and Language Shift Among School-Aged Children](#)
- ▶ [Multilingual Socialization and Education in Non-Western Settings](#)
- ▶ [The Ecology of Second Language Acquisition and Socialization](#)

Related Articles in the Encyclopedia of Language and Education

- Thomas Ricento: [Researching Historical/Political Perspectives on Language, Education and Ideology](#). In Volume: Research Methods in Language and Education
- Ingrid de Saintes-George: [Researching Media, Multilingualism and Education](#). In Volume: Research Methods in Language and Education
- David Bloome and SangHee Ryu: [Literacies in the Classroom](#). In Volume: Literacies and Language Education
- Janet Soler: [The Politics of the Teaching of Reading](#). In Volume: Literacies and Language Education
- Rebecca Rogers: [Critical Discourse Analysis in Education](#). In Volume: Discourse and Education
- Peter Freebody: [Critical Literacy Education: ‘The Supremely Educational Event’](#). In Volume: Literacies and Language Education
- Silvia Valencia Giraldo: [Talk, Texts and Meaning-making in Classroom Contexts](#). In Volume: Discourse and Education

References

- Apple, M. W. (1979). *Ideology and curriculum*. New York: Routledge Falmer.
- Apple, M. W. (1993). *Official knowledge: Democratic education in a conservative age*. New York: Routledge.
- Apple, M. W., & Christian-Smith, L. K. (Eds.). (1991). *The politics of the textbook*. London: Routledge.
- Auerbach, E. R., & Burgess, D. (1985). The hidden curriculum of survival ESL. *TESOL Quarterly*, 19, 475–495.
- Byram, M. (2012). Language awareness and (critical) cultural awareness – Relationships, comparisons and contrasts (The Eric Hawkins Lecture). *Language Awareness*, 21(1), 5–13.
- Byram, M., & Masuhara, H. (2013). Intercultural competence. In B. Tomlinson (Ed.), *Applied linguistics and materials development* (pp. 143–157). London: Bloomsbury.
- Chen, Y. (2010). Exploring dialogic engagement with readers in multimodal EFL textbooks in China. *Visual Communication*, 9(4), 485–560.
- Curdt-Christiansen, X. L. (2008). Reading the world through words: Cultural themes in heritage Chinese language textbooks. *Language and Education*, 22(2), 95–113.
- Curdt-Christiansen, X. L. (2015a). Ideological and cultural hegemony in lower primary English teaching materials in Singapore. In X. L. Curdt-Christiansen & C. Weninger (Eds.), *Language*,

- ideologies and education: The politics of textbooks in language education* (pp. 129–144). London/New York: Routledge.
- Curdt-Christiansen, X. L. (2015b). Striking a balance: Cultural conflicts or cultural adaptation. *Journal of European Applied Linguistics and TEFL*, 4(2), 73–92.
- Curdt-Christiansen, X. L., & Weninger, C. (Eds.). (2015). *Language, ideologies and education: The politics of textbooks in language education*. London/New York: Routledge.
- De Castell, S., Luke, A., & Luke, C. (Eds.). (1989). *Language, authority and criticism: Readings on the school textbooks*. New York: Falmer Press.
- Dendrinos, B. (1992). *The EFL textbook and ideology*. Athens: Grivas Publications.
- Duff, P. (2008). Language socialisation, higher education and work. In P. A. Duff & N. H. Hornberger (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of language and education, Language socialisation* (Vol. 8, 2nd ed., pp. 257–270). New York: Springer.
- Duff, P. (2009). Language socialisation in a Canadian secondary school: Talking about current events (take 1). In R. Barnard & M. Torres-Guzmán (Eds.), *Creating classroom communities of learning: International case studies and perspectives* (pp. 165–185). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Duff, P. (2015). Foreword. In X. L. Curdt-Christiansen & C. Weninger (Eds.), *Language, ideologies and education: The politics of textbooks in language education* (pp. xi–xiv). London/New York: Routledge.
- Eco, U. (1979). *The role of the reader*. Bloomington: University of Indiana Press.
- Esquinca, A. (2012). Tranfronterizos' socialization into mathematical discourse: Capitalizing on language and cultural resources or caught between conflicting ideologies? *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 15(6), 669–686.
- Fairclough, N. (2001). *Language and power*. Harlow: Longman.
- Gammage, P. (1982). *Children and schooling: Issues in childhood socialisation*. London: George Allen & Unwin.
- Gee, J. (1990). *Sociolinguistics and literacies*. London: Taylor & Francis.
- Graff, H. J. (1987). *The legacies of literacy: Continuities and contradictions in western culture and society*. Bloomington: University of Indiana Press.
- Gray, J. (2010). *The construction of English: Culture, consumerism and promotion in the ELT global coursebook*. London: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Gray, J., & Block, D. (2014). All middle class now? Evolving representations of the working class in the neoliberal era: The case of ELT textbooks. In N. Harwood (Ed.), *English language teaching textbooks: Content, consumption, production* (pp. 45–71). Basingstoke/New York: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Gulliver, T. (2011). Banal nationalism in ESL textbooks. *Canadian Journal of Education/Revue canadienne de l'éducation*, 34(3), 119–135.
- Harwood, N. (Ed.). (2014). *English language teaching textbooks: Content, consumption, production*. Basingstoke/New York: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Hodge, R., & Kress, G. (1993). *Language as ideology*. New York: Routledge.
- Horii, S. (2015). Creating a multilingual/multicultural space in Japanese EFL: A critical analysis of discursive practices within a new language education policy. In X. L. Curdt-Christiansen & C. Weninger (Eds.), *Language, ideologies and education: The politics of textbooks in language education* (pp. 145–162). London/New York: Routledge.
- Kalmus, V. (2004). What do pupils and textbooks do with each other?: Methodological problems of research on socialisation through educational media. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 36(4), 469–485.
- Khine, M. (Ed.). (2013). *Critical analysis of science textbooks: Evaluating instructional effectiveness*. New York/London: Springer.
- Kowalski, E. (2008). Representations of linguistic and ethnocultural diversity in Poland's education policy, national school curricula and textbooks. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 29(5), 364–379.
- Kramsch, C. (1987). Foreign language textbooks' construction of foreign reality. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 44(1), 95–119.

- Kramersch, C. (1993). *Context and culture in language teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kumaravadivelu, B. (2008). *Cultural globalization and language education*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Lee, I. (2009). Situated globalization and racism: An analysis of Korean high school EFL textbooks. *Language & Literacy, 11*(1), 1–14.
- Leeman, J., & Martinez, G. (2007). From identity to commodity: Ideologies of Spanish in heritage language textbooks. *Critical Inquiry in Language Studies, 4*(1), 35–65.
- Liu, Y. B. (2005). The construction of cultural values and beliefs in Chinese language textbooks: A critical discourse analysis. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education, 26*(1), 15–30.
- Luke, A. (1988). *Literacy, textbooks and ideology*. London: Falmer Press.
- Nostrand, H. L. (1991). Basic intercultural education needs breadth and depth. In I. E. S. Silber (Ed.), *Critical issues in foreign language instruction* (pp. 131–159). New York: Garland.
- Pennycook, A. (2001). *Critical applied linguistics*. Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Rivers, W. M. (1968). *Teaching foreign-language skills*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Seelye, H. N. (1974). *Teaching culture: Strategies for foreign language educators*. Skokie: National Textbook.
- Sherman, J. C. (2010). Uncovering cultural bias in EFL textbooks. *Issues in Applied Linguistics, 18*(1), 27–53.
- Shin, J., Eslami, Z. R., & Chen, W.-C. (2011). Presentation of local and international culture in current international English-language teaching textbooks. *Language, Culture & Curriculum, 24*, 253–268. doi:10.1080/07908318.2011.614694.
- Sunderland, J. (1992). Gender in the EFL classroom. *ELT Journal, 61*(1), 81–91.
- Taki, S. (2008). International and local curricula: The question of ideology. *Language Teaching Research, 12*(1), 127–142.
- Tok, H. (2010). TEFL textbook evaluation: From teachers' perspectives. *Educational Research and Review, 5*(9), 508–517.
- Wang, Y., & Phillion, J. (2009). Minority language policy and practice in China: The need for multicultural education. *International Journal of Multicultural Education, 11*(1), 1–14.
- Weninger, C., & Kiss, T. (2013). Culture in English as a foreign language (EFL) textbooks: A semiotic approach. *TESOL Quarterly, 47*(4), 694–716.
- Weninger, C., & Kiss, T. (2015). Analyzing culture in foreign/second language textbooks: Methodological and conceptual issues. In X. L. Curdt-Christiansen & C. Weninger (Eds.), *Language, ideologies and education: The politics of textbooks in language education* (pp. 50–66). London/New York: Routledge.
- Weninger, C., & Williams, J. P. (2005). Cultural representations of minorities in Hungarian textbooks. *Pedagogy, Culture and Society, 13*(2), 159–180.
- Williams, R. (1989). Hegemony and the selective tradition. In S. C. De Castell, A. Luke, & C. Luke (Eds.), *Language, authority and criticism: Readings on the school textbook* (pp. 56–60). London: Falmer Press.
- Woolard, K. (1998). Language ideology as a field of inquiry. In B. Schieffelin, K. Woolard, & P. Kroskrity (Eds.), *Language ideologies: Practice and theory* (pp. 3–49). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Wu, J. (2010). A content analysis of the cultural content in the EFL textbooks. *Canadian Social Science, 6*(5), 137–144.
- Yamada, M. (2010). English as a multicultural language: Implications from a study of Japan's junior high schools' English language textbooks. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development, 31*(5), 491–506.
- Yuen, K.-M. (2011). The representation of foreign cultures in English textbooks. *ELT Journal, 65*(4), 458–466.

Part IV

**Language Socialization Among Adolescence
and Adults**

Language Socialization in the Learning Communities of Adolescents

Shirley Brice Heath

Abstract

Adolescents appear rarely in research on language socialization taking place in communities of any type. Yet, when researchers look closely and connect with adolescents in their daily lives, deep language habits come about through friendships and peer interactions. Moreover, such socialization contexts for young people stretch back to the Middle Ages and will surely move into the future. Why? Voluntary learning, or picking up skills and information identified by the young as vital to their interests, means gaining new words and ways of talking and thinking. Since formal schooling, particularly during the adolescent years, has come to be regarded as of little practical use by many of these learners, they increasingly seek other sources of information and skills. Driving this search are the interests and self-perceived and friend-affirmed talents of the young. Learning to play the guitar, successfully carry out special moves in sports, or devise ways to make peers laugh depends on taking in nuanced ways of representing the world. Researchers have much to learn from adolescent language socialization, but as scholars do so, they must respect the young and work to gain their trust and confidence. As they do so, scholars will find that adolescents quickly become curious about how and why adults genuinely feel they need to learn from the young in their communities of voluntary learning. Methods, largely shared with and sometimes carried out by the young in collaboration with researchers, must be nonintrusive, open to review by the young, and honest about motivations behind the research.

Keywords

Adolescents • Middle Ages • Voluntary learning • Adolescent language socialization • Learning communities • Youth culture • Youth language • Friendship groups • Gangs • Arts-based community organizations • Identity

S.B. Heath (✉)
Stanford University, Stanford, CA, USA
e-mail: sbheath@stanford.edu

Contents

Introduction	214
Early Exemplars	216
Major Contributions	218
Home and School Studies	218
Peer-Centered Identity Groupings	219
Community Organizations	219
Work in Progress	221
Problems and Difficulties	221
Future Directions	222
Cross-References	223
Related Articles in the Encyclopedia of Language and Education	223
References	223

Introduction

Throughout history, learning communities have generally come and gone with little public notice. They emerge from the impetus of groups of individuals who identify specific needs for certain times and places. Learning communities differ in fundamental ways from institutions, which are cross-generational persistent entities, such as state systems or governments, religions, the family, and formal schools. Institutions, by their very nature, commit to basic maintenance of the status quo – that is, standardized language, process, and ideology. Thus all institutions have as core responsibilities the transmission of certain values and bodies of knowledge as well as the orderly succession of their core structures and functions. For at least two millennia, societies have sustained their belief in the necessity of a core set of institutions – government, religion, family, and education.

But institutions leave gaps – especially when it comes to meeting the socialization needs of the young in rapidly changing societies. Institutions cannot manage the speed of adaptation and degree of flexibility that learning communities provide. Every age group from infancy through the final years of life provides unique challenges in socialization – particularly in language and interactional needs. Most notably, middle childhood (generally from age 8 through 12) and the adolescent and young adult years from 13 into the early 20s present special challenges. Maturation change comes rapidly along with the certainty of alterations in relationships of the young with key institutions – most notably the family, state, and formal education.

In this review, I first consider the history of youth learning communities back to the Middle Ages. This brief review sets up the framework through which I then examine a sampling of contemporary learning communities drawn from various parts of the world (cf. Amit-Talai and Wulff 1995). All of these include young learners between the ages of 8 and the early 20s – a span of years in which speakers develop language primarily to explore and to expand their identities and roles. They do so while gradually separating from the care-giving of families and preparing for responsibilities imposed on them by the state, families, schools, and in many cultures by religion as well. In most societies, the state expects the young to engage

in formal schooling during these years, as well as to prepare for betrothal, marriage, and procreation plus civic and work responsibilities (including military service in some cases).

The various types of learning involved in such preparation call on highly specific and critical skills for both the production and reception of language. Within sociology and the public media, learning communities generally receive descriptors such as informal, nonformal, or nonconventional. What goes on within these groups may be termed indirect or informal learning. Such dichotomous labels set these communities apart from formal learning environments generally characterized by specific role assignments, hierarchical structures, and time and space boundaries. Moreover, learning communities of young people do not fit easily into transmission models in which teaching and learning stand apart, and the inheritance of a parent culture is assumed. Throughout this review, the perspective is that of a linguistic anthropologist concerned primarily with what happens in communities of learners rather than with how they adhere to structural arrangements – formal or informal – that mark institutions.

Youth learning and what is popularly termed “youth culture” depend not only on oral production and reception of language, but also on embodied performance – particular ways of walking, using hand signals, or emphasizing the spoken word through gesture and posture. Furthermore, youth culture not only represents itself but is represented through multiple modes (e.g., film, video, dance, music, etc.; cf. Kress 2002; Ross and Rose 1994; Shary 2002). The dialogic basis of Rap music, as well as much popular music across cultures, portrays numerous features of youth language. These include: direct quotation, marked intonation, and repetition of key phrases. In many ways, the music to which adolescents and young adults around the world find themselves drawn today incorporates features long identified also with the narrative and dialogic (teller and listener) renderings of folk music, jazz, blues, and chants.

It is also the case that across widely divergent cultures, peer socialization among the young is marked by mixed genres and overlapping multiparty talk. Examples include: reflections of child soldiers in Sierra Leone (Shepler 2005); the South African gestural language accompanying Tsotital (the youth vernacular of townships, Brookes 2000); and the teenage language of aboriginal teenagers in Australia (Kral and Heath 2013; Langlois 2004; Schmidt 1985).

Across cultures, those from 8 years of age forward spend most of their out-of-school time with peers engaged in play and work. Their social interactions and inner voicings call for syntactic forms and genres to support self-monitoring, negotiating, building plans, and assessing contexts, individuals, and information. Of themselves and others, they ask the essential questions “who am I?,” “where do I belong?,” “how will I make my way into the future?,” and “to what and to whom will I be committed?” Their language changes in pronunciation, syntax, intonation, and vocabulary in line with their self-perception of identity (Eckert 1988, 1989, 2000; Mendoza-Denton 1999), as do their styles of swearing (Schworm 2006).

Their learning communities spring directly from the social interactional needs of the young, but this common need does not predict their form or activity focus. Some youth-based learning communities reflect tight organizational structures and political

goals. Consider, for example, the South African township student defense units that formed in the 1980s during the most violent years of the apartheid era in South Africa. Other groups, such as vigilante groups, guerilla or rebel forces, or youth gangs, reflect varying degrees of structure and image of common good in their operations, activities, and manner of identifying themselves to outsiders. Though slightly different in purpose, all these groups use language in similar ways to orient new members and to contain and construct new identities. Varieties of youth learning communities range from highly governed and adult-directed (e.g., baseball teams, choral groups, community service organizations, etc.) to loose and short-lived (e.g., temporarily “favorite” activities, such as DJing). Whether for positive or negative social ends, youth learning communities work to ensure that their members learn the modes, information, skills, and ways of working of value to individual self-identity (Fine 1987; Mahiri 1998, 2004). Of equal importance and often surprisingly similar to the “informal” orientations into membership used in the aforementioned groups stand the socialization practices that address newcomers into professions such as law or medicine (e.g., McFarlane 2010, chapter 2). Language socialization becomes critical when such professions undergo change as a result of governmental shifts or economic swings that call for new roles with these professions.

Early Exemplars

Throughout human history, most learning communities composed largely of the young have disappeared without a trace except in the memories of those who took part. As far back as the Crusades, when widows of the soldiers who died in battle joined with indigent women and girls of the countryside to create communities caring for the sick, needy, and orphaned, learning communities have included odd assortments of members. Many of the earliest of such groups came into being not only to serve charitable ends without profit, but also to take advantage of and to profit from niche markets and vulnerabilities in the social fabric (Watt 1997).

Evidence of the language and thought of these groups comes in the stories told by traveling bards who depended on the likes of Robin Hood and his band of young men for the stuff of good tales. As commerce, industry, and exploration spread on land and sea in the eleventh and twelfth centuries, more and more occupations included learning communities of young people who directly experienced increasingly technical lines of work (Constable 1996). All of these depended on specialized language and representations of symbol systems, from navigation and cartography to illustrated manuscripts and books. Moreover, almost all their learning had to come from observation and trial and error with relatively little explication of process or norms. Bands of travelers, including young people, moved about the countryside, and glimpses of interactions within these groups come in books such as *The Decameron*, by Giovanni Boccaccio (1348–1351), and *Canterbury Tales*, by Geoffrey Chaucer (1342–1400).

Once paper, printing, and publishing came about, young people working on the margins of these businesses had opportunities to expand their experiences with

visual and verbal literacies. As illuminated manuscripts were replaced by illuminated books, the young served as apprentices, and they often introduced themselves and their ideas into the vignettes or borders of the books on which they worked. Histories and analyses of illustration leave no doubt that as young apprentices were left to complete these books, they added their own flourishes, grotesque animals and figures, and picture stories within the backgrounds of scenes or curls of letters of the alphabet (Watson 2003). These “extras” often provided counter messages to those of the straight or sanctioned text. Today they give some evidence of the talents and tastes of the young for subverting authoritative voices and using visual means to do so.

As production of paper spread across Europe from China, young people – copists and students learning together – were needed to copy books for authorized university book dealers, called stationers. These stationers later became booksellers, and their ability to offer paper manuscripts to the public, especially in cities such as Paris and London, relied on the speed of these young copists (Clanchy 1979).

With the invention of movable type in the midfifteenth century, the printing press trade rapidly increased their intake of apprentices who formed their own learning communities in the back of print shops all over Europe. Widening intellectual interests, the rise of universities, and the rapid increase of urban populations called for more and more books. Advertising came about, in part to help sell printers’ left-over books; as the arts expanded from urban centers to small towns, broadsheets and eventually programs and dramatic scripts were in demand. The spread of theater from urban centers to regional markets depended on young male actors in their early teens, highly desired for their abilities to portray women on the stage.

Shakespeare’s plays (much complemented in the minds of filmgoers who saw *Shakespeare in Love* in the late 1990s) tell not only of the wandering young but also give numerous indications of the skills called upon from the young “strays” who hung around the bustling and active public theaters of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Public records multiplied in detail and quantity with the expansion of towns as market centers, and young people, unaccounted for and often unaccountable to any institutions, figure increasingly in these accounts.

Meanwhile, governmental, legal, and accounting matters continued to require production of books and paper for their records. Throughout the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, shipping of goods and expansion of exploration brought new demands and increased specialized interests, such as cartography and botanical drawing, both of which drew the young in once again as copists and gradually as typesetters and binders. Formal schooling during these periods became available only slowly and then to the male privileged. Aside from convents and nunneries, opportunities for females to take part in any kind of formal schooling came about only well into the eighteenth century. Particularly for the West, literary writers and public records increasingly opened up to historians’ tales of youth learning communities exploited by adults for petty crime (recall Charles Dickens’ tales) and laboring in apprentice-like groups in a widening range of economic ventures. Here, as in the Middle Ages, histories of the expansion of literacy, commerce, and industry indicate a reliance on learning communities of young people working under the direction and

often the exploitation of adults with primarily their own economic interests in mind (Darnton 1984; Eisenstein 1979).

Scanty as these early accounts are, several features of language socialization contexts emerge that we find also in contemporary situations. Foremost is the persistent involvement of the young in activities linked to reading, writing, and representing information for transport across time, space, and audiences. Next are the take-risks-to-survive engagements of the young in learning communities, whether as tagalongs to charity or pilgrim groups, or as ship hands. These high-risk activities, such as setting off for sea and managing on the open seas, involved endless demands for uses of visual literacies and playful language – demonstrated repeatedly by adults in charge, whether in barked commands related to maintenance of ship rigging or in preparation for facing pirates or the ravages of storms. Finally, we see in this early history that without opportunities for formal schooling, the young learned primarily through observation, trial and error, and direct experience. They had to work with their hands in tasks requiring focused attention to visual detail and high-performance demands that almost invariably involved use of verbal or visual symbol systems.

Major Contributions

For contemporary research on language socialization of those in middle childhood and adolescents on their way to young adulthood, Romaine (1984), Eckert (1997), and Heath (2011) offer brief overviews regarding language learning. How young people learn syntax, genres, discourse styles, and the visual and performative dimensions of communication relates to age-grading and gender differences, as well as to the extent and nature of their access to linguistic resources and special interests (such as hobbies related to collecting stamps, coins, etc., or learning specific aspects of the arts or sciences). The key research question is therefore: When, how, and where do the young have sustained interaction with models and opportunities to gain practice in receiving and producing verbal and visual symbols?

Home and School Studies

We take up studies that compare home and school briefly to consider two small bodies of literature. First are studies that compare home and school language patterns and ideologies for older children (Zentella 1997, 2005). Work carried out with an “ethnographic” approach has been inspired primarily by the seminal work of Cusick (1972); Heath (1982, 1983/1996, 2007, 2012a, 2012b); Philips (1972, 1983); and George and Louise Spindler (see Spindler and Hammond 2006; Spindler and Spindler 1992, for bibliographies). Studies in the critical tradition illustrate the class-based nature of contrasts between school-based language choices and language and media usage and ideologies of teenagers (cf. McLaren 1986; Sarroub 2005; Willis 1977).

Other language socialization and ideology studies carried out in schools point out the extent to which the young take in, modify, transfer, or subvert teachers' instructions and norms related to performance of academic language and literacy (Everhart 1983; Shuman 1986; Snow and Blum-Kulka 2002). Such norms include not only appropriate participation within question–answer routines in classroom discussion but also adherence to the written language norms of spelling, mathematical calculation, and school genres (e.g., standardized tests, the *précis*, short answers, book or laboratory reports, and essays). The majority of studies centered on oral language uses focus on the talk of teachers and students, emphasizing the dominance of teacher talk and restricting attention generally to questions and answers, discussion, and teacher–student conferences. Most relevant from these studies is the extent to which literacies are hidden, and the young creatively subvert and re-create school norms and standards in their peer interactions (e.g., note-writing, hand signaling, and social interactions outside the classroom in halls, lunchrooms, and sports activities; cf. Flinders 1997; Wells 1996).

Peer-Centered Identity Groupings

Sociologists and linguistic anthropologists have ventured beyond schools into friendship groups and youth gangs. Their studies demonstrate the rapid-fire overlapping nature of talk, representations of group identity and popular culture, interdependence with visual and performative modes, and gender differences (e.g., Cintron 2005; Corsaro and Eder 1995; Eder 1995; Jacobs-Huey 2006; Mahiri 1998, 2004).

Youth gangs work to shape language uses and structures as well as dress, performative modes, and graffiti arts (Moore 1991; Vigil 1993).

As migration of young people increases around the world – Central Americans escaping ganglife in Honduras, El Salvador, and Nicaragua and refugees fleeing from African civil disputes and Middle East warfare to European nations, communities of learners of new languages and ways of talking become more prominent, especially in urban areas of receiving nations. Able to identify with neither their parents' nor their own past and unable to envision or control their own possible futures, young immigrants have strong needs to form their own learning communities. Community service, youth mentoring, promotion and experimentation with youth culture constitute ways of passing time until they receive asylum and are able to attend school or go to work. Without official entry, many of these young fall prey to drug cartels and become part of illegal underground economies. To the extent that we have any information on language socialization within such groups, we depend largely on first-person accounts (Brotherton and Barrios 2004; Rodriguez 1994) and journalistic reports.

Community Organizations

Peer-centered friendship groupings, whether in the parking lot of fast-food chains or street corners, or in parks and small village centers, generally receive little more

than fleeting attention from adults. In modern economies, gangs, also peer and friendship-centered, on the other hand, generally raise suspicions and legal resistance from adults. Standing apart from the extremes of being either nearly invisible or highly provocative are youth-oriented community organizations, generally adult-led. Considered “community service,” participation in these organizations brings young people and the results of their learning to positive public attention through exhibitions, service pursuits, and performances (Heath 2001, 2013). The most long lasting and successful of these groups offer opportunities for young people to take on many roles that parallel those of adult work experiences, including management, marketing, security, public relations, and programming. Long-term research directed by Milbrey McLaughlin and Shirley Brice Heath of Stanford University analyzed the structures, uses, and values of language and multimodal development in community-service, sports, and arts-based community organizations (Heath and McLaughlin 1993; McLaughlin et al. 1994).

Critical to the interactional work of community organizations in which young people play key roles in producing goods and services is the sheer amount of talk in which they take active part. Immersed in group commitment, individuals receive sustained adult and multiparty input from learners that vary in expertise, talent, experience, and style (Heath 2012b). Across exemplary organizations studied in the McLaughlin-Heath longitudinal research, young people could hear and use directions to listen, look, feel, and imagine as many as 50 times in any 2-hour work session. In a similar time period, they could take part in spontaneous demonstrations by a more capable adult or peer of what a particular detail could look, sound, or feel like under different circumstances. Explanation of routines, techniques, possible outcomes, as well as narratives of past shows or performances, could take place more than a dozen times in any 2-hour session (Heath and Smyth 1999).

Participation in creating a performance or exhibition of any of the arts generates more language input and production during any unit of time than does involvement in community service or sports teams. More open and flexible in outcomes and process than either sports or service to others, the arts generate opportunities for hypothetical thinking, creating of models (verbal, visual, and performative), and explaining, comparing, and critiquing work-in-progress (Heath and Langman 1994; Heath and Soep 1998; Heath and Roach 1999; Mandell and Wolf 2003; Soep 2000; Soep and Chávez 2010). The language socialization of rehearsals and studios resembles in numerous ways that of science laboratories. Both depend on “what if” queries, consideration of alternatives, and intensive observation of the process and products of others (Heath 2012b).

Young people who engage in such community organizations see their groups as filling gaps that institutions cannot fill. Whether a dance troupe made up of street children in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, or an arts-based environmental sustainability center in Boston, Massachusetts, these organizations take on responsibilities that complement the work of institutions as well as originate services that institutions later absorb into their own units. For example, in Mumbai, India, street children working with social workers formed a network of support that street children could

access through a toll-free telephone number. Called Child Line, the service was seen as so valuable by several state governments that they established internal units with similar procedures and goals (Heath and Robinson 2004).

Regardless of physical location or period of history, learning communities exhibit certain core features. The young must work across media, in high-risk roles, under high-demand circumstances, and they learn primarily through observation, direct experience, and trial and error. Much of what they do in these learning communities depends on close visual attention, manual dexterity, embodiment of roles, identity strengthening, and orientation to the future (Soep 2014).

Work in Progress

With the turn of the twenty-first century and widespread publicity about the perceived inadequacies of schools and families, more and more researchers began to study learning communities outside institutional sponsorship (Hull and Schultz 2002; Miles et al. 2002). The percentage of two working-parent and single-parent households increased in economies driven by technological advances and information-access explosions. Commercial edutainment and video and computer games drew the young deeper into peer socialization and interaction. Young people began to spend most of their time as spectators of the creative work of others, “plugged-in” cellphone and iPod users, and solo players involved in highly repetitive eye-hand manipulative activities. Interactive talk with adults in project work or plan development or critique decreased in the home and in out-of-school hours of the young (Buckingham 1993; Jenkins and Shresthova 2016; Lareau 2003).

New research underway in European nations, England, Australia, Canada, and the USA focuses primarily on learning communities created by youth engaged in the arts, community development, environmental sustainability, health education, and social marketing. The wave of the future promises to address the proposal made by anthropologist Margaret Mead that the future of learning would belong to the prefigurative talents of the young that would inevitably take over the postfigurative orientation of their elders (Mead 1970).

Problems and Difficulties

Variation and variability within and across learning communities of the young pose a major challenge to advancement of methods and theory. No problems are more critical than the dominance of studies of monolingual speakers. Across societies around the world, most young people speak, perform, and create in more than one language or language variety and in multiple modes (cf. Rampton 1995). Moreover, depiction of the young in terms of an assumed generational response (e.g., Generation X or millennials) strips away the fact that the young invent and reinvent themselves in personal meanings and community involvement when they undertake membership in peer friendship groups, gangs, community, or religious organizations

(cf. Baquedano-López 1997; Sunaina and Soep 2013; Soep and Chávez 2010). Young people need a biographic space to understand how and what they mean to others now and for the future. Moreover, symbolic representation and manipulation, along with creation of visual and performative means of projecting identities, constitute a substantial part of young people's sense of involvement in youth culture, local, and global.

These difficulties come in the mismatch of customary data collection methods with the ability of the young to exclude their elders and to have considerable insight into the *a priori* assumptions of adults who ask questions, hold interviews, and lead focus groups. Across cultures, the young also excel in "true lies," saying earnestly what is "true" at the moment or to someone somewhere, but without verification (Heath 1997). Research with young people, perhaps more than any other group, depends upon building trust and a sense of reciprocity, respect, and data sharing along the way (Heath 1995, 1996).

Nothing more than a rough framework is possible in the study of the linguistic life course of any individual or group. In particular, categories, agents, and settings derived from research in mainstream Western societies cannot be transferred across either socioeconomic or cultural boundaries. Furthermore, findings and theories drawn from studies of monolingual speakers in societies that expect maturity to bring developing fluency in a standard variety relevant for schooling often have little or no relevance for bilingual or multilingual communities around the world.

Future Directions

The future for research on the socialization of the young in verbal, visual, and performative dimensions holds few prospects for long-term work. As noted above, speakers and listeners in this group present almost insurmountable difficulties for researchers because of their closed-group inclusion norms. The presence of adults alters the language and modal production and valuation underway in drastic ways.

For the future, youth voices through their own work or their collaboration with listening adults will be at the center (cf. Farrell 1990). The young in their friendship groups and in their work within community organizations will, no doubt, be preferred contexts for data collection and analysis.

Community organizations offer some particular benefits. Adult presence in these environments is routine; moreover, many adults who come through the organizations are expected to enter into conversation with the young, learn more about their work, and offer evaluative comments as well as resources. Furthermore, the service orientation and performative nature of many community organizations means that listening and recording and asking for explanations take place on a regular basis. The most effective and promising direction for research on language socialization of young people in these environments will come from highly creative collaborative work in which some data collection methods, such as interviews, questionnaires, and close observation, can be undertaken by youth members themselves who have real questions they want answered about their group and its work.

We can expect that learning communities of young people will continue to be heavily influenced by the need for a sense of belonging and meaning by the young. Simultaneously, they strive for coherence and identity all the while knowing that they must make some kind of place for themselves in the rules and resources of the adult world to come. Social criticism, along with the desire to serve, heal, and help, will continue to place the young in these communities at the margins and often in opposition to the everyday lives of adults. Hence, problematization will continue to come naturally, and research asking “how” and “for what” will not lose appeal. Researchers who can work with these questions are likely to be welcomed so long as they are true learners along with the young.

Cross-References

- ▶ [Language Socialization in Children’s Peer and Sibling-Kin Group Interactions](#)
- ▶ [Language Socialization Through Hiphop Culture](#)
- ▶ [Language Socialization: An Historical Overview](#)

Related Articles in the Encyclopedia of Language and Education

- Jabari Mahiri: [Literacies in the Lives of Global Youth](#). In Volume: Literacies and Language Education
- Brian Street: [New Literacies, New Times: Developments in Literacy Studies](#). In Volume: Literacies and Language Education
- Django Paris and Lorena Gutierrez: [Youth Language in Education](#). In Volume: Language Policy and Political Issues in Education.
- Elizabeth Birr Moje: [Theory and Research on Literacy as a Tool for Navigating Everyday and School Discourses](#). In Volume: Discourse and Education.
- Katherine Schultz and Glynda Hall: [Literacies In and Out of School in the United States](#). In Volume: Literacies and Language Education

References

- Amit-Talai, V., & Wulff, H. (Eds.). (1995). *Youth cultures: A cross-cultural perspective*. London: Routledge.
- Baquedano-López, P. (1997). Creating social identities through doctrina narratives. *Issues in Applied Linguistics*, 8(1), 27–45.
- Brookes, H. J. (2000). A contextual study of gestural communication in a South African township. Ph.D. Dissertation, Stanford University, Stanford.
- Brotherton, D. C., & Barrios, L. (2004). *The almighty Latin king and queen nation*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Buckingham, D. (1993). *Reading audiences: Young people and the media*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Cintron, R. (2005). Gangs and their walls. In S. Maira & E. Soep (Eds.), *Youth-scapes: The popular, the national, the global*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

- Clanchy, M. T. (1979). *From memory to written record: England, 1066–1307*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Constable, G. (1996). *The reformation of the twelfth century*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Corsaro, W., & Eder, D. (1995). Development and socialization of children and adolescents. In K. Cook, G. Fine, & J. House (Eds.), *Sociological perspectives on social psychology* (pp. 421–451). New York: Allyn & Bacon.
- Cusick, P. (1972). *Inside high school*. New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston.
- Darnton, R. (1984). *The great cat massacre and other episodes in French cultural history*. New York: Basic Books.
- Eckert, P. (1988). Sound change and adolescent social structure. *Language in Society*, 17, 183–207.
- Eckert, P. (1989). *Jocks and burnouts: Social categories and identity in the high school*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Eckert, P. (1997). Age as a sociolinguistic variable. In F. Coulmas (Ed.), *The handbook of sociolinguistics* (pp. 151–167). Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.
- Eckert, P. (2000). *Linguistic variation as social practice*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Eder, D. (1995). *School talk: Gender and adolescent culture*. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.
- Eisenstein, E. (1979). *The printing press as an agent of change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Everhart, R. B. (1983). *Reading, writing, and resistance: Adolescence and labor in a junior high school*. Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Farrell, E. (1990). *Hanging in and dropping out: Voices of at-risk high school students*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Fine, G. A. (1987). *With the boys: Little League baseball and preadolescent culture*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Flinders, M. J. (1997). *Just girls: Hidden literacies and life in junior high*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Heath, S. B. (1982). What no bedtime story means: Narrative skills at home and at school. *Language in Society*, 11(2), 49–76.
- Heath, S. B. (1983/1996). *Ways with words: Language, life and work in communities and classrooms*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Heath, S. B. (1995). Race, ethnicity, and the defiance of categories. In W. D. Hawley & A. Jackson (Eds.), *Toward a common destiny: Educational perspectives on improving race and ethnic relations* (pp. 39–70). San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- Heath, S. B. (1996). Ruling places: Adaptation in development by inner-city youth. In R. Shweder, R. Jessor, & A. Colby (Eds.), *Ethnographic approaches to the study of human development* (pp. 225–251). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Heath, S. B. (1997). Culture: Contested realm in research on children and youth. *Applied Developmental Science*, 1(3), 113–123.
- Heath, S. B. (2001). Three's not a crowd: Plan, roles, and focus in the arts. *Educational Researcher*, 30(3), 1–7.
- Heath, S. B. (2011). Language socialization in art and science. In A. Duranti, E. Ochs, & B. Schieffelin (Eds.), *The handbook of language socialization* (pp. 425–442). London: Blackwell Publishers.
- Heath, S. B. (2012a). *Words at work and play: Three decades in family and community*. London: Cambridge University Press.
- Heath, S. B. (2012b). Seeing our way into learning science in informal environments. In W. F. Tate (Ed.), *Research on schools, neighborhoods, and communities: Toward civic responsibility* (pp. 249–267). New York: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.
- Heath, S. B. (2013). Social entrepreneurship: Learning environments with exchange value. In O. Erstad & J. Sefton-Green (Eds.), *Identity, community, and learning lives in the digital age* (pp. 146–162). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

- Heath, S. B., & Langman, J. (1994). Shared thinking and the register of coaching. In D. Biber & E. Finegan (Eds.), *Sociolinguistic perspectives on register* (pp. 82–105). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Heath, S. B., & McLaughlin, M. (Eds.). (1993). *Identity and inner-city youth: Beyond ethnicity and gender*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Heath, S. B., & Roach, A. (1999). Imaginative actuality: Learning in the arts during the nonschool hours. In E. Fiske (Ed.), *Champions of change* (pp. 19–34). Washington, DC: Arts Education Partnership.
- Heath, S. B., & Robinson, K. (2004). Making a way: Youth arts and learning in international perspective. In N. Rabkin & R. Redmond (Eds.), *Putting the arts in the picture: Reframing education in the 21st century, center for arts policy* (pp. 107–126). Chicago: Columbia College.
- Heath, S. B., & Smyth, L. (1999). *ArtShow: Youth and community development*. Washington, DC: Partners for Livable Communities.
- Heath, S. B., & Soep, E. (1998). Youth development and the arts in nonschool hours. *Grantmakers in the Arts*, 9(1), 9–16. 32.
- Hull, G., & Schultz, K. (Eds.). (2002). *School's out! Bridging out-of-school literacies with classroom practice*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Jacobs-Huey, L. (2006). *From the kitchen to the parlor: Language and becoming in African American women's hair care*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Jenkins, H. Y., & Shresthova, S. (2016). *By any media necessary: The new youth activism*. New York: New York University Press.
- Kral, I. & Heath, S. B. (2013). The world with us: Sight and sound in the “cultural flows” of informal learning: An indigenous Australian case. *Learning, Culture and Social Interaction*. doi:10.1016/j.lcsi.2013.07.002.
- Kress, G. (2002). *Literacy in the new media age*. London: Routledge.
- Langlois, A. (2004). *Alive and kicking: Areyonga teenage Pitjantjatjara*, *Pacific Linguistics* 561. Canberra: Research School of Pacific and Asian Studies, Australian National University.
- Lareau, A. (2003). *Unequal childhoods: Class, race and family life*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Mahiri, J. (1998). *Shooting for excellence: African American and youth culture in new century schools*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Mahiri, J. (2004). *What they don't learn in school: Literacy in the lives of urban youth*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Mandell, J., & Wolf, J. (2003). *Acting, learning & change: Creating original plays with adolescents*. Portsmouth: Heinemann.
- McFarlane, J. (2010). *The new lawyer: How settlement is transforming the practice of law*. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press.
- McLaren, P. (1986). *Schooling as a ritual performance: Towards a political economy of educational symbols and gestures*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- McLaughlin, M., Irby, M., & Langman, J. (1994). *Urban sanctuaries: Neighborhood organizations in the lives and futures of inner-city youth*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- Mead, M. (1970). *Culture and commitment: A study of the generation gap*. New York: Doubleday.
- Mendoza-Denton, N. (1999). Fighting words: Latina girls, gangs, and language attitudes. In L. Galindo & N. Gonzalez-Vasquez (Eds.), *Speaking Chicana: Voice, power and identity* (pp. 39–56). Tucson: University of Arizona Press.
- Miles, S., Pohl, A., Stauber, B., Walther, A., Banha, R., & Gomes, M. (2002). *Communities of youth: Cultural practice and informal learning*. Burlington: Ashgate.
- Moore, J. (1991). *Going down to the barrio: Homeboys and homegirls in change*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

- Philips, S. (1972). Participant structures and communicative competence: Warm Springs children in community and classroom. In C. B. Cazden, V. P. John, & D. Hymes (Eds.), *Functions of language in the classroom* (pp. 370–394). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Philips, S. (1983). *The invisible culture: Communication in classroom and community on the Warm Springs Indian Reservation*. New York: Longman.
- Rampton, B. (1995). *Crossing: Language and ethnicity among adolescents*. London: Longman.
- Rodriguez, L. (1994). *Always running: La vida loca, gang days in L.A.* New York: Touchstone Books.
- Romaine, S. (1984). *The language of children and adolescents*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Ross, A., & Rose, T. (1994). *Microphone fiends: Youth music, youth culture*. New York: Routledge.
- Sarroub, L. (2005). *All-American Yemeni girls: Being Muslim in a public school*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Schmidt, A. (1985). *Young people's Dyrbal: An example of language death from Australia*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Schworm, P. (2006). Talking a blue streak. *The Boston Globe*, B 5, 7.
- Shary, T. (2002). *Generation multiplex: The image of youth in contemporary American cinema*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Shepler, S. (2005). Globalizing child soldiers in Sierra Leone. In S. Maira & E. Soep (Eds.), *Youthscapes: The popular, the national, the global* (pp. 119–136). Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Shuman, A. (1986). *Storytelling rights: The uses of oral and written texts by urban adolescents*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Snow, C., & Blum-Kulka, S. (2002). From home to school: School-age children talking with adults. In S. Blum-Kulka & C. E. Snow (Eds.), *Talking to adults: The contribution of multiparty discourse to language acquisition* (pp. 327–341). Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Soep, E. (2000). To make things with words: Critique and the production of learning. Ph.D. dissertation, Stanford University, Stanford.
- Soep, E. (2014). *Participatory politics: Next-generation tactics*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Soep, E., & Chávez, V. (2010). *Drop that knowledge: Youth radio stories*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Spindler, G., & Hammond, L. (2006). *Innovations in educational ethnography: Theory, methods, and results*. Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Spindler, G., & Spindler, L. (1992). Cultural process and ethnography: An anthropological perspective. In M. LeCompte, W. L. Millroy, & J. Preissle (Eds.), *The handbook of qualitative research in education* (pp. 53–92). San Diego: Academic Press.
- Sunaina, M., & Soep, E. (2013). *The popular, the national, and the global*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Vigil, J. D. (1993). Gangs, social control and ethnicity. In S. B. Heath & M. McLaughlin (Eds.), *Identity & inner-city youth: Beyond ethnicity and gender* (pp. 94–119). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Watson, R. (2003). *Illuminated manuscripts and their makers*. London: Victoria & Albert Museum.
- Watt, D. (Ed.). (1997). *Medieval women in their communities*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Wells, M. C. (1996). *Literacies lost: When students move from a progressive middle school to a traditional high school*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Willis, P. (1977). *Learning to labor: How working class kids get working class jobs*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Zentella, A. C. (1997). *Growing up bilingual*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Zentella, A. C. (2005). *Building on strength: Language and literacy in Latino families and communities*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Language Socialization in Study Abroad

Celeste Kinginger

Abstract

This chapter first explores how a rationale for language socialization studies emerges from the broader effort to understand language learning in study abroad contexts. It then reviews a number of longitudinal investigations as well as ethnographic and micro-ethnographic projects relevant to the topic of language socialization. These include studies of interaction in homestays, residence halls, and service encounters, which vary in topical focus from the learning of honorific systems in Asian languages to the socialization of taste, gendered identities, and politeness. Finally, the chapter considers problems and gaps in the literature as well as proposals for future research.

Keywords

Study abroad • Student mobility • Honorifics • Pragmatics • Homestay • Service encounters

Contents

Introduction	228
Early Developments	228
Major Contributions	230
Work in Progress	234
Problems and Difficulties	235
Future Directions	236
Cross-References	236
Related Articles in the Encyclopedia of Language and Education	236
References	236

C. Kinginger (✉)

Department of Applied Linguistics, Pennsylvania State University, University Park, PA, USA

e-mail: cxk37@psu.edu

Introduction

As a context for second language socialization, study abroad is distinct both from classroom learning and from other forms of travel or residence in a country other than one's own. Among language educators, a sojourn abroad is usually interpreted as a key context for language learning, a time when students may be immersed in authentic communicative situations that are meaningful for their well-being and personal or other relationships. Language learners abroad may be presented with opportunities to observe how the language they have learned is used in a range of settings and also to discover linguistic varieties or registers not represented in classrooms, as well as links between language use and the performance of identities. Unlike most tourism, programs of study abroad tend to foreground academic goals, usually within the structures of home-based institutions. Unlike immigrant language learners, participants in study abroad are by definition temporary residents in their host communities. The definition of study abroad adopted in this chapter is therefore "a temporary sojourn of pre-defined duration, undertaken for educational purposes" (Kinger 2009, p. 11). As the review below illustrates, the status of participants as relatively short-term visitors to the communities they join translates into variability in both the linguistic and cultural outcomes and the processes in question.

Early Developments

Language socialization research in study abroad contexts is a relatively recent and as yet somewhat rare pursuit. As portrayed in a comprehensive overview (Kinger 2009), research on language learning in these contexts has tended to reflect the broader divide in applied linguistics between outcomes versus process orientations. The great majority of studies focus in some way on outcomes, expressed as holistic constructs such as proficiency or fluency, as skills, or as components of communicative competence such as pragmatic, discourse, grammatical, or strategic abilities. A smaller number of qualitative studies examine the ways in which language students abroad are received by their hosts and interpret their experiences. The impetus for taking up language socialization as a framework or topic of study abroad research nevertheless emerges from the overall findings of research in this area. On the one hand, the results of outcomes-oriented research are somewhat mysterious. While evidence can be found to show that study abroad is beneficial for all aspects of language learning, these benefits are unevenly distributed and most investigations reveal significant individual differences in achievement. Several large-scale projects involving US-based students (e.g., Rivers 1998; Van de Berg et al. 2009) have failed to generate evidence that homestays are superior environments for language learning in comparison to other housing arrangements. Why are individual differences "amplified" in study abroad as compared to classroom settings (Huebner 1995), and how can life with a local family be a poor language learning environment?

Qualitative accounts, meanwhile, portray variability in the nature of study abroad environments as contexts for language learning. In this literature, the homestay

appears in numerous guises. The benefits of the homestay were highlighted in Hashimoto's (1993) case study of an Australian female teenager who had developed an extensive Japanese language repertoire following an academic year in Japan. This study included descriptions of numerous socializing encounters, including discussion of register when the student attempted to use a vulgar term, explicit instruction on the use of honorifics, and observation of the ongoing first language (L1) socialization of younger host siblings. By contrast, to explain why a study abroad homestay did not predict oral proficiency gains in Russian, Rivers (1998) turned to an ethnographic study by Frank (1997) in which interactions involving American college students and their hosts were limited to "quotidian dialogue and television watching" (Rivers 1998, p. 496), and participants spent most of their time at home alone in their rooms. Kinginger (2008) contrasted the cases of six American university students of French, all of whom professed strong language learning motivation prior to their sojourns in France. For example, "Ailis" was placed in the home of a single woman with a stressful full-time job, who preferred to devote her attention at dinnertime to the television rather than to her guest, whereas "Bill" lived with a family of four who routinely included him in lengthy mealtime conversations during which his interactive abilities were explicitly assisted. "Beatrice's" host family included a mother, a father, and two age-peer sisters and also engaged their guest in extensive mealtime interaction. However, since her sojourn coincided with the US-led invasion of Iraq, these conversations devolved into severe conflict as the family queried Beatrice about her support of American foreign policy, and Beatrice increasingly suspected her hosts of deeply ingrained anti-Americanism.

Variation in the quality of classroom experiences is illustrated in a study by Churchill (2006) involving a group of Japanese high school students visiting the USA on a short-term program and placed in one of two host institutions. At St. Martin's, a prestigious private school, the students were warmly welcomed, given an official schedule, and encouraged to display their competence however possible, for example by solving math problems beyond the competence of their American classmates. At Belleville High, a labyrinthine public school, no welcome was prepared, and the students were instructed to choose an American partner at random and follow that person throughout the day; in class, their participation was interpreted as disruptive. As is the case for homestays, classrooms may also generate conflict when student visitors observe and condemn local practices. Patron (2007) examined how a cohort of French university students interpreted their experiences in Australia. Initially these students were shocked by the apparent lack of respect displayed by Australian students toward their professors, by the professors' own use of informal address, and by the very notion of social events involving all parties. Eventually, however, they came to appreciate and even to admire the local meaning of these practices.

In principle, the above-discussed literature suggests that study abroad can function as an environment for second language socialization. However, on the one hand much depends on the ways in which students are received by their local hosts and whether or not they are interpreted as legitimate peripheral participants (Lave and Wenger 1991) or as persons of consequence deserving of care and assistance as they

develop language ability. On the other hand, the desires and motives of the students themselves are varied and susceptible to change. As temporary residents, students abroad may or may not imagine a future in which integration into the local society is necessary or significant. Depending on the complex interplay of these features, a sojourn abroad can immeasurably enrich students' language competence, deepen their understanding of another culture, and enhance their motivation for continued study, or it can cement ethnocentric attitudes and notions of national superiority. Language socialization and related approaches have much to offer language educators in their attempts to understand, in precise detail, how the qualities of students' participation in routine interactions abroad influence both their language competence and their dispositions toward intercultural learning.

Major Contributions

As noted above, language socialization and related approaches are as yet infrequently represented in the literature on language learning abroad. The projects that have appeared thus far are diverse in terms of their thematic focus and the languages in question. Notable studies are those that have to do with the learning of honorific systems in Asian languages, such as Cook (2008) for Japanese (described below in more detail) and Brown (2013) for Korean. There also exists a line of inquiry into the broader nature of mealtime discourse in study abroad homestays, including DuFon (2006) on the socialization of taste in Indonesia, Cook (2006) on the exchange of folk beliefs at the dinner table in Japan, and Kinginger et al. (2014) on the contextualized language practices surrounding learning to eat in China. Diao (2014) took up the study of gendered language practices in Chinese residence halls. Shively (2011) examined how service encounters function as contexts for language socialization in Spain. She also analyzed one student's development of the ability to be funny in that language, through interactions with peers (2013).

Cook (2008) undertook a study of language socialization at the Japanese dinner table, focusing on the learning of the addressee honorific form *masu* by nine Anglophone students. The students displayed a range of proficiency in Japanese. During the month when data were collected, they had stayed with their current host families for various amounts of time, from 3 to 9 months. Cook argued that *masu* is an ideal linguistic feature for the study of implicit second language (L2) socialization. *Masu* is presented in textbooks as an index of formal style. Native speakers of Japanese commonly believe that *masu* is not used in conversations among close associates, friends, or family members. However, an important distinction must be established between out-group communication, where the use of *masu* is expected, and in-group communication in families and among intimates, where the plain form prevails but *masu* is also used. Cook's previous work examining the use of this form in naturally occurring informal conversational settings had demonstrated that style shifts between the honorific and the plain form are "among the most salient features of Japanese that construct social context" (2008, p. 8). That is, *masu* is more than just a marker of politeness; it is a resource for the creative, strategic, and flexible

construction of identity in interaction. Based on transcribed recordings of 25 conversations, Cook's findings demonstrated that, although the plain form dominates in family conversation, native speaking host family members used this form for three purposes: (1) in fixed phrases; (2) as displays of social identities linked to parental authority or responsibility; and (3) in reported speech. Thus, like children learning Japanese as their L1, the adult learners in this study were socialized to use the plain form for in-group talk and *masu* to construct identities as persons in charge, such as English teachers. Furthermore, host family members' use of direct quotations offers opportunities to learn how out-group communication is carried out. Cook therefore concluded that homestay mealtime conversation can play a vital role in the learning of pragmatics in Japanese.

Other studies have highlighted the role that "foreigner" identities can play in the process of learning the honorific systems characteristic of Japanese and Korean. The Japanese host families examined in Iino (2006) took up stances toward their guests along a continuum from "two-way immersion" to "cultural dependency." For families engaged in two-way immersion, the hosting experience was interpreted as a learning opportunity for all parties. In families adopting a cultural dependency model, however, guests were interpreted as fundamentally incapable both of surviving in Japan without massive assistance and of understanding the intricacies of Japanese politeness. This theme was revisited in a more recent study by Brown (2013) examining how attitudes toward the (in)competence of foreigners can limit opportunities for socialization in L2 Korean. Brown first proposed an outline of the Korean honorific system: the relatively formal *contaymal* ("respect speech") versus the relatively informal *panmal* ("half-speech"). These forms are strongly associated with the performance of Korean identity, and indeed, "in every single Korean utterance, the speaker is forced into choices between different honorific verb endings and lexical forms" (p. 270). Participants in the study were four adult male students of various national origins (Britain, Japan, Austria, and Germany). These participants demonstrated advanced proficiency and strong command of Korean honorifics in a preliminary Discourse Completion Task, a written questionnaire presenting fictional situations eliciting either *contaymal* or *panmal*. In examining recordings of these students' interactions with peers and other associates outside the classroom, however, Brown discovered that opportunities to consolidate and apply this knowledge were relatively rare. On the one hand, the learners were often positioned as outsiders for whom the usual rules did not apply. On the other, the learners themselves sometimes reacted negatively to the strict enforcement of honorifics use based on age or seniority, expressing strong preference for egalitarian, and therefore non-nativelike language use. Brown's findings echo those of earlier work on ways in which foreigner identities may influence the socialization of politeness (e.g., Siegal 1996) and raise questions about how these identities, imposed by host communities, may impact language learning at advanced levels more generally.

While the above-mentioned studies focus on the socialization of specific linguistic systems, other research addresses particular themes, including taste, folk notions of culture, and gender. Based on field notes, language learning journals and recorded interactions collected over a period of 5 years, DuFon (2006) explored the

socialization of taste for US-based learners of Indonesian studying and residing in Indonesia. Six themes emerged as characterizing the topical orientation of the talk: (1) orientation to the food, (2) food as pleasure, (3) food as social/ethnic identity marker, (4) food as gifts, (5) food as a material good, and (6) food and health. As their hosts oriented them to unfamiliar food and eating practices, the learners were explicitly socialized in the naming of dishes and ingredients and in learning proper table manners. Discussions of food as pleasure introduced the students to Indonesian culinary aesthetics and ways of describing what tastes good or bad. In episodes related to food as a marker of identity, host families familiarized the students with cultural diversity within Indonesia. The students were also instructed to follow gift-giving conventions, especially *oleh-oleh*, or gifts of regional specialty food upon returning from a trip. Lesser themes were the economic value of food and health-related practices such as avoiding iced beverages to calm flu symptoms. Noting that the dinner table was the setting in which students had the greatest opportunities for participation in informal interaction with host family members, DuFon argued that this setting “offers many opportunities for learning through the use of language about a culture’s values, beliefs, attitudes and view of food, and for learning to use the language in certain ways in order to talk about food” (Dufon 2006, pp. 117–118).

In addition to examining the socialization of the *masu* addressee honorific form described earlier, Cook (2006) also scrutinized the topics discussed during interactions at Japanese host family mealtimes involving American guests, focusing on the negotiation of folk beliefs, including cultural stereotypes. The beliefs expressed by Japanese hosts were influenced by an ideology termed *nihonjinron*, according to which Japanese culture, language, and food ways are exceptionally unique and therefore inaccessible to foreigners. A common theme in these interactions was food, including the belief that Americans cannot survive without beef or that the tastes of certain Japanese dishes, such as fermented soybeans (*natto*), are intolerable to them. While these assertions often went uncontested, in 40.4% of cases the student guests challenged them, attempting to do so politely and indirectly by offering counterexamples rather than by overtly refuting their host’s claims. In such “two-way immersion” experiences, therefore, the dinner table can become a locus for the socialization of all parties.

In another study with a culinary theme, Kinginger et al. (2014) adopted a microgenetic approach to the investigation of homestay mealtime conversations in China as sites for language and culture learning. As one dimension of Vygotsky’s broader genetic approach to the study of development in process, microgenetic study involves tracing the history of particular functions as they unfold “right before one’s eyes” (Vygotsky 1978, p. 61). Participants were three American high school students of varying proficiency and their Chinese host families in a short-term summer program. At regular intervals, twenty-three interactions, totaling nearly twelve hours of talk were recorded and subsequently transcribed. Findings of the study indicate that food and taste were frequently discussed, accounting for 29% of turns at talk, and that themes in the data reflect those present in the work of both DuFon (2006) and Cook (2006). A common focus was orientation to food, in episodes where host family members regularly sought to locate their guests’ Zone of Proximal

Development in order to best assist their performance in learning to understand and talk about food. These episodes could involve relatively simple notions, such as the name and ingredients of dishes. They could also be devoted to more complex concepts, such as the quality of dishes named *zhuàngyǔán* ('number one scholar'), a term referencing the ancient tradition of Imperial examinations granting access to the Chinese civil service to commoners, and now used to denote excellence. In discussing food as pleasure as well as its role in maintaining health, host families also oriented students to aesthetic concepts such as *he* ('harmony') achieved through the choice of a variety of seasonally appropriate foods. As in Cook (2006), host families expressed negative stereotypes about their guests' home culinary practices, such as the belief that Americans do not bother to cook or that their diet is too monotonous. In these encounters, students with advanced proficiency were afforded opportunities both to inform their hosts and to hone their debating skills in Chinese as they defended the nutritional potential of the hamburger or described how their families did sometimes prepare meals from scratch using fresh ingredients. Overall, the findings of this study suggest that even a short-term homestay can present significant learning opportunities if it includes ritual, convivial mealtime talk.

Much of the work thus far discussed involves homestays, and especially mealtime interactions, but not every study abroad program includes such arrangements, and this is not the only setting for language socialization in these contexts. Focusing on the use of Chinese affective sentence-final particles (ASPs) as a gendered linguistic practice, Diao (2014) conducted case studies of three American students living with Chinese roommates in Shanghai during a semester-long program. The participants were instructed to provide audio recordings of routine interactions in the residence hall each week. Over the course of her semester in Shanghai, the female participant, "Ellen," was socialized by her female roommate to increase her use of ASPs in order to index a "cute" feminine identity. The male participant, "Tuzi," had spent 6 months in southern China, where the use of ASPs is frequent; when attempting to use these particles with his roommate in Shanghai, however, he was criticized as sounding "gay" or "like a woman" (pp. 14–15) and subsequently dropped them from most utterances. In the third case, "Mac," a male student, interacted with his roommate very little and almost always in English both because Mac was frequently absent or involved with a group of compatriots and, the author speculates, possibly also because he was viewed as a foreigner who was not expected to develop advanced discourse competence in Chinese.

Two notable studies examining language socialization of American students in Spain have appeared. Shively (2011) investigated how service encounters functioned as contexts for second language socialization for seven US-based students during their semester-long sojourn in Toledo, Spain, based on a longitudinal database of audio recordings collected by the students in shops, restaurants, and cafes. In order to become successful in these encounters, the students needed to reverse their expectations for the corresponding conventional scripts. Service encounters in Spain are typically hearer-oriented and direct, involving the use of direct imperatives, such as *dame un café* ('give me a coffee') or ellipticals such as *tres barras de pan* ('three loaves of bread'). Service encounters in the USA tend to be speaker oriented (e.g., I

want a coffee) and are preceded by how-are-you phatic routines. Moreover, previous classroom instruction had led many students to believe that politeness is enhanced by the use of complex grammatical forms such as the conditional or past subjunctive (e.g., *quisiera comprar una pila para este reloj*, ‘I would like to buy a battery for this watch’). Shively’s findings showed that while the students accommodated to Spanish norms over time, this did not necessarily mean that they learned to interpret them from a Spanish point of view. For example, one student, “Greta,” persisted in viewing the absence of how-are-you routines as unfriendliness on the part of Spaniards.

In a later study, Shively (2013) turned her attention to the case of one of these students, “Kyle,” and his struggle to express a sense of humor in Spanish. In addition to participating in interviews and keeping a language-learning journal, at regular intervals across the semester, Kyle recorded naturally occurring conversations with his host family and with a friend from Puerto Rico. The findings show that, over time, Kyle was able to become funny in certain situations, especially those involving Puerto Rican friends. He achieved this goal in three ways. First, he developed a friendship with one particular individual (“Paola”); the friends came to trust one another and to be familiar with each other’s values and attitudes, all of which supported Kyle’s attempts at humor. Secondly, whereas his earliest utterances intended as humorous were delivered in a deadpan style, and failed, he later framed his humor much more explicitly, using prosodic, lexical, or morphosyntactic contextualization cues (e.g., taking on a gruff tone as he imitated a typical Spaniard). Finally, he playfully revoiced the colloquial expressions and dialectal variations to which he was exposed in informal settings. The findings of these latter studies highlight the significance of settings outside the homestay, including residence halls, routine service encounters, and friendships with more expert speakers.

Work in Progress

Four works in progress will expand the scope of second language socialization research in study abroad contexts. Three of these emerge from or have been inspired by the project described in Kinginger et al. (2014). Drawing from the same corpus of recorded interactions involving American high school students and their hosts in China as well as additional data from a college-aged student in Beijing, Lee and Kinginger (2016) examine the authenticating practices used by host parents to evaluate and guide their guests’ learning. Drawing from Bucholtz (2003), they distinguish *authentication* as an interactional practice from the concept of *authenticity* as form of ideology, then examine how host parents actively authenticate the performances of students in the domains of phonology, use of metaphors, and cultural practices. Lee’s dissertation project will be an extended longitudinal study of several learners of Chinese collected over a period of 3 to 4 years (Lee 2016; Lee and Wu 2015). The study will be based on interviews, field notes, and regularly recorded interactions beginning in the classroom, at home, and continuing through multiple sojourns abroad in China and Taiwan. In a related project, Wu’s dissertation

will examine how a cohort of American learners of Chinese develop the ability to express emotion during a semester-long sojourn in Shanghai (Wu 2016) and will be based in part on regularly scheduled recordings, by focal participants, of naturally occurring conversations in homes or residence halls.

Another notable recent project is Anya's (2016) ethnographic study, also based on a dissertation, of African-American students learning Portuguese in Brazil. The students in question found themselves, for the first time, to be members of the racial majority within their host society, yet also encountered multiple challenges to the intransigence of their own views concerning identity categories. Many study abroad researchers have commented on the fact that sojourners abroad are often drawn into groups of their compatriots, particularly when these students receive sheltered instruction together, and therefore interact relatively little with inhabitants of their temporary communities. Anya's research is unique in that she examines both the students' interactions with local Brazilians and the process of peer socialization within the study abroad cohort. One of her focal participants, "Didier," encountered several particular challenges to his attempts to develop a nuanced articulation of race and sexuality. As a self-identified "Creole" from Louisiana, he found local support for the notion that one may be more or less "White" or "Black." Similarly, he discovered that performance of sexuality among Afro-Brazilians may include heterosexual males behaving in feminine ways that blur the distinction between "straight" and "gay" personae. His attempts to introduce these notions to his cohort, however, usually resulted in the group's reinforcement of rigid categorization of race and heteronormativity.

Problems and Difficulties

The most obvious problem for language socialization in study abroad contexts is that, although the number of projects is growing, as yet there is very little such research. Quite a number of qualitative studies may be interpreted from the standpoint of language socialization, but these works seldom involve the full combination of microlevel sustained, direct observation of routine practices with macrolevel interpretation of sociocultural meanings and values that the approach advocates (Duff 2012; Ochs 2002). Only a few existing studies are truly longitudinal. This problem may be attributable in part to constraints on investment of time and demands for rapid productivity that affect many language education researchers and to the amount of foresight that is required to carry out a true longitudinal study within the usual institutional strictures. This problem is also related to the fact that, within this domain as elsewhere in the literature on study abroad, the research is dominated by studies involving American participants. However, a longitudinal study involving these students is becoming increasingly difficult to conduct if the focus is on study abroad per se, since the typical sojourn now involves a short-term program of 6 weeks or less. The Junior Year Abroad model is now almost entirely anachronistic, and a semester abroad is considered "long term." Also,

there is a clear need for more investment in research involving the socialization of sojourners from origins other than the USA.

Future Directions

Language socialization research posits a dialectical relationship between particular socializing events and their broader sociocultural contexts, combining a maximally holistic, ethnographic perspective with attention to the microlevel details of specific interactions. By including the perspectives of both students and local hosts, this research holds significant promise for overcoming the problem of ethnocentric bias in qualitative research on study abroad (Kinger [forthcoming](#)). All too often, the goal of this research is to achieve understanding of student perspectives, and data are collected only from novice interactants who, by definition, do not fully understand the motives or values informing the practices they observe. The result of this process is that we learn only about what is “wrong” with other cultures, according to temporary residents. By including the voices of all parties to the learning that emerges in study abroad settings, language socialization offers a means to overcome this difficulty. It is hoped that, in the future, more scholars will take up this approach, carrying out truly longitudinal studies involving a broader range of participant profiles, program types, languages, and settings, including both face-to-face talk and the digital communication that now characterizes everyday life throughout the world.

Cross-References

- ▶ [Language Socialization in Japanese Communities](#)
- ▶ [Pragmatic Socialization](#)

Related Articles in the Encyclopedia of Language and Education

- Celeste Kinginger: [Second Language Learning in a Study Abroad Context](#). In Volume: [Second and Foreign Language Learning](#)
- Chantelle Warner: [Foreign Language Education in the Context of Institutional Globalization](#). In Volume: [Second and Foreign Language Learning](#)

References

- Anya, U. (2016). *Racialized identities in second language learning: Speaking blackness in Brazil*. New York: Routledge.
- Brown, L. (2013). Identity and honorifics use in Korean study abroad. In C. Kinginger (Ed.), *Social and cultural dimensions of language learning in study abroad* (pp. 269–298). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

- Bucholtz, M. (2003). Sociolinguistic nostalgia and the authentication of identity. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 7(3), 398–416.
- Churchill, E. (2006). Variability in the study abroad classroom and learner competence. In M. A. DuFon & E. Churchill (Eds.), *Language learners in study abroad contexts* (pp. 203–227). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Cook, H. (2006). Joint construction of folk beliefs by JFL learners and Japanese host families. In M. A. DuFon & E. Churchill (Eds.), *Language learners in study abroad contexts* (pp. 120–150). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Cook, H. (2008). *Socializing identities through speech style: Learners of Japanese as a foreign language*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Diao, W. (2014). Peer socialization into gendered L2 Mandarin language practices in a study abroad context: Talk in the dorm. *Applied Linguistics*, 37(5), 599–620. doi:10.1093/applin/amu053.
- Duff, P. A. (2012). Second language socialization. In A. Duranti, E. Ochs, & B. B. Schieffelin (Eds.), *The handbook of language socialization* (pp. 564–586). Malden: Wiley-Blackwell.
- DuFon, M. A. (2006). The socialization of taste during study abroad in Indonesia. In M. A. DuFon & E. Churchill (Eds.), *Language learners in study abroad contexts* (pp. 91–119). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Frank, V. (1997, March). Potential negative effects of a homestay. Paper presented at the Middle Atlantic Conference of the American Association for the Advancement of Slavic Studies, Albany.
- Hashimoto, H. (1993). Language acquisition of an exchange student within the homestay environment. *Journal of Asian Pacific Communication*, 4(4), 209–224.
- Huebner, T. (1995). The effects of overseas programs: Report on a case study of an intensive Japanese program. In B. Freed (Ed.), *Second language acquisition in a study abroad context* (pp. 171–193). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Iino, M. (2006). Norms of interaction in a Japanese homestay setting – Toward two way flow of linguistic and cultural resources. In M. A. DuFon & E. Churchill (Eds.), *Language learners in study abroad contexts* (pp. 151–173). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Kinginger, C. (2008). Language learning in study abroad: Case studies of Americans in France. *Modern Language Journal*, 92. Monograph.
- Kinginger, C. (2009). *Language learning and study abroad: A critical reading of research*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Kinginger, C. (forthcoming). Overcoming ethnocentrism in research on language learning abroad. In M. Fuchs, Y. Loiseau, & S. Rai (Eds.), *Study abroad: Traditions, directions, and innovations*. New York: Modern Language Association.
- Kinginger, C., Lee, H.-S., Wu, Q., & Tan, D. (2014). Contextualized language practices as sites for learning: Mealtime talk in short-term Chinese homestays. *Applied Linguistics*, 37(5), 716–740. doi:10.1093/applin/amu061.
- Lave, J., & Wenger, C. (1991). *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Lee, H.-S. (2016, March). Developing awareness and use of compliments in the Chinese homestay: A longitudinal study. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Association for Applied Linguistics, Orlando.
- Lee, H.-S., & Kinginger, C. (2016). Authenticating practices in Chinese home stay interactions. In R. Van Compernelle & J. McGregor (Eds.), *Authenticity, language, and interaction in second language contexts* (pp. 151–173). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Lee, S.-H. & Wu, Q. (2015, April). Authentic language and culture: Scenes from Chinese homestays. 27th North American Conference on Chinese Linguistics, Los Angeles.
- Ochs, E. (2002). Becoming a speaker of culture. In C. Kramsch (Ed.), *Language acquisition and language socialization: Ecological perspectives* (pp. 99–120). New York: Continuum.
- Patron, M.-C. (2007). *Culture and identity in study abroad contexts: After Australia, French without France*. Bern: Peter Lang.
- Rivers, W. (1998). Is being there enough? The effects of homestay placements on language gain during study abroad. *Foreign Language Annals*, 31(4), 492–500.

- Shively, R. (2011). L2 pragmatic development in study abroad: A longitudinal study of Spanish service encounters. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 43(6), 1818–1835.
- Shively, R. (2013). Learning to be funny in Spanish during study abroad: L2 humor development. *Modern Language Journal*, 97(4), 930–946.
- Siegal, M. (1996). The role of learner subjectivity in second language sociolinguistic competency: Western women learning Japanese. *Applied Linguistics*, 17(3), 356–382.
- Van de Berg, M., Connor-Linton, J., & Paige, M. (2009). The Georgetown Consortium Project: Interventions for student learning abroad. *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad*, 18, 1–75.
- Vygotsky, L. (1978). *Mind in society*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Wu, Q. (2016, June). Communicating emotions in Chinese: A case study of an American student on a semester abroad in China. Paper presented at the Fourth International Symposium on Chinese Language and Discourse, Smithfield.

Academic Discourse Socialization

Masaki Kobayashi, Sandra Zappa-Hollman, and Patricia A. Duff

Abstract

Research on academic discourse socialization (ADS), a form of language socialization, examines the social, cognitive, and cultural processes, ideologies, and practices involved in higher education in particular. ADS is concerned with the means by which newcomers and those they interact with learn to participate in various kinds of academic discourse in their communities and other social networks.

In this chapter, we discuss recent developments in scholarship on ADS, following on earlier such reviews (e.g., Duff 2010; Morita and Kobayashi 2008). We describe the challenges faced by some students (and sometimes their mentors) in relation to intertextuality, unfamiliar or evolving academic genres, and social stratification and marginalization, which may be exacerbated by students' proficiency in the language of education. We review research examining the linguistic and rhetorical demands of academic texts in diverse disciplines, noting the complexities, contingencies, and hybridity of ADS. We also discuss problems with research that assumes a prescriptive, deterministic view of ADS instead of an innovative, transformative, and sometimes contested process.

M. Kobayashi (✉)

Department of English, Kanda University of International Studies, Chiba, Chiba Prefecture, Japan
e-mail: masakik@kanda.kuis.ac.jp

S. Zappa-Hollman

Department of Language and Literacy Education, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, BC, Canada

e-mail: sandra.zappa@ubc.ca

P.A. Duff

University of British Columbia, Vancouver, BC, Canada

e-mail: patricia.duff@ubc.ca

We conclude by identifying areas for future studies in ADS, emphasizing fertile research possibilities associated with technology-mediated socialization (e.g., i-clickers, Skype, Google Docs, and course-related discussion platforms), new forms of assessment (e.g., portfolios), the inclusion of a wider range of oral, written, and multimodal learning activities, and a more diverse range of contexts, both disciplinary and geographical. Finally, we suggest that longitudinal studies of ADS across learners' academic programs (i.e., within and across courses) over an extended period are needed.

Keywords

Academic discourse socialization • Language socialization • Learning communities • Social networks • Intertextuality • Stance • Online discussion forums • Humor • English for academic purposes • Identity • Agency

Contents

Introduction	240
Major Contributions	241
Negotiation and Co-construction of Identities	243
Work in Progress	245
Roles and Types of Socialization Agents	245
Intertextuality and ADS	246
Entextualized Humor in ADS	247
Learners' Trajectories and Identities and Socialization Across Tasks/Events	247
Semiotic Resources Mediating ADS	248
Problems and Difficulties	249
Future Directions	250
Cross-References	251
Related Articles in the Encyclopedia of Language and Education	251
References	252

Introduction

Over the last decade, research on academic discourse socialization (ADS), especially the disciplinary socialization of second language (L2) students, has gained ground in the field of applied linguistics. This is evidenced by the increasing number of publications, including research articles and state-of-the-art review papers (e.g., Duff 2010; Duff and Anderson 2015), monographs (e.g., Leki 2007; Mertz 2007), edited volumes (e.g., Casanave and Li 2008), and doctoral dissertation projects (e.g., Anderson 2016; Fei 2016; Morton 2013), which offer rich accounts of university students' lived experiences with academic discourse and literacy. According to Hyland (2009), discourse plays a central role in academia as "it is the way that individuals collaborate and compete with others, to create knowledge, to educate neophytes, to reveal learning and define academic allegiances" (p. 2). ADS research, therefore, is concerned with how students gain the necessary dispositions and learn to perform meaningful actions in institutionally and socioculturally valued ways as they participate in their disciplinary communities (Duff 2010).

This chapter focuses primarily on developments in scholarship on ADS in higher education published since Morita and Kobayashi's (2008) chapter in the second edition of the *Encyclopedia of Language and Education*. Acknowledging the diversity of theoretical and methodological approaches to the study of disciplinary socialization, Morita and Kobayashi identified three major orientations: English for academic purposes (EAP) research, such as survey research and genre-based research, focusing on what students need to know to succeed in higher education; qualitative/ethnographic research documenting the socially and historically situated nature of disciplinary socialization; and critical discourse/literacy studies, which foreground issues of access and power and examine identity, agency, and learner resistance (as in the more recent studies by Liu and Tannacito 2013; Waterstone 2008; White 2011). These lines of research have further developed in the interim, contributing to a broader and deeper understanding of the challenges that students face in their academic studies (e.g., Anderson 2015; Evans and Morrison 2011), the linguistic and rhetorical demands of academic texts in diverse disciplines (e.g., Bazerman et al. 2009; Nesi and Gardner 2012), and the complexities, contingencies, and hybridity of ADS (Duff 2010). The chapter includes a selective review of studies of the actual socialization experiences of L1 and L2 speakers/writers in post-secondary contexts primarily, drawing either explicitly or implicitly upon the theory of language socialization (Ochs and Schieffelin 2012) and closely related sociocultural theories (e.g., Engeström 2014; Lave and Wenger 1991).

Major Contributions

Early studies on ADS focused on academic writing and literacy practices, uncovering the socially, culturally, and historically situated processes of disciplinary socialization (see Morita and Kobayashi 2008). More recently, studies have examined students' socialization into oral discourse and multimodal practices, focusing on oral interactions in speech events such as academic presentations (e.g., Duff and Kobayashi 2010; Kobayashi 2016; Morton 2009; Yang 2010; Zappa-Hollman 2007a), class or small group/team discussions (e.g., Ho 2011; Morita 2009; Seloni 2012; Vickers 2008), negotiation simulations (Shi 2010, 2011), "desk crit" (critique) sessions in architectural design studios (Morton 2013), and one-on-one writing conferences. With respect to the latter, Gilliland (2014) scrutinized teachers' oral responses during writing conferences with high school writers and detailed the features of responses that helped writers incorporate ideas or language in their writing and those that did not. Collectively, these studies have contributed to our understanding of ADS by unveiling the Janus-faced nature of oral interactions as resources and constraints for learning and socialization. Some studies have also gone beyond an analysis of overt participation to illuminate complex processes involved in ADS that are often not readily visible to teachers. For instance, Morita (2009) and Seloni (2012) examined the key role that graduate students' out-of-class conversations and collaboration played in facilitating their academic learning and socialization. Along the same lines, Duff and Kobayashi (2010) examined undergraduate

students' (bilingual) collaborations outside the classroom to accomplish their in-class tasks, which earned them recognition from their teachers and reflected forms of socialization they had experienced in the course. In contrast, other studies (e.g., Shi 2011; Zappa-Hollman 2007b) illustrated instances where efforts and contributions made by international students outside of class did *not* result in successful task performance or recognition. More recently, Fei (2016) conducted a multiple case study of Chinese undergraduate students with different backgrounds at a Canadian university. Her analysis revealed, for example, that trilingual Cantonese-Mandarin-English speakers taking a business course used more Cantonese in their group planning instead of English to exclude Mandarin-English (bilingual) classmates they considered troublesome. These studies show that while joint out-of-class work involving peer socialization frequently plays a key role in students' ADS, in some cases it is not optimal.

Applied linguists working in the tradition of language socialization have recently examined university students' academic socialization in relation to written discourse (e.g., Anderson 2016; Séror 2014; Yamada 2016), from undergraduate to doctoral levels. Séror (2014, and elsewhere) examined different aspects of feedback practices involving Japanese undergraduate students in a Canadian university (e.g., alternative sources of feedback and institutional factors constraining instructors' roles in their L2 students' ADS). For instance, Séror found that a philosophy professor's written feedback on a student's term paper focused critically on language use rather than content, leading to the student's decision to cancel an important trip in order to revise the paper and also resulting in a negative perception of himself as an L2 writer in his academic community. Further illustrating the impact of feedback practices on students' ADS, Fujioka (2014) presented an activity-theory analysis (see Engeström 2014) of the active negotiations of writing assignments between an international graduate student and his professor at an American university. The results showed that these negotiations mutually influenced and shaped each participant's practices over time in complex ways, thus also further supporting the view of language socialization as a "bi- and multidirectional, contingent process" (Duff 2010, p. 171). With regard to studies focusing on ADS through a focus on genre, Yamada's (2016) longitudinal research contributes to our understanding of the striking differences in how psychology students and non-psychology students are socialized into the genre of thesis writing at Japanese universities during the first 2 years of their undergraduate studies. Based on her findings, Yamada suggested that students might benefit from long-term socialization processes through which they are gradually introduced to the genres and associated practices of their disciplines through carefully designed programs.

The increasing use of computer-mediated learning in academia has also created the need to examine the nature and role of digital tools and engagement in ADS. Yim's (2011) study, for example, compared the online discussions of two mixed-mode (blended) graduate education courses at a Canadian university. While her analysis showed that both courses were successful in allowing students to produce a sophisticated level of academic discourse, it revealed important differences between these courses in their approaches to ADS. Students in one course were socialized

into a fairly formal discourse register that resembled academic essay writing, whereas students in the other course were socialized into more informal discourse and discussion (i.e., more spoken-like) that was conducive to friendly interactions among peers. Because of the heavy emphasis that the instructor in the former course placed on the academic quality of their postings, students commented that they felt constrained in sharing their viewpoints and were dissatisfied with the online component (although the study did not examine students' ultimate success with academic writing). Likewise, Liew and Ball (2010) reported on a teaching assistant's (TA's) use of highly academic discourse in response to a student's post, which was perceived negatively as "pretentious" and "intimidating" by some students. In other words, the TA inadvertently neglected socio-affective dimensions of online participation and failed "to 'disguise' his intellectual authority amid the social exigencies of an on-line discussion" (p. 330). In a related study, Chang and Sperling (2014) examined the interactions of community college ESL students in their face-to-face classroom and online discussion forums. In the face-to-face interactions, the instructor tended to emphasize academic topics and modeled academic ways of talking about them. In contrast, the online discussions provided students with opportunities to draw on their personal experiences and to use informal language. This mode enabled them to enact multiple identities and, in Yim's (2011) study, different roles as well (as questioner, supporter, etc.) through written online exchanges on academic topics selected by the instructor. These findings suggest that the in-class (oral) and online (written) interactions afforded participants different but complementary opportunities for learning, which enhanced their ADS.

Negotiation and Co-construction of Identities

Many studies to date have detailed the complex, dynamic negotiation and co-construction of identities involved in ADS, as noted in the previous section. More specifically, these studies have illustrated how newcomers to an academic community negotiate not only their academic and linguistic needs and expectations but also their personal goals and histories, their roles and identities, as well as social, cultural, and historical aspects of their academic socialization. Morita (2004, 2009) delineated the ADS experiences of international graduate students, all from the same country of origin (Japan) but with unique histories and subjectivities. Her findings revealed not just the tensions that arose from the dissonance between the students' assumed and ascribed identities and dispositions, but also their strategies to negotiate their participation and positionalities. For example, a mature male international doctoral student in Morita's (2009) study did not align with the feminist discourse foregrounded in his courses and, according to him, his department. The female instructor's philosophical and instructional approach in one course conflicted with his own, which he interpreted to be a more masculine theoretical orientation to higher education research drawing on economics. However, his (and some of his other male, international classmates') actions and attitudes were interpreted by the female instructor as showing a gender-based lack of respect toward her, and

frustration was expressed by the instructor, focal student, and others (e.g., domestic students) about the classroom discourse. Nevertheless, the student refused to change his theoretical position during the year to conform to local academic ideologies and stances. In that sense, he resisted certain aspects of ADS.

Adding to this line of research, Waterstone's (2008) case study illustrated how a mature international undergraduate student at a Canadian university accepted or rejected certain revisions suggested by her writing consultant depending on her degree of confidence in or understanding of the suggested edits. During the academic term in which the study took place, the student also negotiated – and disclosed to the researcher (who was neither the consultant nor the business course instructor) – her multiple contradictory identifications: as a good student, as a BA holder in English literature, and as an ESL student being compared to a native speaker. In other words, editorial suggestions provided on her drafts were not accepted by her simply because they came from someone more proficient in English attempting to mediate her literacy development. She also exercised her own discretion and agency.

Kim and Duff (2012), similarly, found that two generation 1.5 Canadian-Korean university students experienced conflicts and contradictions associated with the beliefs and ideologies about language learning and use into which they were socialized. One dilemma was whether and how to immerse themselves in Korean vs. English social worlds and (yet) succeed academically in their English institutional context and wider community. This situation resulted in their having to negotiate *investments* in their identities as Koreans vs. Anglophones (Norton 2000). For example, one participant in the study suggested that “speaking English was perceived in her high school as an act of betrayal or lack of allegiance to one’s Koreanness” (p. 89).

Also revealing the kinds of tensions that arise from the pressure to adopt expected academic and social identities, White's (2011) study illustrated two minority college students' ambivalence about appropriating academic discourse even though they were aware of their need to do so to gain respect and legitimacy in class. This resistance resulted from their view of using academic discourse as equivalent to “talking like White people” and “selling out” their cultural or ethnic traditions” (p. 259). In contrast, two other students in White's study, although initially ambivalent, were willing to appropriate academic discourse as essential for their academic success. Likewise, the Taiwanese college students in Liu and Tannacito's (2013) study at a US university embraced all practices associated with white American or native speakers of English and rejected writing instruction (e.g., formulaic genres for TOEFL preparation; peer editing and feedback; simple writing tasks to accompany photos they had taken) that they felt did not assist them in joining their imagined communities of creative, more free-spirited, capable and prolific American writers. This alignment with a white norm (i.e., “White Prestige Ideology”), according to the authors, resulted in the two focal students' construction of inferior identities as racialized, Taiwanese, nonnative writers of English not yet able to produce the kinds of lengthy, sophisticated texts they associated with American writers. These acts of resistance and acceptance can be viewed as displays and exertion of agency, which mediates ADS and other kinds of language socialization (Duff and Doherty 2015; Haneda 2009; Ochs and Schieffelin 2012).

Work in Progress

Several major areas of current work on ADS, which are often closely related or overlapping, include (1) roles and types (e.g., teachers, peers, networks, learners themselves) of socialization agents, (2) intertextuality in ADS, (3) entextualized humor in ADS, (4) learners' trajectories and identities associated with and resulting from socialization across tasks/events, and (5) semiotic resources involved in mediating ADS. Each of these themes is illustrated in turn below.

Roles and Types of Socialization Agents

One line of current research relates to *agents* of socialization. As Lave and Wenger's (1991) situated learning theory suggests, socialization has traditionally been seen to take place through apprenticeship, where novices are inducted into the valued practices of their community with the help of more experienced members. For example, the teacher in Chang and Sperling's (2014) study often repeated and elaborated on her students' oral contributions, thereby modeling for the students how to give a fuller account of their observations, support their ideas with textual evidence, and make more appropriate academic language choices. Eriksson and Makitalo's (2013) multimodal discourse analysis of one-on-one supervisory sessions demonstrated how a Swedish instructor of environmental engineering guided his international graduate student into disciplinary ways of writing and reasoning by making reference to others' previously published work. As a third example, Anderson (2016) found that professors at a Canadian university provided many kinds of feedback, both critical and encouraging, on the academic writing of Chinese doctoral students in his study, which five of the six students reported to be instrumental in their development and success as emerging scholars.

While these studies suggest the important roles that teachers can play as mentors and thus agents of ADS, other studies foreground the key role that *peer collaboration* can also play in ADS (e.g., Duff and Kobayashi 2010; Ho 2011; Seloni 2012; Yang 2010; Zappa-Hollman and Duff 2015). One example is Vicker's (2008) microanalysis of interaction in team meetings by two undergraduate engineers at an American university, which illustrated how an L1 Japanese student, with more experience and background in computer programming, socialized his American partner into ways of thinking and talking expected of competent programmers. Yang (2010) explored the group collaboration of five international undergraduate students as they prepared an academic presentation for their commerce course at a Canadian university. Their joint rehearsal resulted in the elimination of spelling errors, an improvement in the organization of their speech, and an increased awareness of the time allotted for the presentation. However, despite the potential for ADS afforded by peer scaffolding and support, as recent studies have shown, group work does not always proceed seamlessly. Cheng (2013) identified the power inequality between a Korean MA student and her native English-speaking peers, which limited her

contribution to the production of their group paper, a finding common to other studies examining group work interactions (see also Fei 2016).

A relatively understudied yet promising line of research combines the compatible, complementary frameworks of language socialization, communities of practice (Lave and Wenger 1991; Wenger 1998), and social network theory (Milroy 1987). Studies framed in this way (e.g., Zappa-Hollman 2007b) have mapped out the multiplicity of factors and agents (near and far) involved in students' ADS process. These factors include feedback by instructors and peers, scaffolding provided by instructors and TAs (through teaching and interactions in class or during office hours), institutional documents available (such as course outlines, policy documents, and reference guides), team work (in and out of class), and students' "individual networks of practice (INoPs)" (i.e., the connections they forge over time with friends, peers, roommates, instructors, and significant others; see Zappa-Hollman and Duff 2015). A key contribution of such studies is the recognition of the interplay between emotional and academic support afforded to students by different socialization agents, primarily by those key people in their INoPs. And by considering this wide range of factors, such investigations provide a more holistic, ecological perspective of ADS that takes account of the multiple agents that impact students' experiences. This approach further supports the view of ADS as a highly dynamic, at times contentious and unpredictable process, where both teaching *and* learning opportunities can sometimes be missed or not fully taken advantage of.

Intertextuality and ADS

A second line of current research focuses on intertextuality. Some studies adopt a Bakhtinian perspective on intertextuality; as Blommaert (2010) puts it, "whenever we speak we produce the words of others, we constantly cite and re-cite expressions and recycle meanings that are already available" (p. 187). Moreover, from a social semiotic perspective, intertextuality is viewed as a function of the relations that people construct as they interact with each other, rather than as a property of the text itself (Bloome and Clark 2006).

While several studies have demonstrated that intertextuality and heteroglossia can be utilized to create learning opportunities and exercise student agency (e.g., Ho 2011; Kobayashi 2016), others suggest that it can also contribute to social marginalization. Haneda (2009), for example, found that an instructor's frequent (intertextual) references to US pop culture presented challenges for Korean graduate students in class discussions. One student, therefore, formed a Korean group for all of the assignments for the course, which she felt resulted in a marked improvement in writing, but not in her oral language skills. As a second example, Bucholtz et al. (2012) demonstrated how two female undergraduate students in a first year chemistry course, through mockery and criticism, often linked a particular male student (Bill) with the host of a television science (Bill Nye) show for children during their interactions in the lab as in the following utterance "unlike Bill Nye, our Bill has

questionable scientific knowledge” (p. 165). Such *intertextual configuration* gave him the stable but unflattering identity of a weak and incompetent science student.

Academic posters constitute another highly intertextual genre and activity that merits more ADS research precisely because of their multimodal and social nature (D’Angelo 2016) throughout the various stages involved in poster preparation (e.g., conceptualization, design, presentation, discussion, and assessment). Intertextuality therefore often involves multimodality, embodiment, and performativity in ADS as well as identity work.

Entextualized Humor in ADS

A third emerging area of research relates to the role of entextualized humor in informal academic socialization. *Entextualization* is defined by Blommaert (2010) as “the process by means of which discourses are successively or simultaneously decontextualised and metadiscursively recontextualised, so that they become a new discourse associated to a new context” (p. 187). Bucholtz et al. (2011) examined undergraduate students’ science jokes in a calculus class where student-student interactions were valued. Their analysis showed that students positioned themselves in relation to the science knowledge underlying the jokes made by their peers in group interactions, indexing either understanding or nonunderstanding of the science humor. The authors reported that two contrasting novice identities emerged over time: some students constructed themselves as *scientists in the making*, who “claimed both scientific knowledge and familiarity with the cultural practices of science and hence embraced formulaic science humor” (p. 179), while others constructed themselves as *science students*, who were eager to learn science (and mathematics) but were not invested in the culture of science and thus did not accept or (re)produce such humor. Thus, the former engaged in peer socialization and positive stance-taking toward scientist identities and knowledge through the sharing of scientific humor, whereas the latter found it more of a distraction than delight. In the end, two of those same “science students” switched to different majors, in environmental science and philosophy.

Learners’ Trajectories and Identities and Socialization Across Tasks/Events

A fourth recent area, closely connected with the previous example, concerns students’ learning trajectories and identity development through the use of learning strategies across contexts, or via repeated engagement in similar tasks (i.e., entailing cross-event analysis), which can be traced through longitudinal studies of participation and transformations. A study by Roozen (2010), for instance, detailed how an English literature graduate student drew upon some of the discursive practices that she had previously developed in other contexts. Her passage-copying practice, which helped her understand disciplinary texts (i.e., novels and journal articles)

and appropriate the language of literary criticism, originated from her experience copying verses from the Bible into her journals as a member of a church youth group. Such “repurposing of extradisciplinary practices across contexts” (p. 327) seemed to have played an important role in her development of disciplinary expertise. Cheng (2013) described how the Korean student in her study became a fuller participant as she developed disciplinary expertise and coping strategies (e.g., trying to achieve her self-set goals such as presenting the most relevant information, using academic terminology, and consulting sample writings). Shi (2010) demonstrated how a female Chinese student enrolled in an MBA program at a US institution, after being repeatedly criticized by her professor as a “tough negotiator” in simulation negotiations, felt that her face had been threatened and therefore changed her strategy by adopting a peaceful concession approach. Although this change was mostly behavioral rather than ideological at first, she eventually came to appreciate the idea of compromising to reach a win-win agreement – a highly valued approach in her classroom community.

Moreover, Kobayashi’s (2016) in-depth, longitudinal account of a Japanese undergraduate student’s learning across three oral presentations and related group interactions suggested that the student approached and performed her presentations differently as her understanding of this academic task evolved over time. These cross-event (or cross-task) analyses coupled with detailed analysis of task-related interactions (see also Duff and Kobayashi 2010) are vital to capture long-term ADS trajectories, especially given that learning and socialization “take place inherently across events” (Wortham and Reyes 2015, p. 1).

Semiotic Resources Mediating ADS

Finally, there is growing interest in the use of multiple meaning-making resources in academic learning and socialization. In line with the Vygotskian view of language as a psychological tool (e.g., Swain and Lapkin 2013), Duff and Kobayashi (2010) showed how Japanese undergraduate students in Canada used their L1 to negotiate task requirements, (English) language, and content as they prepared for their group presentations outside the classroom, suggesting that learners’ L1 can be an important tool that mediates L2 learning through academic tasks. This finding resonates with Turnbull and Dailey-O’Cain’s (2009) and many other scholars’ suggestion that L2 learners be viewed “not as ineffective and imperfect monolingual speakers of the target language” (p. 187) but rather as aspiring, emergent bilinguals or multilinguals. More recently, an increasing number of studies have shown that multilingual students engage in *translanguaging* as they participate in academic activities. According to García and Sylvan (2011), translanguaging refers to “the process by which bilingual students and teachers engage in complex discursive practices in order to ‘make sense’ of, and communicate in, multilingual classrooms” (p. 389). In other words, translanguaging is instrumental in allowing bilingual/multilingual students to “develop and enact standard academic ways of languaging” (p. 389). Along this line, Moore (2014) traced the interactions of four undergraduates – both

local and international – enrolled in an educational psychology course at a Catalan university, illustrating how they developed their plurilingual resources to accomplish their group task. Moreover, Preece's (2015) study with working-class English L1 first year undergraduates in the UK focused on what Morek and Heller (2015) called the "socio-symbolic function" of academic language, which concerns how individuals identify themselves with particular communities of practice. Her findings indicated that some students assumed identities as bidialectal users of English and used their vernacular speech as a resource for negotiating academic texts and constructing knowledge in their study group. Similarly, Seloni's (2014) case study revealed how a Colombian student pursuing an MA in visual culture at a US university marshalled a variety of multilingual and multimodal resources (e.g., conceptual map, visual annotations) in his thesis writing process, which suggested his active engagement in academic reading and meaning making. These studies together highlight the importance of making strategic use of students' multiple linguistic and other resources (e.g., L1s, dialects, and other forms of knowledge).

Problems and Difficulties

Despite the significant advances in research on ADS in the past decade, a number of challenges remain, two of which are discussed in this section. First, documentation and assessment of linguistic development and use (i.e., socialization in situ) continue to be an issue, particularly in self-report studies (e.g., narratives by learners about their experiences), which may lack sufficient oral, written, or multimodal discourse as evidence of their actual socialization experiences. This absence of direct observational data or artifacts makes it difficult to assess learners' development or socialization processes. One reason for researchers providing more self-reported, emic, narrative accounts is that access to contexts in which ADS occurs (e.g., classroom interactions, writing conferences with tutors, feedback on written papers) may be difficult to obtain, for a variety of ethical, practical, and personal reasons. In addition, participants' own accounts of ADS can be very compelling (e.g., Anderson 2016).

A second issue is that uncritically promoting the adoption of certain academic values, identities, and practices through ADS, without also allowing newcomers to have a greater voice in shaping their own and others' academic discourse and possibilities, perpetuates long-established practices and ideologies, even when other aspects of academia have changed (e.g., new technologies for mediating learning, changing dissertation or thesis structures, new ways of publishing, new ways of configuring participation in learning communities). Socialization viewed in this manner is prescriptive and reproductive, not transformative and innovative; the process therefore disempowers or reduces the agency of learners and may foster unhelpful and dated practices. The question, then, is: How can ADS provide a sufficient foundation so that learners can succeed in their academic domains without the process being overly dogmatic or restrictive and the range of outcomes too narrow and conventional?

Future Directions

There is a need for more longitudinal, situated investigations of ADS within and across course and program areas (e.g., throughout students' undergraduate or graduate programs), and across a wider variety of learning events and disciplinary contexts (for the same learners or for different ones). The growing literature focusing on oral presentations has significantly enhanced our awareness of the types of expectations and skills required, and the typical language features and genre stages of this prominent task in both undergraduate and graduate contexts. It has also revealed the challenges as well as opportunities for ADS afforded to students through preparation, negotiation (e.g., with teammates, often behind the scenes), and enactment of oral presentations. Yet a large number of other tasks (or learning events) deserve attention, especially those increasingly used in the assessment of student learning across disciplinary fields, such as student portfolios and related reflections on learning. It thus seems necessary to gain a deeper understanding of ADS that takes place through multiple sources of mediation (e.g., via feedback from teachers, tutors, friends and peers) on particular types of texts, such as reflections or self-assessments of progress.

Other types of tasks or learning events that merit close examination in ADS due to their increasing use as teaching and assessment tools include the use of interactive student response systems such as i-clickers, typically used in large-sized classes. Locally designed by course instructors to assist with attendance and quick comprehension checks of classroom content, these tools are emerging as regular forms of in-class participation that come with their own sets of rules and uses. In light of their increasing use and the stakes involved, research should investigate the role played by these tasks and devices in not just ascertaining comprehension of subject matter but also in scaffolding learners' ADS through participation in fast-paced, real-time, technology-mediated tasks.

In addition, most studies to date have been situated in North American contexts, many of them in TESOL programs with large numbers of Asian international students. A wider range of geographical contexts and types of institutions in which ADS takes place (e.g., research-intensive universities vs. community colleges or high schools) would provide insights into the types of genres favored in each and the means by which socialization is institutionally and culturally organized. In particular, with the proliferation of academic English preparatory or bridge-like programs specifically designed to orient students to the local academic discourses and practices, it would be beneficial to examine ADS at the program and institutional level (i.e., beyond the course level, which has been the focus of much research). This would help answer such questions as: What additional resources (e.g., access to tutors, teaching assistants, coaches, language-exchange program peers) are embedded in these programs, and how do they contribute to students' ADS trajectories? A combination of qualitative and quantitative research techniques might more effectively address such questions. Additionally, input from all stakeholders would yield a more holistic understanding of the issues.

Another under-researched topic concerns nonlanguage specialists' support of learners' ADS. Particularly during the last decade or so, there has been a rise and geographical expansion across K-12 and higher education programs with a dual focus on the teaching/learning of content and language (i.e., content-based instruction [CBI] or content and language integrated learning [CLIL]). Such curricular approaches often presuppose varying levels of collaboration between disciplinary (i.e., content) and language instructors. Yet there is a dearth of research examining content instructors' views on their role in promoting their students' academic discourse development, nor is there much known about the multidirectional ADS that might take place among the paired disciplinary and language instructors themselves (e.g., transformations that may result from their collaboration). Some investigations have focused on "language-related episodes" in content area classes, for instance (e.g., Basturkmen and Shackleford 2015), but this is still an untapped area for research in LS. Furthermore, the role of metalanguage (i.e., language to talk about language) in scaffolding students' ADS could complement other kinds of linguistic analysis in ADS.

Finally, given the phenomenal affordances of contemporary digital technologies in mediating ADS – from Skype, to Google Docs, to classroom bulletin boards, and to other online learning and discussion platforms (twenty-first-century tools/communities of socialization) – much more research is required on how people engage with and develop greater discursive expertise and other knowledge through interactions with these tools and with other actors.

Cross-References

- ▶ [Language Socialization and Schooling](#)
- ▶ [Language Socialization in Digital Contexts](#)
- ▶ [Language Socialization in Study Abroad](#)
- ▶ [Language Socialization, Higher Education, and Work](#)

Related Articles in the Encyclopedia of Language and Education

- Kara Jackson and Hannah Nieman: [Discursive Perspectives on Learning and Teaching Mathematics](#). In Volume: *Discourse and Education*
- Angele Reyes and Stanton Wortham: [Discourse Analysis Across Events](#). In Volume: *Discourse and Education*
- Mary R. Lea: [Academic Literacies in Theory and Practice](#). In Volume: *Literacies and Language Education*
- Gregory J. Kelly: [Learning Science: Discourse Practices](#). In Volume: *Discourse and Education*
- Constant Leung: [Second Language Academic Literacies: Evolving Understandings](#). In Volume: *Literacies and Language Education*

References

- Anderson, N. J. (2015). Academic reading expectations and challenges. In N. W. Evans, N. J. Anderson, & W. G. Eggington (Eds.), *ESL readers and writers in higher education: Understanding challenges, providing support* (pp. 95–109). New York: Routledge.
- Anderson, T. (2016). *Negotiating academic discourse practices, ideologies, and identities: The socialization of Chinese PhD students*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The University of British Columbia, Vancouver.
- Basturkmen, H., & Shackelford, N. (2015). How content lecturers help students with language: An observational study of language-related episodes in interaction in first year accounting classrooms. *English for Specific Purposes*, 37, 87–97. doi:10.1016/j.esp.2014.08.001.
- Bazerman, C., Bonini, A., & Figueiredo, D. (2009). *Genre in a changing world*. West Lafayette: Parlor Press.
- Blommaert, J. (2010). Text and context. In C. Coffin, T. Lillis, & K. O'Halloran (Eds.), *Applied linguistics methods: A reader* (pp. 182–200). London: Routledge.
- Bloome, D., & Clark, C. (2006). Discourse-in-use. In J. Green, G. Camilli, & P. B. Elmore (Eds.), *Handbook of complementary methods in education research* (pp. 227–241). New York: Routledge.
- Bucholtz, M., Skapoulli, E., Barnwell, B., & Lee, J. J. (2011). Entextualized humor in the formation of scientist identities among U.S. undergraduates. *Anthropology & Education*, 42(3), 177–192.
- Bucholtz, M., Barnwell, B., Skapoulli, E., & Lee, J. J. (2012). Itineraries of identity in undergraduate science. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly*, 43(2), 157–172. doi:10.1111/j.1548-1492.2012.01167.x.
- Casanave, C., & Li, X. (2008). *Learning the literacy practice of graduate school: Insiders' reflections on academic enculturation*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Chang, Y., & Sperling, M. (2014). Discourse and identity among ESL learners: A case study of a community college ESL classroom. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 49(1), 31–51.
- Cheng, R. (2013). A non-native student's experience on collaborating with native peers in academic literacy development: A sociopolitical perspective. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 12, 12–22.
- D'Angelo, L. (2016). The academic poster genre: Friend or foe? In K. Hyland & P. Shaw (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of English for academic purposes* (pp. 392–402). London: Routledge.
- Duff, P. (2010). Language socialization into academic discourse communities. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 30, 169–197.
- Duff, P., & Anderson, T. (2015). Academic language and literacy socialization for second language students. In N. Markee (Ed.), *The handbook of classroom discourse and interaction* (pp. 337–352). Malden: Wiley Blackwell.
- Duff, P., & Doherty, L. (2015). Examining agency in (second) language socialization research. In P. Deter, X. Gao, E. R. Miller, & G. Vitanova (Eds.), *Theorizing and analyzing agency in second language learning: Interdisciplinary approaches* (pp. 54–72). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Duff, P., & Kobayashi, M. (2010). The intersection of social, cognitive, and cultural processes in language learning: A second language socialization approach. In R. Batstone (Ed.), *Socio-cognitive perspectives on language use and language learning* (pp. 75–93). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Engeström, Y. (2014). *Learning by expanding: An activity-theoretical approach to developmental research* (2nd ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Eriksson, A., & Makitalo, A. (2013). Referencing as practice: Learning to write and reason with other people's texts in environmental engineering education. *Learning, Culture, and Social Interaction*, 2, 171–183. doi:10.1016/j.lcsi.2013.05.002.
- Evans, S., & Morrison, B. (2011). Meeting the challenges of English-medium higher education: The first year experience in Hong Kong. *Journal of English for Specific Purposes*, 30(3), 198–208. doi:10.1016/j.esp.2011.01.001.

- Fei, J. (2016). *The politics of oral participation: The experiences of Chinese multilingual speakers in Canadian university classrooms*. Doctoral dissertation, Simon Fraser University.
- Fujioka, M. (2014). L2 student-US professor interactions through disciplinary writing assignments: An activity theory perspective. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 25*, 40–58.
- Garcia, O., & Sylvan, C. E. (2011). Pedagogies and practices in multilingual classrooms: Singularities in pluralities. *The Modern Language Journal, 95*, 385–400.
- Gilliland, B. (2014). Academic discourse socialization in high school writing conferences. *The Canadian Modern Language Review, 70*, 303–330.
- Haneda, M. (2009). Enculturation into discourses by East Asian students in a graduate TESOL program. *TESL Canada Journal, 27*(1), 64–84.
- Ho, M. (2011). Academic discourse socialization through small-group discussions. *System, 39*, 437–540.
- Hyland, K. (2009). *Academic discourse*. London: Continuum.
- Kim, J., & Duff, P. (2012). The language socialization and identity negotiations of generation 1.5 Korean-Canadian university students. *TESL Canada Journal, 29*, 81–102.
- Kobayashi, M. (2016). L2 academic discourse socialization through oral presentations: A Japanese undergraduate student's learning trajectory in study abroad. *The Canadian Modern Language Review, 72*, 95–121.
- Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Leki, I. (2007). *Undergraduate students in a second language: Challenges and complexities of academic literacy development*. New York: Routledge.
- Liew, W. M., & Ball, A. F. (2010). Social academic writing: Exploring academic literacies in text-based computer conferencing. In C. Bazerman, R. Krut, K. Lunsford, S. McLead, S. Null, P. Rogers, & A. Stansell (Eds.), *Traditions of writing research* (pp. 325–338). New York: Routledge.
- Liu, P. E., & Tannacito, D. J. (2013). Resistance by L2 writers: The role of racial and language ideology in imagined community and identity investment. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 22*, 355–373.
- Mertz, E. (2007). *The language of law school: Learning to "think like a lawyer"*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Milroy, L. (1987). *Language and social networks* (2nd ed.). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Moore, E. (2014). Constructing content and language knowledge in plurilingual student teamwork: Situated and longitudinal perspectives. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 17*, 586–609.
- Morek, M., & Heller, V. (2015). Academic discourse as situated practice: An introduction. *Linguistics and Education, 31*, 174–186.
- Morita, N. (2004). Negotiating participation and identity in second language academic communities. *TESOL Quarterly, 38*, 573–603.
- Morita, N. (2009). Language, culture, gender, and academic socialization. *Language and Education, 23*(5), 443–460. doi:10.1080/09500780902752081.
- Morita, N., & Kobayashi, M. (2008). Academic discourse socialization in a second language. In P. A. Duff & N. Hornberger (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of language and education, Language socialization* (Vol. 8, 2nd ed., pp. 243–255). New York: Springer.
- Morton, J. (2009). Genre and disciplinary competence: A case study of contextualisation in an academic speech genre. *English for Specific Purposes, 28*, 217–229.
- Morton, J. (2013). *Adjacent worlds: An analysis of a genre at the intersection of academic and professional communities*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Melbourne, Melbourne.
- Nesi, H., & Gardner, S. (2012). *Genres across disciplines: Student writing in higher education*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Norton, B. (2000). *Identity and language learning: Gender, ethnicity, and educational change*. Harlow: Pearson Education.

- Ochs, E., & Schieffelin, B. (2012). The theory of language socialization. In A. Duranti, E. Ochs, & B. B. Schieffelin (Eds.), *The handbook of language socialization* (pp. 1–21). Malden: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Preece, S. (2015). “They ain’t using slang”: Working class students from linguistic minority communities in higher education. *Linguistics and Education*, 31, 260–275.
- Roozen, K. (2010). Tracing trajectories of practice: Repurposing in one student’s developing disciplinary writing processes. *Written Communication*, 27, 318–354.
- Seloni, L. (2012). Academic literacy socialization of first year doctoral students in USA micro-ethnographic perspective. *English for Specific Purposes*, 31, 47–59.
- Seloni, L. (2014). “I am an artist and a scholar who is trying to find a middle point”: A textgraphic analysis of a Colombian art historian’s thesis writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 25, 79–99. doi:10.1016/j.jslw.2014.06.001.
- Séror, J. (2014). Or, just it’s my fault?: Language socialization through L2 writing feedback. In J. S. B. Clark & F. Dervin (Eds.), *Reflexivity in language and intercultural communication: Rethinking multilingualism and interculturality* (pp. 64–80). New York: Routledge.
- Shi, X. (2010). Intercultural language socialization of a Chinese MBA student in an American negotiation class. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 42, 2475–2486.
- Shi, X. (2011). Negotiating power and access to second language resources: A study on short-term Chinese MBA students in America. *The Modern Language Journal*, 95, 575–588.
- Swain, M., & Lapkin, S. (2013). A Vygotskian sociocultural perspective on immersion education. *Journal of Immersion and Content-Based Language Education*, 1(1), 101–129.
- Turnbull, M., & Dailey-O’Cain, J. (2009). *First language use in second and foreign language learning*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Vickers, C. H. (2008). Expertise, language competence, and the L2 user. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 18(3), 237–255.
- Waterstone, B. (2008). “I hate the ESL idea!”: A case study in identity and academic literacy. *TESOL Canada Journal*, 26(1), 52–67.
- Wenger, E. (1998). *Communities of practice: Learning, meaning and identity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- White, J. W. (2011). Resistance to classroom participation: Minority students, academic discourse, cultural conflicts, and issues of representation in whole class discussions. *Journal of Language, Identity, and Education*, 10, 250–265.
- Wortham, S., & Reyes, A. (2015). *Discourse analysis beyond the speech event*. New York: Routledge.
- Yamada, K. (2016). Cross-disciplinary variations: Japanese novice writers’ socialization into the undergraduate thesis. *The Asia-Pacific Education Researcher*, 25(2), 207–217.
- Yang, L. (2010). Doing a group presentation: Negotiations and challenges experienced by five Chinese ESL students of commerce at a Canadian university. *Language Teaching Research*, 14(2), 141–160.
- Yim, Y. K. (2011). Second language students’ discourse socialization in academic online communication. *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, 67(1), 1–17.
- Zappa-Hollman, S. (2007a). Academic presentations across post-secondary contexts: The discourse socialization of non-native speakers. *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, 63, 455–485. doi:10.3138/2Fcmlr.63.4.455.
- Zappa-Hollman, S. (2007b). *The academic literacy socialization of Mexican exchange students at a Canadian university*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of British Columbia, Vancouver.
- Zappa-Hollman, S., & Duff, P. (2015). Academic English socialization through individual networks of practice. *TESOL Quarterly*, 49(2), 333–368. doi:10.1002/tesq.188.

Language Socialization, Higher Education, and Work

Patricia A. Duff

Abstract

The discursive and interactional demands of higher education and work are evolving with the advent of new technologies, social and industrial restructuring, outsourcing, and globalization. In addition, powerful international lingua francas, especially English, are being used by a growing number of people worldwide for higher education and work, often in combination with other languages. People's career trajectories are now also quite dynamic and, in some fields, precarious, given the social and economic changes in society, in addition to technological advances and the pressures of neoliberalism. As a result of these factors, people must learn new ways of speaking, writing, interpreting, and representing meaning through expanding repertoires of semiotic and communication tools, for new purposes and audiences, and with new networks of colleagues. Researchers, educators, and other members of society need to understand these complex socialization processes better. In this chapter, I discuss the socialization of learners at work or preparing for work by means of education activities and various forms of apprenticeship. I review early developments and main contributions in research in this area and then consider challenges and opportunities for future research.

Keywords

Workplace • Language and work • Professions • Socialization • Neoliberalism • Academic discourse • Trajectories of socialization • Communication repertoires • Identity

P.A. Duff (✉)
University of British Columbia, Vancouver, BC, Canada
e-mail: patricia.duff@ubc.ca

Contents

Introduction	256
Early Developments	257
Major Contributions	259
Family Socialization and Work	259
Postsecondary Academic and Vocational Discourse Socialization	260
Socialization in the Workplace	261
Trajectories of Socialization	264
Work in Progress	265
Expanding Communication Repertoires and Identities	265
Language Socialization and Humor	266
Problems and Difficulties	266
Future Directions	267
Research Methods and Ethical Issues	267
Socialization and Induction in Education and Academia	268
Metaphors, Neoliberalism, and Socialization	268
Conclusion	269
Cross-References	269
Related Articles in the Encyclopedia of Language and Education	270
References	270

Introduction

Although most language socialization research has historically been situated in homes and schools with relatively young language learners, a growing number of studies have investigated socialization well beyond childhood and adolescence into adulthood. An examination of the length and breadth of language socialization – “lifelong” and “lifewide” socialization – takes into account individuals’ and groups’ movement into new educational, vocational, professional, and other social settings, and into the cultures, language and literacy practices, identities, and stances instilled there. In this chapter, I focus on the socialization of learners at work or preparing for work by means of education activities and apprenticeship, keenly aware that the distinction between (higher) education and work is becoming increasingly blurred. Formal education now offers on-the-job internships and integrative cooperative (co-op) experiences as well as traditional in-class, mixed-mode (online and face-to-face), or distance-education study. At the same time, different kinds of work may involve rigorous on-site training, professional development, and implicit or explicit socialization as well, especially in the context of the postindustrial, global knowledge economy, and the increasing impact of neoliberalism on higher education and work.

Thus, the traditional progression from secondary and postsecondary education programs to work is not as seamless or linear as it once was. Postsecondary institutions now accommodate more “nontraditional” (e.g., first-generation college students, international students, people requiring various instructional “accommodations,” older students, even retirees) into academic programs at various stages in their lives and careers. In addition, nonformal education and work contexts, such as

community centers, after-school or after-work programs, workplace kitchens, homes, and social media, represent sites for work-related language socialization. Some of this work may be voluntary and unpaid, in nongovernmental or nonprofit organizations, and language socialization research has begun to examine these contexts as well (e.g., Perren 2008).

The discourse demands of work are also evolving with the advent of new technologies, social and industrial restructuring, outsourcing and globalization, and with the emergence of powerful international lingua francas, such as English, in higher education and workplaces. Many people's career trajectories are now not only nonlinear but also quite precarious, given the pervasive social and economic changes in society, in addition to technological changes. As a result, people must learn new ways of speaking, writing, interpreting, and representing meaning through a variety of semiotic tools, for new purposes and audiences, and with new colleagues – both local and distant. Their work may cross communities, disciplines, professions, languages, cultures, and geographical boundaries, requiring the expansion of their communication repertoires. Therefore, the need to understand complex socialization processes, outcomes, and points of tension has become quite acute. In the remainder of this chapter, I discuss early developments and main contributions in research on language socialization in the contexts of higher education and professional work. I then describe some of the challenges and opportunities for future research in this area.

Early Developments

Heath's (1983) groundbreaking research in three diverse communities in the southeastern United States provided an important early analysis of how people's educational and career trajectories are influenced by their own and their caregivers' oral and literate language socialization histories, activities, opportunities, and their forms of linguistic and social capital. Their ongoing language socialization and their future prospects are also inextricably linked to the economic conditions and vitality of their communities. Heath conceded that the power enjoyed by middle-class educated townspeople in her study in both schools and workplaces was largely "foredestined in the conceptual structures which they have learned at home and which are reinforced in school and numerous other associations" (p. 368). Her study also highlighted the importance of having teachers learn about their own and their students' home language socialization behaviors. She recommended ethnographic fieldwork and the analysis of language and literacy in and across local communities and workplaces, including schools, as a means of learning to accommodate diverse learners better.

Heath (1989) later wrote about the rapidly changing workplace affected by widespread industrialization, urbanization, migration, displacement, and the closing of factories in the region affecting her participants. (These trends have, of course, continued to plague many communities worldwide in the intervening decades.) Mainstream schools and curricula, she noted, with their emphasis on the

development of individual autonomous learners and knowledge, were not socializing students into vaunted new collaborative practices or project work. Heath therefore underscored the need for language socialization involving collaborative teamwork, joint authorship and interpretation of texts, graphics, and other media, and shared responsibility for plans, decisions, and actions of the sort required in many postindustrial workplaces (see also chapter “► [Language Socialization in the Learning Communities of Adolescents](#),” this volume).

Interactional sociolinguistic research being conducted concurrently in multiracial communities in England examined the difficulties faced by South Asian immigrants seeking employment in English workplaces (e.g., Jupp et al. 1982). Performing well in “gatekeeping” job interviews and then becoming integrated within the local workplace culture and society proved challenging for many of these newcomers because of their prior linguistic socialization and cultural values. However, employment challenges were also seen to be a consequence of the host culture members’ unfamiliarity with – and often intolerance of – these same practices and values. Newcomers wishing to emulate the valued discourse of the local English-speaking community lacked access to naturally occurring peer-group English interaction and thus opportunities for further discourse socialization in English.

As Heath and others subsequently observed, these issues can be difficult to address without some form of mediation. Under the auspices of the Industrial Language Training Service, Jupp et al. (1982) developed ethnographically informed training programs aimed at “breaking the cycle” faced by workers by creating “new contexts for language socialization” (p. 247). The well-known video *Crosstalk* (Gumperz et al. 1979) illustrated their approach to linguistic socialization. They simulated an interview between British college employers and a South Asian seeking a job as a college librarian, in which the candidate failed to “sell himself,” discursively, in an effective (Anglo-British) manner for the job in question. The researchers worked with members of both communities (newcomers and Anglophones) to help them understand why the discourse of the two parties seemed to be operating at cross purposes and how that might be remedied.

Philips’ (1982) research in the United States took place in a more exclusive academic and sociocultural environment – in a law degree program in which she immersed herself for a year as a participant observer. Her initial study of language socialization within the legal profession focused on the “legal cant.” That is, the specialized, complex, and often publicly inaccessible or impenetrable legal terminology and discourse patterns, both oral and written, associated with appellate (case) law and practice. Indeed, Philips observed that “it is almost necessary to go to law school to learn how to use the language” appropriately (p. 196). The highly segregated social organization of law school, moreover, ensured that law students spent a great deal of time speaking to one another using this newly acquired in-group language and knowledge, with little need or chance to speak intelligibly about the law to nonspecialist outsiders. Through her ethnographic research, Philips aimed to not only understand legal discourse socialization processes but to become sufficiently proficient in legal discourse herself to undertake subsequent research on judges’ language use in courtrooms.

A less well known but intriguing early language socialization study was undertaken by Cohn (1987), a self-described “antiwar feminist” who spent a year in the mid-1980s studying about nuclear strategic analysis within a community of “defense intellectuals” or analysts. She was a participant observer and also a learner of their “techno-strategic” language, as she called it. This language sanitized and neutralized the emotional and other effects of war by using terms such as “clean bombs” and “surgically clean strikes.” The longer Cohn spent in this discourse community, the less galling she found the “bloodcurdling casualness with which they regularly blew up the world while standing and chatting over the coffee pot” (p. 27). And after some time, she noticed with chagrin, “what had once been remarkable became unnoticeable. As I learned to speak, my perspective changed” (p. 27).

These early ethnographic studies featuring participants in very diverse professional fields illustrate the importance of examining language socialization processes within their respective social, cultural, historical, political, institutional, and economic contexts. The studies also provide important reflexive accounts of the ethnographers’ own emic as well as etic socialization experiences and changing perspectives.

Major Contributions

Since the research just described from the 1970s and 1980s, a variety of studies of language socialization have been conducted and reviews of academic- and work-oriented language socialization have been written (e.g., Duff 2005, 2008, 2010; Roberts 2010). Some studies explicitly use the construct of *language socialization* (and associated theory and methods originating in linguistic anthropology), whereas others, perhaps the majority, use terminology and methods from interactional sociolinguistics or related traditions to describe similar processes. In this section, I take a chronological approach to describe early socialization through discussions about work in the home, then postsecondary academic and vocational discourse socialization, and socialization in the workplace. The final section considers socialization trajectories not only within but also across these learning contexts.

Family Socialization and Work

Although it would be reasonable to assume that academic and work-related discourse socialization occurs at the stage of secondary and postsecondary formal education, it actually begins much earlier, albeit in informal ways. Many studies in the USA, Italy, and Sweden have investigated socialization into ideologies, practices, and discourses related to the theme of “work” within family homes (see reviews in Paugh, chapter “► [Language Socialization in Working Families](#),” this volume). Children gain important understandings of work and ways of talking about it by participating in family dinnertime narrative activity in homes with working parents. During these intimate everyday conversations, parents report on,

problematize, or evaluate aspects of their own and each other's work lives. Children are also socialized into a work ethic through discussions of homework activities and scheduling and coordinating daily activities.

Postsecondary Academic and Vocational Discourse Socialization

Most studies of academic and professional socialization have been situated in universities (see Kobayashi, Zappa-Hollman, and Duff, chapter “► [Academic Discourse Socialization](#),” this volume, for a review), vocational training programs, and workplaces, as well as in spaces not traditionally thought of as workplaces (e.g., social media). The studies encompass such divergent contexts as physics labs, hospitals and nursing homes, courtrooms, hairstyling salons, manufacturing plants, call centers, and engineering departments. In these settings, newcomers are expected to think, act, speak, and write more like their experienced co-workers and mentors, in keeping with the ethos of the institution. Very often this work must be done in a context-relevant register of English, whether as one's native or subsequently learned language.

In academic discourse socialization research in higher education, one important activity or communication event frequently analyzed is oral presentations given in undergraduate courses, graduate seminars, and at conferences. Researchers have explored the cognitive, epistemological, linguistic, discursive, and technological (e.g., multimodal) preparation of students and other novices, and the interpersonal identity work and stance-taking involved in presentations. For example, in her study of doctoral students and postdoctoral fellows in physics and the distinguished physics professors supervising them, Jacoby (1998) examined how the “conference talk rehearsal” in physics labs served a number of functions related to the discursive and professional socialization of physicists. Many other, more recent, studies of oral discourse socialization are reviewed in the chapter “► [Academic Discourse Socialization](#)” by Kobayashi, Zappa-Hollman, and Duff (this volume).

Studies reviewed here examine discourse socialization in legal, medical, healthcare, and other vocational or professional fields. In the field of law, following on Philips' (1982) earlier research, Mertz (1996, 1998, 2007) analyzed ideologies and language socialization in first-year American law school classroom discourse involving, for example, Socratic dialogue and simulated courtroom interaction. Through such forms of discourse and interaction, “students are socialized to a new identity and a new way of talking” (1998, p. 151). Mertz (1996) also studied the “recontextualization of legal texts” (p. 231) as a related form of socialization, based on the cases (appellate court opinions) that students must learn to read critically and that have authority as legal precedents in other cases or opinions and thus must be newly entextualized through “mastery and manipulation” (p. 246) by students.

In the medical context, Hobbs (2004) analyzed medical residents' and doctors' handwritten progress reports (treatment notes) as well as physicians' implicit socialization into these practices/genres by means of their supervisors' reviews and concurrence on cases. Hobbs, who was at the time a practicing lawyer in the USA,

represented the obstetrical department of an urban teaching hospital in medical malpractice cases. She studied applied linguistics and sociolinguistics in order to analyze this “biophysical discursively constructed data” (p. 1603) in the medical field as well as data in her parallel research on legal discourse (e.g., lawyers’ closing arguments; judges’ use of humor). She observed that the physicians’ progress reports, in the interest of efficiency and economy, used a mixture of Latin, English abbreviations, and other symbols, which Hobbs described as “a system of notation as mysterious as hieroglyphics, that renders medical records cryptic and incomprehensible to the uninitiated” (p. 1586). To produce and interpret such reports accurately, physicians needed considerable theoretical and clinical experience, as well as knowledge of accepted discourse conventions. Thus, similar to other ethnographers’ induction into the worlds of defense intellectuals, lawyers, cosmetologists, and other professionals, Hobbs’ experience of grappling with initially incomprehensible language, texts, and social practices, in this case in progress report production, gave her a first-hand understanding of how newcomers (including her) are socialized into these practices and genres.

In a vocational context, cosmetology, Jacobs-Huey (2003, 2006) examined how novices learn to engage in the professional language and phatic communication expected in hairstyling salons. In the African American cosmetology college at which she carried out her study, she noted how the aspiring hairstylists learned to talk about haircare like medicine (“diagnose and treat sick hair,” Jacobs-Huey 2003, p. 278), to speak indirectly to clients, and to be polite and soft-spoken (“Ladies are seen, not heard”; “Manners will take you where money can’t” (p. 283)). Some of the expressions were the proverbs that older female relatives had used to socialize them when growing up. Through textbook readings, discussion, and role-play, novices learned how to manage complaints from dissatisfied clients. The researcher herself, much like a novice seeking a career in that field, was also being socialized into normative speech about aspects of haircare, sometimes through direct rebukes of her lexical choices (described as “breaches” in expected phrasing or terminological errors): for example, when using *wash-and-set* instead of the preferred expression *shampoo-and-set*, or *perm* instead of *relaxer* (Jacobs-Huey 2007). She documented other kinds of breaches in language, in interactional and pragmatic routines, and in body positioning in encounters between stylists and their clients.

In summary, these studies in legal, medical, and haircare contexts illustrate the discipline-specific nature of socialization, intertextuality, and identity work.

Socialization in the Workplace

The novices in the studies just discussed were (primarily) American native speakers of English who faced challenges entering their new discursive domains and communities of practice. Students and workers from other countries often have additional burdens related to their non-Anglophone linguistic and cultural backgrounds and lack of recognition of their prior learning or skills. They may therefore face complicated and protracted socialization into new fields, especially when their prior

socialization was in a very different context and language. In this section, I discuss studies involving nonnative speakers of English seeking employment, increasingly in very multilingual workplaces. Starting with the job interview itself, as discussed in “Early Developments” section, they need to learn to effectively present themselves, their histories, and their strengths. Once employed, if successful, they must navigate complex new sociolinguistic practices and ideologies related to communication and work.

Job applicants in a high-stakes, gatekeeping medical oral examination for foreign-trained doctors in the UK must reconcile their own linguistic, professional, and institutional medical socialization experiences and those that interviewers expect them to display. Sarangi and Roberts (2002) documented the case of a Spanish woman who, through a series of “misalignments” with examiners’ questions, failed her examination because of what was construed as inadequate English proficiency, especially fluency. In fact, the issue was her inability to interpret subtle and sometimes confusing contextualization cues in the examiners’ questions signaling whether an answer was expected to draw on medical literature, opinion, or institutional experience.

More entry-level, low-paying (e.g., blue-collar) jobs often attract recent immigrants in English-dominant societies precisely because they do not require high levels of English, although some companies may provide free on-site language classes for their workers (e.g., Goldstein 1997). Furthermore, sewing, cleaning, and factory work may require minimal language use or interaction because of the isolated nature of the work, the noise of machines, or the physical location of coworkers, who may not face one another (McAll 2003). In addition, communication may take place within same-first-language (L1) cultural groups. Indeed, employers may encourage workers to work within cohesive groups because it promotes better communication between management and workers (assuming that translators or go-betweens exist), promotes better harmony within groups, and at the same time may also reduce opposition to management practices if workers are not organized and do not communicate well *across* language groups (Goldstein 1997; McAll 2003). All of these factors may preclude opportunities to develop more sophisticated repertoires in the dominant language of the workplace and society, however.

In contrast, some workplaces, such as call centers, require an abundance of language use that complies with locally prescribed norms. Heller and her colleagues (e.g., Budach et al. 2003; Heller 2002; Roy 2003) in Canada examined changes in language and literacy ideologies within minority francophone communities involved in call center work in which effective communication in a standard language is essential. Employees must learn to respond to e-mail and telephone inquiries from around the world, possibly in multiple languages. On-the-job training, surveillance, evaluation, and the enforcement of tightly scripted, highly repetitive but empathetic, interaction patterns help companies maintain quality control communication standards. Roy (2003) and Budach et al. (2003), for example, conducted ethnographic research on bilingual workers in a rural French Ontarian call center and in literacy

centers. Language ideologies and policies were shifting and tensions were apparent in response to two competing trends. The first trend involved local initiatives to encourage the maintenance and commodification of “authentic” local culture and to promote the regional vernacular to attract Francophile tourism. This valorization of the local was intended to build solidarity around a strong place-based cultural identity. In contrast, the second trend, institutionalized in the call centers, involved an ideology of language purity (without code-switching, Anglicization, or local slang) and required a more globally accessible, standard variety of French for international communication. Unfortunately, then, despite the local francophone bilinguals’ efforts to retain their local French skills in response to the first goal, they were not considered qualified speakers of standard French for call center work and were therefore hired as Anglophones instead.

Related research in a Swiss tourism call center (Duchêne 2009) also focused on multilingualism as an important marketing commodity. The company prided itself on its highly qualified, flexible, multilingual “live agents” (as opposed to automated services) proficient in a minimum of three languages. The workers needed to display their legitimacy as sources of information about Switzerland and as speakers of suitable varieties of the languages being used (with certain preferred “accents”). Indeed, the workers’ language use often became a discussion point between them and callers.

The preceding studies in this section on socialization at work illustrate ideologies that stress bilingualism or multilingualism and professional standardized language use and that socialize supervisors, workers, and clients accordingly. Other changes in workplaces have been connected to a different ideology: hierarchical versus flatter, more ostensibly democratic, organizational architecture, with a corresponding distribution of power and responsibility. The latter is associated with “fast capitalism,” which requires flexibility, speed, multitasking, problem-solving, information technology, and economical communication skills. Workers not previously trained to perform in settings where responsibilities are increasingly distributed horizontally across workers, rather than vertically or hierarchically among different layers of management, may find themselves disadvantaged in such environments (cf. Heath 1989; Lankshear et al. 1997). Katz (2000) and Hull (1997), for example, documented some of the oral and written English skills that multilingual immigrant workers required in high-tech Silicon Valley companies in California. They described culturally challenging ideologies in workplace discussion sessions in which employees, in the presence of their coworkers and managers, were expected to volunteer personal opinions and publicly demonstrate their abilities (“show what you know” and “speak your mind”) even when this was considered by some of the workers to be culturally inappropriate and boastful.

Kleifgen (2013) reported on her longitudinal, ethnographic sociolinguistic research over a 7-year period in Silicon Valley. The study site was a small company that manufactured circuit boards. Kleifgen analyzed the multilingual and multimodal communicative practices that were part of workers’ language socialization in this high-tech electronics field. English was the lingua franca used among speakers from

different linguistics backgrounds (Chinese, Vietnamese, Spanish) and with Anglo-phones; co-ethnic workers also conferred in their own languages among themselves. Effective modes of communication were needed to quickly solve problems and accomplish joint goals related to production and quality control and to compete successfully with the many other high-tech companies in the area. However, Li (2000) reported that workplace ideologies and socialization can sometimes be contradictory – when the native English-speaker co-workers who are supposed to be socializing the apprentices into appropriate local practices themselves behave badly. The Chinese worker in Li's case study had to learn to be assertive enough to contest some of her colleagues' unwelcome behaviors, yet do so in a pragmatically face-saving way for all concerned.

Trajectories of Socialization

Another focus of language and literacy socialization research is the multilingual and multimodal *repertoires* and *trajectories* of young professionals as they proceed from undergraduate degrees or training programs and internships to relevant employment. Parks (2001) and Parks and Maguire (1999) conducted studies of the university-workplace transitions in nursing in Quebec, Canada, particularly in relation to genres of nursing reports and care plans taught in nursing programs and then how these were actually used in their eventual hospital placements. In another study, Duff et al. (2000) examined the linguistic socialization of adult immigrants training to become long-term resident care aides in order to work in hospitals and nursing home facilities or to provide home care. The authors revealed the distinct expectations and socialization experiences for participants while studying in their training program versus while in their practicum or workplace settings.

Also looking at school-to-work transitions, Bremner's (2012) research in Hong Kong examined a bilingual Cantonese-English woman's socialization into particular genres of professional communication as she progressed from her undergraduate business coursework into an internship at a public relations (PR) company. Through her detailed daily written reflections over the 3-month internship, and interviews with Bremner, the participant noted how she was being socialized into a hierarchically organized workplace culture, with particular divisions of labor, in which the production of certain kinds of discourse (press releases, brochures, promotional media "pitches") and multitasking and collaboration were expected. She reflected on how her coursework helped socialize her to important aspects of the workplace culture and communication. Also essential, in her account, was on-the-job immersion, experimentation, and feedback from colleagues. This socialization research into workplace written genres builds on earlier such work by Paré (2000) in the field of social work, Artemeva (2009) in engineering, and in recent work on socialization into legal written genres (Hartig *in press*). This research also ties in with oral (and multimodal) discourse socialization in engineering (Vickers 2008) and architecture (Morton 2013).

Work in Progress

Expanding Communication Repertoires and Identities

Trajectories of socialization (Wortham 2005), as described in the previous section, may entail the crossing of languages, institutions, and roles, along different time-scales. Räsänen (2013) examined socialization into the professional bilingual communication repertoires of young Finnish engineers. They began their education in Finland at a polytechnic institution, completed funded training programs in Germany as part of their studies using English as a *lingua franca* and then secured jobs in management and engineering in international companies in Finland also requiring English knowledge. Using a multiple-case study (with five participants), Räsänen's fieldwork over 6 years involved observations of the young engineering majors while in Germany, in their job sites back in Finland, and on work-related trips (e.g., a trip to China for one participant). The participants audio-recorded many of their everyday work-related interactions for analysis. An interesting insight from the study was that participants differed in what they considered "work" when choosing their recordings, illustrating the diverse nature and contexts for professional communication in global contexts.

However, studying professional trajectories from higher education to work over multiple years, sites, and countries, as in Räsänen's (2013) research, is seldom viable within the constraints of a single study. Another approach, then, is to consider the planned future trajectories of individual learners and the ideologies and identities they associate with such aspirations. Anderson (2017, *in press*) studied the (English) academic socialization of Chinese international doctoral students at a Canadian university. He examined the discourses surrounding career paths for doctoral students – that is, whether they envisioned taking up academic appointments in Anglophone countries or, rather, sought to return to China. These intended trajectories had many implications – for the students' investments in their current English-medium studies; their interpretation of and receptiveness to the mentoring they were receiving in their current university programs; their publication goals (and language of publications); and how they positioned themselves and how they saw themselves positioned by others, based on their choices, in terms of being successful students and future academics (or not). Anderson examined doctoral students' discursive socialization by peers as well as by more institutionally powerful agents (e.g., supervisors). However, he also noted that students often self-regulated their activities based on perceived surveillance by others regarding their progress in competitive doctoral programs. This perception, too, had a strong socializing effect on students.

Li (2016, and in other publications), similarly, has researched the socialization of Chinese doctoral students into academic writing that enables them to publish their work in prestigious, English-medium international journals. She has conducted work in science departments in Chinese universities that have a program requirement for doctoral students to publish their research (alone or with their supervisors) in order to obtain a Ph.D. degree. This expectation, especially in the sciences where supervisors

typically have limited training in English for academic purposes, poses many challenges for supervisors and doctoral students alike. Li's work looks closely at the supervisor-student (and team) interactions vis-à-vis drafting and revision of articles and how students can be supported in this high-stakes process.

Language Socialization and Humor

In addition to the *technical* aspects of disciplinary or specialist discourse that doctoral students, and others, must gain control over, researchers have examined how spontaneous expressions of humor, teasing, and “small talk” (some of it closely associated with the study or work context) can be very important aspects of work-related socialization and group membership (Holmes 2005; Holmes and Schnurr 2005; Mak et al. 2012; Schnurr 2009). Yet these interpersonal speech acts can be challenging for non-native speakers of the language and for (other) newcomers who are not as invested in or experienced in such practices. Bucholtz et al. (2011) analyzed undergraduate science majors' informal socialization into math and science-related joke-telling and other displays and appreciation of humor (e.g., puns, riddles). In that disciplinary culture, these practices were valued indices of their identities as budding scientists who wished to align themselves with like-minded classmates and professors.

Problems and Difficulties

As noted in previous sections, the issue of how earlier language socialization experiences affect subsequent ones has not been examined sufficiently to date. Most of the research, though typically longitudinal, does not extend over enough years to capture these longer-term school-to-work (or work-to-school; home-to-work) or cross-career trajectories. Also lacking in the existing research is close analysis of how newcomers may exert their agency in an attempt to change – or resist – the dominant cultures and practices within their new discourse communities and the consequences of such actions. How, for example, are syncretic or hybrid practices created, possibly with the cooperation of supervisors and more established group members? And how are the ideologies and practices of the so-called experts transformed through these forms of bi- or multidirectional socialization and contestation?

One of the thorny challenges in workplace-oriented research of this sort relates to ethics and confidentiality agreements required by public and private institutions such as universities and corporations. These considerations may entail careful negotiation of access, observations, and reporting (e.g., Räisänen 2013). As Roberts (2010) puts it, the well-intentioned researchers may be viewed as “spies or troublemakers” (p. 213). Acts of resistance by employees against locally sanctioned norms, or disclosure of confidential material to researchers, might be cause for dismissal or

discipline. Such scenarios raise ethical or even legal concerns and could lead to the termination of a study and other possible consequences.

Another challenge is the steep initial learning curve for researchers to become sufficiently familiar with and immersed in these work cultures and disciplines so as to understand practices, texts, norms, compliance, and counterdiscourses. Such engagement requires sustained collaboration with professors, workers, and managers (or other personnel facilitating or participating in the study), who typically already have many demands on their time and may have their own motives for becoming involved.

Researchers typically have many other responsibilities at their own institutions. If their research contexts and issues are not directly connected with those that they are expected to teach about, and if the ethnographic fieldwork takes them away from their own primary workplace for extended periods of time, their home departments might not be wholly supportive of their efforts. That is, spending inordinate amounts of time in contexts of legal or medical discourse may not align well with their own academic programs (e.g., in language education). One compromise may be to conduct less intensive, shorter-term studies that are closer, both geographically and academically, to researchers' institutional bases.

Future Directions

Research Methods and Ethical Issues

Notwithstanding the logistical challenges of carrying out sustained ethnographic fieldwork noted in the previous section, applied linguistics, sociolinguistics, and linguistic anthropology will benefit from additional language socialization research in the future – with attention to people's changing repertoires, trajectories, social networks, and identities as they gain knowledge and expertise in new fields. Some of this work will only be possible with teams of researchers using digital tools and employing multiple or mixed methods and with major grant funding. In research undertaken by individual scholars, which is more typical in language socialization, smaller-scale sociolinguistic studies of discourse and case studies of socializers/socializees may be more feasible than full-scale ethnographic studies. The latter are more typical of doctoral dissertations. Workplace language databases, such as those produced for the University of Wellington Language in the Workplace Project, can also be mined to advantage. Auto-ethnographic studies, as well, can be illuminating and deeply personal, although the anonymity and privacy of institutions, companies, students, superiors, and colleagues must (normally) be carefully attended to. Auto-ethnographers must also try to find ways to adequately triangulate or temper perspectives in such studies to provide a measured and credible account of their reported experiences. Critical ethnographies (whether auto-ethnographic or not) examining discrimination, harassment, bullying, and other exclusionary practices may be difficult to undertake precisely because of the good-faith agreements researchers (and their universities) enter into with sponsoring agencies and with

research participants, and the desire to minimize harm to the dignity and reputation of these individuals and institutions.

Socialization and Induction in Education and Academia

Within our own institutions, tracking the socialization and “induction” of teacher candidates and doctoral students through their university coursework, practicum placements or fieldwork, and into their new careers offers many research possibilities. One study examined internationally educated teachers who were not native speakers of English engaging in continuing education and socialization for post-immigration or transnational careers (Deters 2011). Such studies are important given the significant investments in – and by – these individuals and their careers. The highly discursive nature of the work, often in a nonnative language, and the significant risk of attrition or failure (Li, 2016) cannot be understated. The social and discursive processes by which doctoral students and other emerging scholars learn to conduct and publish their work (e.g., Casanave and Li 2008), obtain grants, write executive summaries, and run meetings following Roberts Rules of Order (among the myriad forms of communication required in academia) deserve further research as well. Indeed, the highly distributed work involved in producing an encyclopedia such as this is itself an interesting case of contemporary academic and professional socialization: with volume editors in different parts of the world (in Canada and New Zealand for this volume), publishers in Germany (headquarters), production staff in India (using lingua franca English), and authors and reviewers at different stages of their careers at institutions around the globe. All were communicating via email and corporate document management systems on multiple drafts involving many other textual resources. How does one learn to do this kind of complex, highly distributed, discursive work, especially while navigating multiple academic deadlines, including the publisher’s?

Metaphors, Neoliberalism, and Socialization

A final point relates to the use of metaphors and how they shape our thoughts and actions (i.e., our habitus), as in Cohn’s (1987) experience among defence intellectuals described earlier. Metaphors offer another analytic tool for future language socialization research (see, e.g., Woodhams 2014). In our own universities, powerful neoliberal discourses, ideologies, and metaphors have infused department meetings, mission statements, websites, strategic plans, mottos, advising sessions, Facebook updates, official tweets, reviews for tenure and promotion, and other aspects of academic life. Socialization into this ubiquitous discourse involves repeated encounters with the following sorts of phrases and their underlying ideologies and forms of textual practice (e.g., documentation): *impact* (and *impact factors*), *deliverables*, *accountability*, *sustainability*, *internationalization*, *assessment*, *commercialization*, *rankings*, *competition*, *program marketing*, *grant funding*, *university branding*,

“development” (e.g., alumni *“cultivation”*), *casualization* or *precarity of labor*, *reputation management*, and *boosterism*. Such discourse and the mandates underpinning it may encounter resistance from scholars more interested in and trained for intellectual activity of another sort. Neoliberalism and its discourses have been taken up in recent applied linguistics in various ways (e.g., Block et al. 2012), but this topic warrants close attention from a language socialization perspective as well. Does one become desensitized to this discourse and what it represents (or actively espouse it), and then reproduce it (consciously or not), just as apprentices and researchers did in ethnographic studies in defense institutions, hospitals, and legal contexts reviewed in earlier sections of this chapter? What processes, stances, and discourses of acquiescence, contention, or transformation are at play? What are the effects on participants and publics?

Conclusion

Future language socialization studies related to higher education and work are needed in a wider range of contexts and languages and in settings outside of North America and Europe, as well as within those regions. Research that examines the intertextuality, interdiscursivity, and hybridity of language practices will extend existing knowledge about socialization and discourse at (or about) work. Lingua franca interaction and socialization within dense local/transnational linguistic ecologies deserves more attention as well, in both face-to-face and electronically or technologically mediated interaction for education or work. Finally, including a wider cross-section of contexts, discourses/genres, and disciplines or vocations into which individuals and groups are socialized should yield important, nuanced insights into the complexities of language use in the so-called new work order (Gee et al. 1996). Ideally, the novices being apprenticed into these new “orders” and their mentors will also become better equipped to effect change in highly intercultural, interconnected, and multilingual societies. As Heller (2002) reminds us, there are many “sites of struggle” when communities are confronted with the pressures of globalization, the commodification of particular languages, and the existence of potentially marginalizing linguistic practices. The first four decades of language socialization research into and through higher education and work have been very fruitful. The coming decades promise to be equally innovative and illuminating and will take the field into untold – and even currently unimaginable – new directions.

Acknowledgment I thank Ava Becker-Zayas and Duanduan Li for their helpful suggestions on earlier drafts of this chapter.

Cross-References

- ▶ [Academic Discourse Socialization](#)
- ▶ [Language Socialization and Schooling](#)

Related Articles in the Encyclopedia of Language and Education

- Britt-Louise Gunnarsson: [Professional Communication](#). In Volume: Second and Foreign Language Education
- Constant Leung: [Second Language Academic Literacies: Evolving Understandings](#). In Volume: Literacies and Language Education
- Ifigenia Mahili and Jo Angiuri: [Language Awareness and Multilingual Workplace](#). In Volume: Language Awareness and Multilingualism
- Linda von Hoene: [The Professional Development of Foreign Language Instructors in Postsecondary Education](#). In Volume: Second and Foreign Language Education.
- Mary Lea: [Academic Literacies in Theory and Practice](#). In Volume: Literacies and Language Education.

References

- Anderson, T. (2017). The doctoral gaze: Foreign PhD students' internal and external academic discourse socialization. *Linguistics and Education*. Advance online publication. doi:[10.1016/j.linged.2016.12.001](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.linged.2016.12.001)
- Anderson, T. (in press). Reproductions of Chinese transnationalism: Ambivalent identities in study abroad. *Applied Linguistics*.
- Artemeva, N. (2009). Stories of becoming: A study of novice engineers learning genres of their profession. In C. Bazerman, A. Bonini, & D. Figueredo (Eds.), *Genre in a changing world: Perspectives on writing* (pp. 158–178). Fort Collins: The WAC Clearinghouse and Parlor Press.
- Block, D., Gray, J., & Holborow, M. (Eds.). (2012). *Neoliberalism and applied linguistics*. New York: Routledge.
- Bremner, S. (2012). Socialization and the acquisition of professional discourse: A case study in the PR industry. *Written Communication*, 29(1), 7–32.
- Bucholtz, M., Skapoulli, E., Barnwell, B., & Lee, J. J. (2011). Entextualized humor in the formation of scientist identities among U.S. undergraduates. *Anthropology & Education*, 42(3), 177–192.
- Budach, G., Roy, S., & Heller, M. (2003). Community and commodity in French Ontario. *Language in Society*, 32, 603–627.
- Casanave, C. P., & Li, X. (Eds.). (2008). *Learning the literacy practices of graduate school: Insiders' reflections on academic enculturation*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Cohn, C. (1987). Sex and death in the rational world of defense intellectuals. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, 12, 687–718.
- Deters, P. (2011). *Identity, agency and the acquisition of professional language and culture*. London: Continuum.
- Duchêne, A. (2009). Marketing, management and performance: Multilingualism as commodity in a tourism call centre. *Language Policy*, 8, 27–50.
- Duff, P. (2005). Thinking globally about new literacies: Multilingual socialization at work. In J. Anderson, M. Kendrick, T. Rodgers, & S. Smythe (Eds.), *Portraits of literacy across families, communities and schools* (pp. 341–362). Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Duff, P. (2008). Language socialization, higher education, and work. In P. Duff & N. Hornberger (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of language and education, Language socialization* (Vol. 8, pp. 257–270). New York: Springer.
- Duff, P. (2010). Language socialization into academic discourse communities. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 30, 169–197.

- Duff, P., Wong, P., & Early, M. (2000). Learning language for work and life: The linguistic socialization of immigrant Canadians seeking careers in healthcare. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 57, 9–57.
- Gee, J. P., Hull, G., & Lankshear, C. (1996). *The new work order: Behind the language of the new capitalism*. Boulder: Westview Press.
- Goldstein, T. (1997). *Two languages at work: Bilingual life on the production floor*. New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Gumperz, J., Jupp, T., & Roberts, C. (1979). *Crosstalk: A study of cross-cultural communication*. London: National Centre for Industrial Language Training in conjunction with the BBC.
- Hartig, A. J. (in press). *Connecting language and disciplinary knowledge in English for specific purposes: Case studies in law*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Heath, S. B. (1983). *Ways with words: Language, life, and work in communities and classrooms*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Heath, S. B. (1989). Oral and literate traditions among Black Americans living in poverty. *American Psychologist*, 44(2), 367–373.
- Heller, M. (2002). Globalization and the commodification of bilingualism in Canada. In D. Block & D. Cameron (Eds.), *Globalization and language teaching* (pp. 47–63). London: Routledge.
- Hobbs, P. (2004). The role of progress notes in the professional socialization of medical residents. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 36, 1579–1607.
- Holmes, J. (2005). When small talk is a big deal: Sociolinguistic challenges in the workplace. In M. H. Long (Ed.), *Second language needs analysis* (pp. 344–372). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Holmes, J., & Schnurr, S. (2005). Politeness, humor and gender in the workplace: Negotiating norms and identifying contestation. *Journal of Politeness Research*, 1, 121–149.
- Hull, G. (Ed.). (1997). *Changing work, changing workers: Critical perspectives on language, literacy, and skills*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Jacobs-Huey, L. (2003). Ladies are seen, not heard: Language socialization in a southern, African American cosmetology school. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly*, 34(3), 277–299.
- Jacobs-Huey, L. (2006). *From the kitchen to the parlor: Language and African American women's hair care*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Jacobs-Huey, L. (2007). Learning through the breach: Language socialization among African American cosmetologists. *Ethnography*, 8(2), 171–203.
- Jacoby, S. (1998). *Science as performance: Socializing scientific discourse through the conference talk rehearsal*. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles.
- Jupp, T., Roberts, C., & Cook-Gumperz, J. (1982). Language and disadvantage: The hidden process. In J. Gumperz (Ed.), *Language and social identity* (pp. 232–256). Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.
- Katz, M.-L. (2000). Workplace language teaching and the intercultural construction of ideologies of competence. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 57, 144–172.
- Kleifgen, J. (2013). *Communicative practices at work: Multimodality and learning in a high-tech firm*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Lankshear, C., Gee, J. P., Knobel, M., & Searle, C. (1997). *Changing literacies*. Bristol, PA: Open University Press.
- Li, D. (2000). The pragmatics of making requests in the L2 workplace: A case study of language socialization. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 57, 58–87.
- Li, Y. (2016). Publish SCI papers or no degree: Practices of Chinese doctoral supervisors in response to the publication pressure on science students. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education*, 36(4), 545–558.
- Mak, B. C. N., Liu, Y. Q., & Deneen, C. C. (2012). Humor in the workplace: A regulating and coping mechanism in socialization. *Discourse and Communication*, 6(2), 163–179.
- McAll, C. (2003). Language dynamics in the bi- and multilingual workplace. In R. Bayley & S. Schecter (Eds.), *Language socialization in bilingual and multilingual societies* (pp. 235–250). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

- Mertz, E. (1996). Recontextualization as socialization: Text and pragmatics in the law school classroom. In M. Silverstein & G. Urban (Eds.), *Natural histories of discourse* (pp. 229–249). Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Mertz, E. (1998). Linguistic ideology and praxis in US law school classrooms. In B. Schieffelin, K. Woolard, & P. Kroskrity (Eds.), *Language ideologies: Practice and theory* (pp. 149–162). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Mertz, E. (2007). *The language of law: Learning to think like a lawyer*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Morton, J. (2013). *Adjacent worlds: An analysis of a genre at the intersection of academic and professional communities* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation), University of Melbourne, Melbourne, Australia.
- Paré, A. (2000). Writing as a way into social work: Genre sets, genre systems, and distributed cognition. In P. Dias & A. Paré (Eds.), *Transitions: Writing and academic and workplace settings* (pp. 145–166). Cresskill: Hampton Press.
- Parks, S. (2001). Moving from school to the workplace: Disciplinary innovation, border crossings, and the reshaping of a written genre. *Applied Linguistics*, 22, 405–438.
- Parks, S., & Maguire, M. (1999). Coping with on-the-job writing skills in ESL: A constructivist-semiotic perspective. *Language Learning*, 49, 143–175.
- Perren, J.M. (2008). *Intercultural language socialization through volunteering: A qualitative study of directive use in nonprofit organizations*. PhD Dissertation, Temple University, Philadelphia.
- Philips, S. U. (1982). The language socialization of lawyers: Acquiring the “cant”. In G. Spindler (Ed.), *Doing the ethnography of schooling* (pp. 176–209). New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Räisänen, T. (2013). *Professional communicative repertoires and trajectories of socialization into global working life*. PhD Dissertation, University of Jyväskylä, Finland. <https://jyx.jyu.fi/dspace/bitstream/handle/123456789/42565/978-951-39-5470-3.pdf>
- Roberts, C. (2010). Language socialization in the workplace. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 30, 211–227.
- Roberts, C., Davies, E., & Jupp, T. (1992). *Language and discrimination: A study of in multi-ethnic workplaces*. New York: Longman.
- Roy, S. (2003). Bilingualism and standardization in a Canadian call center: Challenges for a linguistic minority community. In R. Bayley & S. Schecter (Eds.), *Language socialization in bilingual and multilingual societies* (pp. 269–285). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Sarangi, S., & Roberts, C. (2002). Discoursal (mis)alignments in professional gatekeeping encounters. In C. Kramsch (Ed.), *Language acquisition and language socialization: Ecological perspectives* (pp. 197–227). New York: Continuum.
- Schnurr, S. (2009). Constructing leader identities through teasing at work. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 41(6), 1125–1138.
- Vickers, C. H. (2008). Expertise, language competence, and the L2 user. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 18(3), 237–255.
- Woodhams, J. M. (2014). We’re the nurses: Metaphor in the discourse of workplace socialisation. *Language & Communication*, 34, 56–68.
- Wortham, S. (2005). Socialization beyond the speech event. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology*, 15(1), 95–112.

Language Socialization Among Persons with Dementia and Their Caregivers

Pamela A. Saunders

Abstract

Language socialization (LS) is a constructive theoretical framework through which to view interactions between persons with a diagnosis of dementia and their caregivers. The tenets of the LS paradigm are found in dementia research that examines communication and behavior through the social interactions of persons with dementia with their caregivers, often in institutional settings. This chapter focuses on works from social sciences, with some inclusion of nursing and medical research that employs a socio-cultural lens, if not an LS one specifically. To begin, the background literature on language and dementia is reviewed. The section on “Early Developments” concentrates on communication disorders and psycholinguistic research on language deficits as well as sociolinguistic investigations into language and dementia. Early studies of caregiver communication training programs are discussed briefly. The section on “Major Contributions” explores how language is used to socialize persons with dementia and their caregivers and how language is used to socialize others to this experience. “Works in Progress” examines Validation Theory and the socialization of people suffering from dementia. Finally, “Future Directions” suggests how the incorporation of the arts – including poetry, theater, and music – might supplement existing clinical and qualitative studies focusing on everyday language, communication, and socialization. In addition, the need for definitional and methodological clarity across studies is underscored.

Keywords

Language • Communication • Dementia • Social construction • Language socialization • Alzheimer’s disease

P.A. Saunders (✉)

Georgetown University School of Medicine, Washington, DC, USA

e-mail: Pamela.Saunders@georgetown.edu

Contents

Introduction	274
Early Developments	275
Major Contributions	278
LS and Dementia	278
LS and Caregivers	280
Works in Progress	282
Problems and Difficulties	283
Future Directions	284
Cross-References	284
Related Articles in the Encyclopedia of Language and Education	285
References	285

Introduction

In 2016, 47 million people worldwide had dementia, with 7.7 million new cases diagnosed every year (Alzheimer's Association 2016). The most common early symptom of dementia is difficulty remembering newly learned information. Poor communication can have a particularly profound effect on the lives of persons with dementia, as it affects their ability to interact socially, maintain relationships, plan daily activities, and express basic needs and thoughts to those around them. Difficulties with language appear early and increase as the disease progresses; cognitive impairment affects more than memory function and produces a wide range of other disabling effects, including naming disorders, verbal disfluency, word finding problems (anomia) and perseveration (repetition) errors, as well as other semantic impairments (Almor et al. 2009; Orange 1991; Ripich and Terrell 1988; Vogel et al. 2014).

Language Socialization (LS) is a constructive theoretical framework through which to view interactions between individuals with a diagnosis of dementia and their caregivers. The process of being socialized into one's native language starts in childhood and continues throughout the lifespan. The research on LS has had a broad reach, including studies of child first language acquisition, second language acquisition, bilingual education, clinical assessment and intervention, as well as construction of a professional or a cultural identity. An early connection between LS and dementia came from Pan and Berko Gleason (1986), who suggested that child language acquisition provides models for the study of language loss. Communication disorders, including aphasia, stroke, mental health, and brain damage as well as dementia, have been the topic of research on linguistic abilities situated within a social and/or cultural context for some time (Goodwin 2002; Hamilton 1994). Another relevant early area of study is captured by the term "elderspeak," which refers to a patronizing speech style as well as a simplified speech register (Caporalet 1981; Kemper 1994). Elderspeak contains linguistic features such as phonology, syntax, morphology, semantics, and prosody that can also be found in babytalk (i.e., caregiver-child register) (Ferguson 1964; Ochs and Schieffelin 2008) but is directed at older adults.

A basic component of LS is the relationship and interaction among individuals and groups in social and cultural context. Language can be a tool for socialization; at the same time, the study of LS can focus on language as part of changing (normally, developing) communicative and social competence. There is little research *per se* on the LS of older adults and practically none on the LS of people suffering from dementia (see Garrett and Baquedano-López 2002, for an extensive overview of early LS research). In dementia research, the individuals with dementia, family, caregivers, and clinicians would be the participants; and the cultural contexts would include institutional or home settings.

In addition, in dementia-related LS a process of development takes place for multiple parties (e.g., the person with dementia, the caregiver, the clinician) at multiple stages in a variety of settings (e.g., home, medical office, adult day care setting, nursing home). Beginning with the diagnosis, medical knowledge and terminology must be acquired. Later in the disease trajectory, new sociolinguistic rules are in play for the person with dementia who is losing some language skill as well as for the caregiver who is operating in a new social dynamic. Clinicians, support staff, and researchers in the field strive to provide support and training (i.e., LS) to facilitate greater social and communicative competence for all parties involved.

The paradigm of LS has rarely been applied to the study of dementia or caregiving. However, there have been scholars of dementia who emphasize social interaction and sociocultural context (Hamilton 1994; Mates et al. 2010; Ramanathan 1997; Sabat 2001; Saunders et al. 2011; Schrauf and Müller 2014). LS offers a powerful way to examine the lived experience of individuals with dementia and how they and their caregivers may acquire communicative and social competence. Across the social sciences, medicine, and nursing, research on dementia and caregiving maintains the goal of exploring cognitive, social, and communicative behavior. Distinctions among disciplines begin to blur, as many use similar methodological approaches to study these behaviors, including ethnographic and longitudinal research, face-to-face interviews, focus groups, discourse analysis, conversation analysis, interpretative phenomenological analysis, grounded theory, thematic analysis, and narrative analysis. These same methods are typically used in LS research as well.

Early Developments

Early developments in dementia research can be traced across multiple fields including communication and speech disorders, psychology, sociology, gerontology, linguistics, and anthropology. This section highlights several important studies from these fields and makes connections to LS.

Scholars in communication studies found that communication problems are among the most difficult of those faced by people with dementia, increasing the

risk of early institutionalization of individuals with dementia. Achieving a better understanding of the processes of communication used by people with dementia in creating and maintaining relationships in the long-term care setting might reduce the negative impacts of communication problems (Orange 1991). A study of caregiver prosody in interaction with people with dementia did not yield conclusive findings regarding how successful conversations would be on the basis of varied pitch and loudness of speech (Small et al. 2009).

In the tradition of psycholinguistics (Pan and Berko Gleason 1986), the research expanded from the examination of discrete linguistic items and short-term memory to functional and pragmatic communication skills including effective coherence, cohesion, sentence correction, sentence disambiguation, story-telling, and turn-taking, all relevant in communication with people with dementia.

Ripich and Terrell (1988) as well as others (Bonilla and Johnson 1995; Fromm and Holland 1989; Mentis et al. 1995) studied the use of semantic space, propositions, cohesion devices, topic, and judgments of coherence in the discourse of persons with dementia. Semi-structured interviews were conducted in subjects' homes covering the topics of family, daily activities, and health. They found that subjects with dementia used significantly more words and turns than cognitively normal individuals. The interviewer also used more words and turns when interviewing dementia patients. However, a pattern of cohesion disruptions in dementia patients was found. The breakdowns in coherence were related to missing conversational elements, suggesting that incoherence may result from the speaker's loss of the listener's perspective in developing thematic structure during conversation.

In the tradition of neurobiology, Mates et al. (2010) used an ethnomethodological approach to understand the discourse in persons with fronto-temporal dementia. They examine the process of socialization, the role of social motives, as well as the role of moral emotions in maintaining relationships.

Dementia caregivers cite communication-related problems with their loved ones as a significant source of stress and burden (Savundranayagam et al. 2005). In addition to making information exchange more challenging, communication impairment may also trigger problem behaviors, such as agitation and aggression, which have been shown to increase emotional strain and demand for caregiver time (Savundranayagam et al. 2005).

To address caregiver burden, training programs for formal (i.e., professional) and informal (i.e., family) caregivers were developed and their efficacy was examined (for a review, see Vasse et al. 2010). The FOCUSED Program, one of the first, was designed to educate and train nursing assistants to use language appropriately as part of acquiring social competence to perform well in the long-term care setting (Ripich et al. 1995). These studies of functional communication as well as these training programs were aimed at understanding language loss as well as (more effective) language use by individuals suffering from dementia (Orange and Colton-Hudson 1998; Richter et al. 1995). While not developed using an LS framework, these training programs could be considered a form of socialization for those individuals providing care.

Concomitant to the research in the field of speech-language disorders, sociolinguistic studies also examined the language and conversational discourse of persons with dementia, albeit in naturalistic settings (i.e., long-term care facilities) versus laboratories. The goal is to understand social and psychological interactions through a discursive analysis. In an important study, Hamilton (1994) studied the conversational abilities of Elsie, a nursing home resident, who maintained the ability to ask and answer questions into advanced stages of the disease. When asked if she knew the activities coordinator at the center, for example, Elsie replied, "I've had so many names . . . sometimes they are hard to get" (p. 157). Ramanathan (1997) examined the coherence of the speech of people with dementia, noting that interlocutors frequently "take over" the conversation, reducing opportunities for subjects to contribute to the conversation. In contrast to the speech-language disorders research, however, Hamilton used a framework that considers the interaction to be socially constructed by all participants.

Many of the early works on language deficits associated with dementia were consonant with the biomedical studies that primarily focused on the number of points gained on a cognitive test, or the number of activities of daily living (e.g., dressing and bathing) performed. The biomedical research did not focus on the skills retained by persons with dementia or the language used by others to construct identity. One of the first to address the identity construct was Lyman (1989), a sociologist. Her work was a call to arms that launched the next 25 years of research that concentrated on the whole person, rather than on the diagnosis.

In this mode of thought, Kitwood, a psycho-gerontologist, started a movement that challenged the way clinicians and researchers looked at people with dementia. Kitwood (1997), founder of the Bradford Group in the UK, introduced the term "malignant psychology," which referred to the way people with dementia were "being demeaned and disregarded" (p. 4). Dementia Care Mapping (DCM) was offered as a new method for evaluating the quality of care in formal setting(s). DCM educated formal/professional caregivers to accept those they cared for in their own space, their own time, and on their own terms. DCM led to a growing body of research with a person-centered approach to understanding the personal identity as well as the behavior of the individual with dementia.

At the same time, psychologists Sabat and Harré (1992) argued for the importance of recognizing the self of people with dementia. They advised that it would be impossible to learn anything about the communication skills of a person with dementia from a profile of cognitive and linguistic test scores alone. They argued that standardized tests provide data about how one individual responds to those tests and not how the person uses language and interacts with other speakers in relevant social contexts.

From a sociocultural perspective, anthropologists were also investigating the behaviors and attitudes of caregivers and individuals suffering from dementia in cross-cultural as well as monocultural domestic settings. The fields of cross-cultural gerontology and linguistic anthropology have a long history of focusing on dementia and caregiving in institutional settings in an effort to understand this population and the challenges it faces (Poveda 2003). These include foregrounding culturally

situated (i.e., cross-cultural) differences in definitions of and attitudes towards dementia as well as noting the under-representation of ethnic minorities in dementia research.

In a study of the local practices in the treatment of Alzheimer's Disease in India, Cohen (1998) observed, as did Sabat (2001) and Kitwood (1997), that the discourse of others contributes to the construction of a nonidentity for the person with dementia; hence, this social process of erasing or undermining their personhood, more so than the biological process of the disease itself, keeps people from living on their own.

In a longitudinal, ethnographic study of a dementia special care unit, Mclean (2007) examined social and cultural factors that influence the care of dementia residents as well as the behavior of the staff. She highlighted that the researcher is often powerless to effect change in less than ideal circumstances for staff or residents.

In summary, early research did not explicitly discuss discourse connected with dementia in terms of LS, but provided important insights about the culturally and socially constructed nature of identity and communication associated with this disease. It also revealed the impact of these processes (in combination with biological/cognitive factors) on individuals and their communities.

Major Contributions

LS and Dementia

Building on a large body of work Sabat (2001) made an important contribution in his book, *The Experience of Alzheimer's Disease: Life through a Tangled Veil*. Sabat described how language use influences the social construction of identity between persons with dementia and their caregivers. Social constructionism is a theory that seeks to understand the ways in which the knowledge of reality comes to be socially established as reality (Burger and Luckman 1967). Making an important connection between social construction and communication, Sabat notes that the greater the communication problems experienced by persons with dementia, the fewer opportunities they have for social interaction. Sabat presented the theory that there are three forms of self: self 1, which is the singular self expressed by "I, me, mine"; self 2, which consists of the characteristics held by an individual (mental, physical, and emotional) and the beliefs the individual holds about these characteristics; and self 3, which is the publicly presented persona that requires the cooperation of others. This theory helped to conceptualize and characterize the discourse of the person with dementia without losing the complexity of the individual.

While biomedical research had generally failed to include the perspective of the individual with dementia, person-centered scholars made a conscious effort to embrace these individuals' perspectives. Downs (1997), among many others, provided an extensive review of how people suffering from dementia describe their own experiences and a sense of self in the early stages of the disease. This research

described the different ways these individuals talk about living with the disease. For example, persons in the early stages of dementia often fall silent in conversations because they struggle to keep pace with the conversation and/or to process the semantic content. To be more communicatively competent, the caregiver should slow down and repeat or rephrase previous comments to ensure that the interlocutor is following along (Phinney 2002). Cotrell and Schulz (1993) claimed that biomedical dementia research limited the design and the evaluation of research as well as services provided for people suffering from dementia.

The biomedical scientists thought that as the disease progresses, the individual's self-awareness diminishes. However, studies have found that sense of self and self-awareness is still evident even in the conversation of persons in the severe stages of dementia (Mayhew et al. 2001). Using a narrative approach, Basting (2003) analyzed three autobiographies written by people with early onset dementia. Two stories followed a chronological structure, and the third was more thematic in the form of a journal. Basting asked several questions, including the following two: "How do these texts articulate a self in the midst of a disease that has been described as a funeral before death? What are the implications for our understanding of the self outside of the disease?" (p. 88). She notes how each author uses the pronoun "I" to describe self and identity in his or her own words. These descriptions provide a linguistic analysis through which the writer articulates personal experience.

More directly related to LS, there have been numerous studies on how to improve the communication behaviors between individuals with dementia and their caregivers. These training programs can be viewed in two ways: first as socialization of the one receiving care and second as socialization of the caregiver. As the literature on this topic is too vast to summarize in this chapter, please refer to Orange (1991) and Bourgeois et al. (2003). Bourgeois et al. tested the effectiveness of external aids used to mediate communication by and with people with dementia, such as memory books (a personalized collection of pictures and statements). Since then, many other aids have been evaluated (e.g., cue cards, written schedules, diaries, log books, visitor sign-in books, daily or weekly planners, and calendars). Results have shown improvement in desirable communication behaviors such as on-topic conversation and a decrease in less desirable behaviors such as repetition. Results were sustained for up to 4 months posttraining (Bourgeois et al. 2003). Suffice it to say that inherent in this work from the field of speech-language pathology is the goal of using language as a tool to socialize people with dementia into a new set of communication behaviors, while the caregivers themselves are socialized through training and experience into more adaptive and responsive orientations.

Support groups are another therapeutic option for linguistic and cognitive socialization, typically for caregivers or individuals in the early stages of dementia. These groups meet weekly to discuss relevant topics including coping strategies, daily living, self-esteem, relationships, and health, legal, and financial concerns. In one study, a content analysis of evaluative statements revealed themes around positive feelings (e.g., feelings of purpose, gratification, belongingness, and survival), as well as negative ones (e.g., feeling helpless and devalued, and about the unpredictability of life) (Snyder et al. 1995). The concept of discourse community from LS applies to

persons with dementia (Schrauf and Müller 2014). Persons in the early stages of dementia often seek out other members in their wider discourse community since these groups provide a constructive social space to gather information and model behaviors (i.e., socialization) and enable newcomers to meet others with the condition.

People suffering from dementia cope in a variety of ways. In that respect, language-oriented coping behaviors analyzed from a LS perspective may be conceptualized as elements of social and communicative competence. Saunders et al. (2011) studied communicative coping behaviors (CCBs) in an institutional setting. When a person is tested for memory issues during a clinical encounter, this is a potentially face-threatening situation. The person may attempt to preserve positive identity or “save face” by using CCBs. The following is an example of a CCB called a cognitive memory account. The clinician (C) is asking the patient (P) some basic questions.

C: Wh— what was his name? Your husband’s name?

P: (3 sec) now, see, Michael I guess,

C: Okay.

P: I’m not sure, now, that, you, mention, it.

C: OK

P: Isn’t that awful, it’s just that my brain is off a key (p. 348)

In this example, the dementia patient attributes her word-finding difficulties to an improperly tuned instrument (her brain). The implication is that if her brain were in tune she would be able to remember her husband’s name. The patient uses a highly sophisticated type of metaphor called metonym that makes a comparison by substituting a part for the whole. In this case, the brain represents the faulty part of the self. Saunders and colleagues claim that teaching doctors and caregivers about these CCBs (i.e., socializing them) would facilitate the language socialization process of both clinicians and patients.

Guendouzi and Müller (2006) examined the discourse of dementia using conversation analysis, ethnography of communication, and interactional sociolinguistics, along with speech act theory. This work provides an important bridge that connects these approaches with a central focus on dementia discourse.

Hesson and Pichler (2016) investigated dementia patients’ use of “I don’t know” (IDK) in Mini-Mental State Exams (MMSEs) using objective linguistic indicators to differentiate IDK, signaling lack of knowledge (LOK), from IDK, used to hedge responses, affect exam progression, etc. They found that increased proportional use of LOK-IDK correlates with worsening dementia severity.

LS and Caregivers

Caring for a loved one with dementia often affects caregivers’ physical health and immune system response and can result in financial strain, degradation in social

well-being, and increased symptoms of depression and anxiety. Yet, caregivers typically cite communication-related problems as among the most common sources of burden. Therefore, it is a key finding that person-centered clinical approaches often get better responses from individuals with dementia than other approaches (Savundranayagam et al. 2005).

Orange (1991) provided an extensive early review of the communication education and training literature. Later, Small and Gutman (2002) reviewed the Alzheimer's disease caregiving literature to identify the 10 most commonly recommended strategies for caregivers, essentially as a means for their own linguistic socialization and accommodation. These included use short sentences, speak slowly, ask one question or give one instruction at a time, approach the person slowly and from the front, establish and maintain eye contact, eliminate distractions, avoid interrupting the person and allow plenty of time for responses, use yes/no rather than open-ended questions, encourage circumlocution (ask the patient to "talk around" or describe the word they are searching for), repeat messages using the same wording, and paraphrase repeated messages. Then, Small and Gutman surveyed 20 spousal caregivers as to which of these strategies they used and which worked. Caregivers were found to use all 10 strategies, but their perceived frequency of use did not match the frequency reported in the literature. However, caregivers perceived the most effective strategies to be the ones they reported to use. The authors' important conclusion was that caregivers are aware of their communication behavior and modify it in ways that they perceive improve communication.

In an outreach effort to help socialize both informal (family) and formal (clinical professional) caregivers into appropriate communication practices, national advocacy organizations simplify the research for nonspecialists and then promote the findings on language and communication strategies (Alzheimer's Association 2016; Mace and Rabins 1981). In turn, they produce tip sheets and pamphlets that are, in essence, elements of LS.

Another aspect of caregiver communication can be found in the study of elderspeak, referred to earlier in this chapter. The Communication Predicament Model (CAM) formulated by Ryan et al. (1986) proposed that aging stereotypes influenced how people talked to older adults. This theory was examined in a number of studies (see Samuelsson et al. 2013, for a review) showing that persons with dementia were more resistive to care when addressed in elderspeak versus normal talk (Williams et al. 2009). A controlling emotional tone has a negative effect on dementia resident behavior (Williams and Herman 2011). In an ethnographic discourse analysis, Hamilton (1994) examined politeness strategies as an example of an interactional style illustrative of elderspeak. Research shows that elderspeak can have positive and negative influences on the person with dementia (Kemper 1994). The notion that caregivers can be socialized through communication programs to use language that is supportive of care recipients can be traced through the literature on training programs.

Indeed, communication education and training programs presume that it is both possible and desirable to socialize professional caregivers into a new way of communicating with this clinical population. Clinicians participate in a professional

discourse community and share best practices for the health and well-being of those with dementia. However, some of this socialization process may be flawed by a lack of understanding of the complexity inherent in acquiring and demonstrating communicative and social competence when also performing the duties of caregiving. For example, when a person with dementia asks the same question repeatedly, the caregiver may not recognize this linguistic behavior as a symptom of the disease. Another example is the frequent use of formulaic language, in such phrases as, “As one makes the bed, so must one lie,” or “Rome wasn’t built in a day.” People suffering from dementia may use these phrases to make conversation; but the caregiver may not recognize this as an attempt to interact with socio-communicative competence (Lindholm and Wray 2011).

From the field of applied linguistics, Schrauf and Müller (2014) juxtapose the cognitivist perspective (i.e., biomedical approach) with the discursivist approach, which examines social construction of identity, cultural differences, and situated context. Aspects of the LS framework are apparent in the question they pose: “. . .who is doing the social construction and for what purpose?” (p. 14). Schrauf and Müller apply the concept of discourse community to caregivers to emphasize that vastly different discourses separate formal/professional caregivers from informal caregivers. These two communities often fail to work well together to best serve the person with the disease. The framework of LS could contribute another avenue for examining points of conflict and misunderstanding as well as effective practices.

Works in Progress

One of the early cornerstones of therapeutic social dementia care was Validation Therapy (VT) – a communication-based therapy developed by Naomi Feil between 1963 and 1980. This approach also aimed to socialize the individual suffering from dementia to a new psycho-socio-linguistic reality. The value of VT was to restore a sense of self-worth, minimizing patient withdrawal and promoting communication and interaction. Feil illustrates this approach with an example in which Mrs. Fish was hallucinating about a strange man who kept her up at night. Instead of trying to convince Mrs. Fish that there was no strange man outside her 6th floor apartment, the Validation Therapist might ask, “What does the man look like? Is he tall? What is he wearing?” (Feil 1993, p. 59). Then the therapist accepts and supports the social construction of reality created by Mrs. Fish. There are very few studies that have examined VT using a social constructionist approach and none focusing on LS, unfortunately.

Nursing home administrators are responsible for making placement decisions for residents in long-term care. Numerous variables impact this decision including the resident’s cognitive status. De Medeiros et al. (2012) conducted a 6-month, mixed-methods study that investigated friendships among 31 assisted-living residents with moderate to advanced dementia. They examined the impact of cognition on the social interaction of residents. Results revealed no correlation between test scores or demographic characteristics (except gender) and friendship dyads identified by staff.

Furthermore, staff members' perceptions of residents' friendships were not supported through ethnographic observations.

Friendships among residents were observed and consisted of voluntary participation and accommodation in conversation and recognition of the uniqueness of the other. Findings suggest staff perceptions of residents' friendships are not sufficient. This study used longitudinal observation of social relationships in the institutional setting and, if viewed from a LS perspective, reveals that a closer examination of the relationships and facilitating linguistic and communicative interaction between staff and residents is needed.

Problems and Difficulties

One of the difficulties in conducting research on language and dementia is the capacity of prospective participants to give consent (Post et al. 1994). When people with dementia lack the decision-making capacity to give informed consent, then consent must be obtained from them as well as from a proxy or legally authorized representative; this is called dual consent. In addition to obtaining informed consent from the latter, assent should be obtained – this refers to an affirmative agreement to participate in research. Best practice would be to obtain assent at the start of each encounter (whether interview, observation, or testing) from the dementia research subject. Most research approved by an Institutional Review Board requires dual consent, including assent, in research involving people with dementia (Black et al. 2010). This presents a clear challenge to those wishing to undertake longitudinal, ethnographic LS research with the same participants.

Applying a LS perspective and research approach to the field of dementia is also complicated by the fact that dementia is a progressive, neurological disease with no known cure. This picture is further complicated by the fact that people with dementia may not be aware they are having memory problems and thus may not have insight into their disease. While language acquisition and LS studies often focus on the young (and in second-language learning, older children or adults), research usually assumes *increasing* mastery of a new language or idiolect, not *attrition*. For people with dementia, the process of acquiring linguistic and social competence at the beginning stages of the disease may include learning communication skills and coping behaviors to manage the disease. In other words, they increase their capacity despite growing challenges. Indeed, the research on language rehabilitation in this population has shown some long-term results. However, inevitably (if they live long enough), the disease will progress to a stage in which the person with dementia is nonverbal. Kontos (2004) conducted research on the embodied self, which addresses this issue of nonverbal communication and identity construction. Is it possible to conduct LS research on nonverbal people with dementia? Does this mean their language acquisition/socialization has stopped entirely? In regard to caregivers, there is a socialization process for acquiring socio-communicative competence in speaking with clinical professionals, on the one hand, and interacting with their loved ones, on the other. The LS process is influenced by the course and stage of the

disease and is contingent on the behaviors and needs of the person being cared for. Therefore, LS in the context of dementia is very multifaceted and involves various kinds of accommodations, both verbal and nonverbal.

Future Directions

Future research on incorporation of the arts – including poetry, theater, and music – would be valuable to supplement the more clinical and qualitative studies that have been conducted focusing on everyday language, communication, and socialization (Angus and Bowen 2011; Beard 2012). Further, the trend of online therapies and support mechanisms is a potential area for future research (Davis et al. 2014).

Given the strong interconnections across studies of discourse and social interaction for people with dementia and the constructs of self, personhood, and identity, future research could benefit by clarifying definitions and methods across studies. Caddell and Clare (2013) offered a framework of the self and everyday life to provide consistency across research studies. Applying these and other concepts of linguistic and social construction of identity and then operationalizing them in interactions might further enhance studies of LS and other aspects of care and communication.

Wray (2016) offers a new approach to capturing the relationship between processing and pragmatics in order to examine how people suffering from dementia and their caregivers attempt to resolve miscommunication, conflict, and resulting dissonance. The Communicative Impact model can be used to understand how the risk of conflict in interaction between people with dementia and their caregivers might be minimized.

Given the increasing incidence of dementia in society, there is a strong epidemiological as well as academic and therapeutic rationale for the application of LS to the study of language and dementia. As seen in this chapter, there are clear connections across these two areas of study given the common theme of social identity construction and the need to mediate communication in a manner that is appropriate to the cognitive and communicative abilities of interlocutors. There is, therefore, a tremendous need to understand how communication can be best achieved, supported, and researched through social interaction between persons suffering from dementia and their caregivers.

Cross-References

- ▶ [Language Socialization and Autism](#)
- ▶ [Language Socialization, Higher Education, and Work](#)
- ▶ [Pragmatic Socialization](#)

Related Articles in the Encyclopedia of Language and Education

Britt-Louise Gunnarsson: [Professional Communication](#). In Volume: Second and Foreign Language Learning

References

- Almor, A., Aronoff, J. M., MacDonald, M. C., Gonnerman, L. M., Kempler, D., Hintiryan, H., ... & Andersen, E. S. (2009). A common mechanism in verb and noun naming deficits in Alzheimer's patients. *Brain and Language*, *111*(1), 8–19.
- Alzheimer's Association. (2016). <https://alz.org/global/>
- Angus, J., & Bowen, S. (2011). Quiet please, there's a lady on stage: Centering the person with dementia in life story narrative. *Journal of Aging Studies*, *25*(2), 110–117.
- Basting, A. D. (2003). Looking back from loss: Views of the self in Alzheimer's disease. *Journal of Aging Studies*, *17*(1), 87–99.
- Beard, R. L. (2012). Art therapies and dementia care: A systematic review. *Dementia*, *11*(5), 633–656.
- Black, B. S., Rabins, P. V., Sugarman, J., & Karlawish, J. H. (2010). Seeking assent and respecting dissent in dementia research. *The American Journal of Geriatric Psychiatry*, *18*(1), 77–85.
- Bonilla, J. L., & Johnson, M. K. (1995). Semantic space in Alzheimer's disease patients. *Neuropsychology*, *9*(3), 345.
- Bourgeois, M. S., Camp, C., Rose, M., White, B., Malone, M., Carr, J., & Rovine, M. (2003). A comparison of training strategies to enhance use of external aids by persons with dementia. *Journal of Communication Disorders*, *36*(5), 361–378.
- Burger, P., & Luckman, T. (1967). *The social construction of reality: A treatise in the sociology of knowledge and commitment in American life*. Garden City: Anchor.
- Caddell, L. S., & Clare, L. (2013). Studying the self in people with dementia: How might we proceed? *Dementia*, *12*(2), 192–209.
- Caporalet, L. R. (1981). The paralanguage of caregiving: Baby talk to the institutionalized aged. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *40*(5), 876–884.
- Cohen, L. (1998). *No aging in India: Alzheimer's, the bad family, and other modern things*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Cotrell, V., & Schulz, R. (1993). The perspective of the patient with Alzheimer's disease: A neglected dimension of dementia research. *The Gerontologist*, *33*(2), 205–211.
- Davis, B., Nies, M., Shehab, M., & Shenk, D. (2014). Developing a pilot e-mobile app for dementia caregiver support: Lessons learned. *Online Journal of Nursing Informatics*, *18*(1).
- Downs, M. (1997). The emergence of the person in dementia research. *Ageing and Society*, *17*(5), 597–607.
- Feil, N. (1993). *The validation breakthrough: Simple techniques for communicating with people with Alzheimer's-type dementia*. Baltimore: Health Professions Press.
- Ferguson, C. A. (1964). Baby talk in six languages. *American Anthropologist*, *66*(6), 103–114.
- Fromm, D., & Holland, A. L. (1989). Functional communication in Alzheimer's disease. *The Journal of Speech and Hearing Disorders*, *54*(4), 535–540.
- Garrett, P., & Baquedano-López, P. (2002). Language socialization: Reproduction and continuity, transformation and change. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, *31*, 339–361.
- Goodwin, C. (2002). *Conversation and brain damage*. Bethesda: Oxford University Press.
- Guendouzi, J. A., & Müller, N. (2006). *Approaches to discourse in dementia*. Washington, DC: Psychology Press.
- Hamilton, H. (1994). *Conversations with an Alzheimer's patient: An interactional examination of questions and responses*. Cambridge: New York.

- Hesson, A. M., & Pichler, H. (2016). Interpreting “I don’t know” use by persons living with dementia in mini-mental state examinations. *Patient Education and Counseling*, 99(9), 1534–1541.
- Kemper, S. (1994). Elderspeak: Speech accommodations to older adults. *Aging and Cognition*, 1(1), 17–28.
- Kitwood, T. (1997). *Dementia reconsidered: The person comes first*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Kontos, P. C. (2004). Ethnographic reflections on selfhood, embodiment and Alzheimer’s disease. *Ageing and Society*, 24(6), 829–849.
- Lindholm, C., & Wray, A. (2011). Proverbs and formulaic sequences in the language of elderly people with dementia. *Dementia*, 10(4), 603–623.
- Lyman, K. A. (1989). Bringing the social back in: A critique of the biomedicalization of dementia. *Gerontologist*, 29(5), 597–605.
- Mace, N., & Rabins, P. V. (1981). *The thirty-six hour day: A family guide to caring for persons with Alzheimer’s disease, related dementing illnesses, and memory loss in later life*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Mates, A. W., Mikesell, L., & Smith, M. S. (Eds.). (2010). *Language, interaction and frontotemporal dementia: Reverse engineering the social mind*. London: Equinox.
- Mayhew, P. A., Acton, G. J., Yauk, S., & Hopkins, B. A. (2001). Communication from individuals with advanced DAT: Can it provide clues to their sense of self-awareness and well-being? *Geriatric Nursing*, 22(2), 106–110.
- McLean, A. (2007). *The person in dementia*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- de Medeiros, K., Saunders, P. A., Doyle, P. J., Mosby, A., & Van Haitsma, K. (2012). Friendships among people with dementia in long-term care. *Dementia*, 11(3), 363–381.
- Mentis, M., Briggs-Whittaker, J., & Gramigna, G. D. (1995). Discourse topic management in senile dementia of the Alzheimer’s type. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research*, 38(5), 1054–1066.
- Ochs, E., & Schieffelin, B. (2008). Language socialization: An historical overview. In *Encyclopedia of language and education, Vol. 8, Language socialization* (pp. 2580–2594). New York: Springer.
- Orange, J. B. (1991). Perspectives of family members regarding communication changes. In R. Lubinski (Ed.), *Dementia and communication* (pp. 168–186). Philadelphia: Mosby.
- Orange, J. B., & Colton-Hudson, A. (1998). Enhancing communication in dementia of the Alzheimer’s type. *Topics in Geriatric Rehabilitation*, 14(2), 56–75.
- Pan, B. A., & Berko Gleason, J. (1986). The study of language loss: Models and hypotheses for an emerging discipline. *Applied PsychoLinguistics*, 7(3), 193–206.
- Phinney, A. (2002). Living with the symptoms. In P. B. Harris (Ed.), *The person with Alzheimer’s disease* (pp. 49–76). Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Post, S. G., Ripich, D. N., & Whitehouse, P. J. (1994). Discourse ethics: Research, dementia, and communication. *Alzheimer Disease & Associated Disorders*, 8(Suppl. 4), 58–65.
- Poveda, A. M. (2003). An anthropological perspective of Alzheimer disease. *Geriatric Nursing*, 24(1), 26–31.
- Ramanathan, V. (1997). *Alzheimer discourse: Some sociolinguistic dimensions*. Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Richter, J. M., Roberto, K., & Bottenberg, D. J. (1995). Communicating with persons with Alzheimer’s disease: Experiences of family and formal caregivers. *Archives of Psychiatric Nursing*, 9(5), 279–285.
- Ripich, D. N., & Terrell, B. Y. (1988). Patterns of discourse cohesion and coherence in Alzheimer’s disease. *The Journal of Speech and Hearing Disorders*, 53(1), 8–15.
- Ripich, D. N., Wykle, M., & Niles, S. (1995). Alzheimer’s disease caregivers: The FOCUSED program. A communication skills training program helps nursing assistants to give better care to patients with disease. *Geriatric Nursing*, 16(1), 15–19.

- Ryan, E. B., Giles, H., Bartolucci, G., & Henwood, K. (1986). Psycholinguistic and social psychological components of communication by and with the elderly. *Language & Communication, 6*(1/2), 1–24.
- Sabat, S. (2001). *The experience of Alzheimer's disease: Life through a tangled veil*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Sabat, S., & Harré, R. (1992). The construction and deconstruction of self in Alzheimer's disease. *Aging and Society, 12*(4), 443–461.
- Samuelsson, C., Adolfsson, E., & Persson, H. (2013). The use and characteristics of elderspeak in Swedish geriatric institutions. *Clinical Linguistics and Phonetics, 27*(8), 616–631.
- Saunders, P. A., de Medeiros, K., & Bartell, A. (2011). "Oh he was forgettable": Construction of self identity through use of communicative coping behaviors in the discourse of persons with cognitive impairment. *Dementia, 10*(3), 341–359.
- Savundranayagam, M. Y., Hummert, M. L., & Montgomery, R. J. (2005). Investigating the effects of communication problems on caregiver burden. *The Journals of Gerontology Series B: Psychological Sciences and Social Sciences, 60*(1), S48–S55.
- Schrauf, R. W., & Müller, N. (2014). *Dialogue and dementia: Cognitive and communicative resources for engagement*. Washington, DC: Psychology Press.
- Small, J. A., & Gutman, G. (2002). Recommended and reported use of communication strategies in Alzheimer caregiving. *Alzheimer Disease & Associated Disorders, 16*(4), 270–278.
- Small, J. A., Huxtable, A., & Walsh, M. (2009). The role of caregiver prosody in conversations with persons who have Alzheimer's disease. *American Journal of Alzheimer's Disease and Other Dementias, 24*(6), 469–475.
- Snyder, L., Quayhagen, M. P., Shepherd, S., & Bower, D. (1995). Supportive seminar groups: An intervention for early stage dementia patients. *The Gerontologist, 35*(5), 691–695.
- Vasse, E., Vernooij-Dassen, M., Spijker, A., Rikkert, M. O., & Koopmans, R. (2010). A systematic review of communication strategies for people with dementia in residential and nursing homes. *International Psychogeriatrics, 22*(2), 189–200.
- Vogel, A., Johannsen, P., Stokholm, J., & Jørgensen, K. (2014). Frequency and severity of semantic deficits in a consecutive memory clinic cohort. *Dementia and Geriatric Cognitive Disorders, 38*(3–4), 214–223.
- Williams, K. N., & Herman, R. E. (2011). Linking resident behaviour to dementia care communication: Effects of emotional tone. *Behaviour Therapy, 42*(1), 42–46.
- Williams, K. N., Herman, R. E., Gajewski, B., & Wilson, K. (2009). Elderspeak communication: Impact on dementia care. *American Journal of Alzheimer's Disease and Other Dementias, 24*(5), 11–20.
- Wray, A. (2016). Mechanisms of conflict and aggression in the dementia context. *Journal of Language Aggression and Conflict, 4*(1), 114–140.

Part V

**Language Socialization in Particular
Ethnolinguistic Communities**

Language Socialization in Canadian Indigenous Communities

Diane Pesco and Martha B. Crago

Abstract

In this chapter, we discuss language socialization among the Indigenous peoples of Canada, with a focus on First Nations and Inuit. We begin with findings from anthropological studies reported in the 1980s regarding communicative practices in Indigenous communities. We then synthesize landmark studies published in the 1990s on the language socialization of Indigenous children, as well as later complementary studies that explored Indigenous adults' perspectives on children's language learning and use. We also discuss recent studies by Indigenous scholars, including a study of children's stories of personal experience, viewed in light of elders' perspectives on storytelling, and auto-ethnographies on the process of learning an ancestral language as an adult.

The data suggest that language socialization practices in Indigenous communities are heterogeneous, reflecting differences in educational and language policies across communities, as well as changes over time within communities. Efforts to maintain and revitalize Indigenous languages also appear to be engendering novel practices that combine language socialization practices associated with the Indigenous language with strategies intended to support bilingualism or second-language learning.

Further research on the language socialization of Indigenous children and youth is recommended, in a wider range of communities and contexts

D. Pesco (✉)
Concordia University, Montreal, QC, Canada
e-mail: diane.pesco@concordia.ca

M.B. Crago
McGill University, Montreal, Canada
e-mail: martha.crago@mcgill.ca

(e.g., peer, family, classroom; mono-, bi-, and multilingual). Additionally, explorations of language socialization later in the lifespan are needed; these would extend the auto-ethnographic studies reviewed in the present chapter and align with research trends in the field (Duff 2008).

Keywords

Maternal perspectives • Educational ethnography • Auto-ethnography • Narrative • Classroom discourse • Indigenous peoples in Canada • First Nations • Inuit • Language maintenance and revitalization • Bilingual and multilingual communities

Contents

Introduction	292
Early Developments	293
Major Contributions	295
Socialization in Families	295
Socialization at School	297
Socialization of and Through Narrative	298
Socialization of Language Choice	300
Work in Progress	300
Problems and Difficulties	301
Future Directions	302
Cross-References	304
Related Articles in the Encyclopedia of Language and Education	304
References	304

Introduction

This chapter addresses language socialization among the Indigenous population of Canada, which is composed of three distinct groups – First Nations, Inuit, and Métis.¹ Also referred to as Aboriginal or First Peoples, Indigenous people number 1.4 million, comprising over 4% of Canada’s total population (Statistics Canada 2013a). They reside in Canada’s ten provinces and three territories, with about half living on reserves in rural/semirural areas or in remote settlements as far as the Arctic and half in urban areas (Kay-Raining Bird 2011). The three Indigenous groups differ from one another in a number of significant ways, including history, culture, and language, and vary within the groups as well. For an example of linguistic variation within the principal groups, of the over 50 languages of First Nations peoples, a few

¹These three groups are recognized in the Constitution Act of Canada of 1982. Discussion of how Indigenous people self-identify can be found at <http://indigenousfoundations.arts.ubc.ca/home/identity.html>, along with information about Indigenous land rights and governance that elucidate some of the differences between the three groups. The site also includes links to organizations that represent First Nations, Inuit, and Métis nationally (e.g., the Assembly of First Nations, Inuit Tapiriit Kanatami, and the Métis National Council).

are still widely spoken, while many others have been lost (Ball and McIvor 2013; Norris and Jantzen 2004). Among Inuit, many speak Inuktitut, but home use of the language varies by age and geographical location (Inuit Tapiriit Kanatami and Research and Analysis Directorate 2007). Most Métis are native speakers of English and/or French, Canada's two official languages, but a minority also speak or understand a First Nation language and/or Michif, a language that mixes elements of Cree and Canadian French (Aboriginal Languages Task Force 2005).

Language socialization research in the Canadian context reflects the diversity of Indigenous communities in that it is typically about specific groups of people and places, rather than about Indigenous people, or First Nations, Inuit, or Métis, as a whole. (A collective Indigenous identity, however, does exist, as discussed in a later section.) In broad terms, language socialization can be defined as expert members in a given community socializing novices by teaching them (usually implicitly) how language is used and providing them with opportunities to gain cultural knowledge expressed through language. While discussions of socialization tend to imply asymmetries between experts and novices, language socialization researchers acknowledge that both parties are agentic. That is, novices do not just receive cultural knowledge and competencies; rather, they actively appropriate and transform these (Ochs and Schieffelin 2011), in keeping with social constructivist accounts of development. By contributing to interaction, the novice also transforms the "expert" (i.e., the expert-novice relationship is bidirectional). Additionally, expert and novice roles are not fixed, or even always required for socialization to take place. As research reviewed by Duff (2008) revealed, peers also socialize one another and collectively develop new practices and forms of participation in discourse.

Early Developments

The first studies of language socialization in the Indigenous context emerged from seminal studies in the 1970s and 1980s of communicative practices within First Nations communities, language socialization studies outside of Canada, and early discussions of Indigenous education within Canada.

Several studies of communicative practices in Canadian Indigenous communities were published as a set in the 1980s. Darnell (1988) described her findings concerning Cree as congruent with those reported for other Native North American groups, noting "the positive functions of silence, the tendency to avoid eye contact, and the use of indirection in requests" (p. vi). Rushforth (1988) reported a Dene preference for implicit communication, indirect speech acts, and non-interfering, constrained behavior in social interaction and interpreted these in light of the importance Dene placed on being one's own "boss" and recognizing the autonomy of others. Black-Rogers (1988) also remarked on a propensity for non-interference among Ojibwa, concluding that it arose from the view that "[t]he proper way to conduct oneself and one's thoughts is simply to leave others alone and concentrate on steering one's own ship" (p. 46). Studies like these revealed concepts that could

potentially guide communicative behavior in at least some Indigenous communities and provided insight into the aspects of communication one might study with respect to adult-child interactions.

The conceptual and methodological framework of the language socialization research that was to emerge in Canada by the 1990s was also guided by Heath's (1983) research on language use in two working-class, racially distinct communities in the Southern United States, as well as ground-breaking (and now classic) studies of sociocultural influences on children's language development carried out by Ochs (1988) in a Samoan village and by Schieffelin (1990) among the Kaluli, an Indigenous people of Papua New Guinea (see Ochs and Schieffelin 2008, for an overview).

Research on classroom discourse in Canadian Indigenous communities, integrating language socialization principles, was also influenced by early educational ethnographies (for a review, see Duff 2008). These included studies that elucidated the cultural nature of talk in classrooms and attested to incompatibilities in the communicative patterns of Indigenous children and their non-Indigenous teachers. Philips (1983), for example, investigated interactions in US classrooms where "Anglo" teachers taught either Warm Springs "Indian" students or "Anglo" students. Relative to their Anglo peers, the Warm Springs children generally talked less, gazed more at each other and less at the teacher during lessons, signaled attention less, responded less to being called upon to speak, respected turn order more, and distributed speaking turns more equally among themselves. Philips characterized Warm Springs Indians as organizing interaction in such a way so as to maximize individual control over one's own speaking turn yet minimize control over others' turns, an account consistent with the notions of "respect" and "non-interference" evoked in the investigations within Canada alluded to above. Additionally, Philip's work, only a small part of which is summarized here, demonstrated how Indigenous children's educational success might be compromised by the "invisible culture" of the school.

In the Canadian context, discussions about culturally and linguistically appropriate education for Indigenous children were already taking place in the 1970s, even though the federal residential school system was still in place. These schools, present in Canada from the 1870s to as late as 1996, did not merely require that children accommodate to an alien school culture. The schools were repressive, designed to strip away children's Indigeneity, including their languages, cultural practices, and spiritual beliefs. Moreover, as Kay-Raining Bird (2011) asserted, "abuse and neglect were systemic" (p. 114), and the Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada's (2015) 6-year study of residential schools has more than substantiated that claim. The residential system has been justifiably charged with eroding not only languages but also the well-being of Indigenous people who were later to become parents and grandparents, robbing many of them of the confidence to engage in the intimate interactions in which language socialization is embedded (Ball 2009).

Notwithstanding the devastating consequences of these schools, Indigenous peoples imagined a future in which their languages would be used at home and integrated in schooling as residential schools were gradually closed. An early

example from the 1970s was the Cree Way Project (Heurer, cited in Visser and Fovet 2014). Although Cree was still the home language for children in this community, elsewhere many Indigenous languages were declining or already lost. Thus, by the 1980s, the school's role in Indigenous language retention and revitalization was already being discussed (see Stairs 1985). In parallel, scholars began to examine how children were being socialized to Indigenous languages at home, based on an interest in the topic for its own sake and the potential of the data gathered to guide instruction as schooling increasingly came under Indigenous direction.

Major Contributions

Socialization in Families

Crago (1992a) and Crago et al. (1993) reported findings from the first language socialization study of an Indigenous group in Canada: a longitudinal, ethnographic study of four Inuit children (1- to 2-year-olds) in Northern Quebec and their families. Using data from videotaped interactions, field notes, and interviews, the authors showed that the Inuit mothers, all of whom spoke Inuktitut to their children, shared certain beliefs and practices surrounding child-rearing and language use. For example, mothers rarely asked questions just so children could display their knowledge but rather reserved questions to elicit information from children they did not yet know. They also tended to evaluate children's knowledge of language based on their comprehension, not production, and valued children's ability to follow directives (Crago et al. 1993). The older mothers, especially, expressed a preference for quiet, visually attentive behavior over talkativeness (Crago 1992a). Crago et al. (1993) also described how Inuit caregivers used imitation routines, greeting rituals, and a "baby talk" register to accommodate children's level of development and prepare them for community life. The study provided valuable information to the Inuit-controlled Kativik School Board governing education in Arctic Quebec, in addition to informing the design of subsequent research on the acquisition of Inuktitut (Allen 1996).

Crago et al. (1998) later studied Inuit families who spoke English and/or French in addition to Inuktitut. In some of the families, both parents were bilingual but consciously chose to speak only Inuktitut to their child to ensure acquisition of the language. However, these parents did not display the language socialization practices observed in the earlier study of Inuit mothers. Other bilingual parents spoke both Inuktitut and English to their children but engaged in language socialization practices in both languages that aligned with those reported by Crago (1992a) and Crago et al. (1993). The findings showed how language and culturally driven language socialization practices can dissociate.

Hough-Eyamie (1999) used both qualitative and quantitative analyses in her comparative study of ten white, Euro-Canadian-/English-speaking families and ten Cree Nation-/Cree-speaking families living in Quebec. One of the striking findings

was that the Cree and Euro-Canadian families differed with respect to the structure of caregiving. Cree toddlers participated in more multiparty interactions, had greater freedom from schedules and structured activity, and engaged in fewer dyadic interactions with mothers than the Euro-Canadian families. When mothers and children were observed in joint interaction, Cree mothers and children were responsive to one another but talked less than Euro-Canadian mothers and children and used more nonverbal communication. The two groups expressed similar communicative functions but in different proportions. For example, Cree mothers directed children's attention and behavior more than the Euro-Canadian mothers did. While this last finding appears to contradict a principle of non-interference reported for some First Nations groups (see section "[Early Developments](#)" above), the difference could reflect intercommunity or intergenerational differences or a difference in Cree parents' beliefs about adult-toddler interactions versus interactions solely among adults.

Ball and Lewis' (2014) interviews of First Nations adults also drew on language socialization research and theory. Elders, grandparents, and parents of young children from First Nations situated in Central and Western Canada (65 people in all) were asked about their values, attitudes, and practices regarding children's language development and language use in the home. While the First Nations were unspecified, most interviewees noted Dakota, Cree, and Ojibway as their ancestral languages. Nearly all of the interviewees spoke of the importance of an accepting and loving atmosphere for learning. Over three-quarters felt it was important that parents talk with their children to foster language. While some interviewees discouraged particular kinds of talk (e.g., asking children to state what people could readily see or children boasting), over half expressed a preference for a "talkative" child; a third expressed no preference or noted that their preference depended on the situation; and only a minority preferred a "quiet" child (p. 228). While First Nations interviewees' thresholds for "too much talk" might still be lower than those of Euro-Canadians, these results contrast with the preference for reserved communicative behavior reported in earlier studies. The differences might simply be explained by a cohort effect (i.e., Indigenous viewpoints in the early 2000s no longer reflect data gathered in the 1980s). Differences in educational histories across communities might also be important. For example, the older Inuit mothers in Crago et al. (1993) had not attended school, while the adults in First Nations communities in Ball and Lewis (2014) would likely have attended residential or day schools. These differing histories would have affected adults' own exposure to language socialization practices as children and, presumably, their practices and views as parents. There was also evidence of cross-generational change in Ball and Lewis (2014). Although elders and younger parents were not significantly different in their responses to interview questions according to statistical tests, all of the elders but only some of the younger parents expressed the view that children should be quiet in some contexts (i.e., adult conversations, ceremonies, prayers, and feasts). Also, Ball and Lewis examined language socialization in communities where English was dominant, rather than Indigenous languages. Language shift might explain differences in socialization patterns, over time or across geographical locations.

In another study using interviews as a data source, Jonk and Enns (2009) asked mothers about their beliefs about children's language development and their verbal interactions with their child, particularly their use of support strategies to encourage talking or foster understanding. These are issues that have often been examined in language socialization research. The participants were Dene mothers living in Lac Brochet, Manitoba, and a socioeconomically matched group of "Western" mothers from Winnipeg, the largest city (and provincial capital) in Manitoba. Dene mothers reported using interactional language support strategies as often as the comparison group. They also reported using some strategies more than the non-Indigenous mothers: following the child's topic of conversation, changing words to support their child's comprehension, and asking their child to repeat sentences after them. The greater reported use of these strategies by Dene mothers could have several explanations. Perhaps ideas about language stimulation that circulate widely in English are also adopted or reported by Indigenous parents who speak mainly English. Alternatively, the Dene mothers' responses might have reflected traditional Dene practices; interestingly, the strategies involving repetition by the child and accommodations to the child (i.e., by following the child's topic) were similar to ones Inuit mothers used (Crago et al. 1993). It is also possible that Dene mothers used some strategies to support language expression and comprehension more intensively than non-Indigenous mothers because they believed that these strategies would help their child in learning two languages: Dene and English. In any case, the Dene mothers appeared to value talking with young children and eliciting talk from them using diverse strategies, as did the parents and elders interviewed by Ball and Lewis (2014).

Questions about education in these two interview studies also shed light on local values and ideologies regarding language. The interviewees in Ball and Lewis' (2014) study expressed a preference for bilingual early education or monolingual education involving their ancestral language, rather than English-only education. They associated Indigenous language use with cultural identity and with a spiritual connectedness to one's ancestors, despite the fact that most interviewees were not themselves speakers of an Indigenous language. Jonk and Enns (2009) included an open-ended comment section on their survey and noted that "almost all comments made by the Dene mothers . . . related to culture and language preservation" (p. 38). Crago (1992b) pointed out how critical it is that not only language but also language socialization practices be preserved and condemned the neglect of such practices by practitioners as a form of unwitting "cultural genocide of non-mainstream communicative practices" (p. 37). This caution also applies to teachers of Indigenous children in schools, a setting to which we now turn.

Socialization at School

Eriks-Brophy and Crago (2003) investigated instructional discourse in Inuit communities in Northern Quebec in terms of language socialization. Inuit teachers taught in Inuktitut through grade 2, while in grade 3 and beyond, instruction was in English

or French and provided by non-Inuit teachers. Eight Inuit and six non-Inuit teachers were compared on how they managed students' turn taking and reacted to students' responses and initiations. Inuit teachers were not as likely as non-Inuit teachers to call on, evaluate, correct, reprimand, or praise students individually. Instead, they used more group (whole-class) address and choral response and incorporated students' initiations more frequently. They also directed students to their peers as sources of information more often and encouraged higher levels of peer interaction during lessons. In interviews, the Inuit teachers revealed some of the cultural values underlying their classroom practices, including beliefs about the importance of cooperation, social interaction, and allowing children to maintain "face" (Eriks-Brophy and Crago 1993). Based on these and other findings, the authors concluded that the shift in language of instruction in grade 3 was accompanied by a shift in classroom culture that led to miscommunication, devaluation of Inuit communicative patterns, and reduced academic success for children.

While research has shown that early instruction or immersion in an Indigenous language has positive effects on children's language development and self-esteem (Taylor et al. 2012), not all Indigenous children receive such instruction. Most that do have early exposure to Indigenous languages in education transition to English or French in the upper grades, due to limits in Indigenous language programming. As Eriks-Brophy and Crago (1993) showed, this transition period is a critical one. Children who do not receive instruction in an Indigenous language even in the early grades are also likely to experience conflicts between language socialization at home and school, with consequences for their educational experience and achievement.

Socialization of and Through Narrative

Narratives (a term used interchangeably with "stories" in the present chapter) merit special attention in language socialization research in Indigenous contexts, given the importance of storytelling traditions in Indigenous communities, and the ramifications of potential mismatches between children's spontaneous narratives and the stories they might be expected to tell at school. Pesco and Crago (1996) studied the personal narratives of bilingual Algonquin-English children (12 years old, on average), in Rapid Lake, Quebec. The children were residing and attending school on reserve (i.e., land reserved for First Nations in the 1800s via the Indian Act). Their narratives, told in English, were interpreted in light of field observations. The findings showed that the children spontaneously co-constructed stories and included performative elements in their stories, in contrast with the more monologic style often expected in Euro-Canadian schools. The narrative themes reflected community life and some aligned with themes in traditional Algonquian stories (e.g., trickster tales). Children tended to end their stories at the high point (i.e., the climax). The authors proposed that this pattern, usually interpreted as a developmental precursor

to the “classic” structure, in which the high point (or conflict) is resolved, might have reflected the narrator’s desire to leave the listener in the story realm. While the study was not a language socialization study per se, the authors examined children’s contributions to one another’s narratives, the sociocultural dimensions of narrative, and the importance of interpreting data in light of local practices, an approach consistent with language socialization research.

Peltier (2014), a member of the Chippewas of Rama First Nation, later investigated narrative socialization more directly by asking elders to act as cultural informants in judging the quality of narratives told by Anishinaabe children of Nipissing First Nation. (Anishinaabe comprises Ojibway/Chippewa as well as Algonquin and Odawa peoples.) The children, ranging in age from 8 to 10 years old, were all monolingual speakers of English. Peltier collected stories in a storytelling circle; a “talking stone” was passed around to “help each person to listen respectfully, remember, and share openly from the heart” (p. 180). Children were invited to tell a story, but were not obliged to do so. Community elders were later asked to listen to recordings of the children’s stories and to identify the ones that they liked best and to explain why. (Peltier asked this of elders but pointed out that they might not otherwise have spontaneously compared children and might have focused on children’s unique gifts instead.)

The elders’ comments were subsequently analyzed. One of the features the elders valued was fluent storytelling: narratives in which events and ideas flowed “without interruption” (Peltier 2014, p. 182). The elders also appreciated the humor in stories, regardless of whether the events recounted were pleasant or not, a finding that Peltier connected to adult storytelling and the importance Anishinaabe place on finding humor even in difficult circumstances. Other qualities appeared to be ones that make a story come alive: “attention-grabbing events” and “descriptive language . . . to create a vivid picture” (p. 185), character emotions, the inclusion of dialogue, and the child’s use of voice to animate the story. Elders also valued children’s references to their relationships with family and community members. These findings, particularly those related to the performance features of narratives and the importance of humor, were consistent with the findings of Pesco and Crago (1996). While one can hardly claim a single Indigenous narrative style based on these data, the findings suggest that Indigenous children’s stories are best understood and appreciated in light of local norms into which children are socialized from a young age.

In the same report, Peltier (2014) also briefly reviewed evidence from other studies of narrative (i.e., storytelling) in Indigenous communities. While oral traditions have long been recognized in Indigenous communities and storytelling by elders and teachers has been integrated into Indigenous school curricula, narratives by Indigenous people in Canada have not been extensively analyzed from a language socialization framework. Nonetheless, there are indications in the literature that Indigenous adults tell stories with explicit and implicit teachings to children and young adults. These interactions and developmental processes merit further investigation (see section “[Future Directions](#)”).

Socialization of Language Choice

The research discussed so far in this section focused on the language socialization of children. In contrast, Patrick (2003) studied Indigenous adolescents and adults residing in an arctic community in Quebec with a minority of Euro-Canadians. Inuit and Cree community members spoke Inuktitut and Cree, respectively, as first languages, while Euro-Canadians spoke English or French. Patrick found that English predominated as the additional (i.e., second or third language) among Inuit. Observations and interviews of community members revealed reasons for this predominance: the symbolic value of English, expressed particularly by Inuit youth; the community-wide use of English for intercultural communication; the perceived importance of learning French (the sole official language in the province) and the time required to learn it; and the Euro-Canadians' lack of even rudimentary Inuktitut or Cree. Patrick's research made an important contribution as it showed how the beliefs, values, and communicative practices of all members of this multi-lingual community socialized the choice of an additional language.

Work in Progress

The preceding sections have discussed the socialization of interactions, features of narrative discourse, and language choice in monolingual, bilingual, or trilingual contexts involving Indigenous languages, English, and/or French. The vitality of Indigenous languages themselves is another major concern that is currently influencing research developments. In order to appreciate these relatively new directions in the language socialization literature, a more nuanced picture of Indigenous language use in Canada is helpful. On the 2011 Canadian National Household Survey (a form of census), over 213,000 Indigenous people (about 15%) reported having an Indigenous language as a "mother tongue" and speaking the language at home (Statistics Canada 2013b). An additional 2–3% of Indigenous people reported being able to converse in an Indigenous language. However, two-thirds of all Indigenous mother tongue speakers reported that they spoke one of just three languages: Inuktitut, Cree, or Ojibway. Though these languages have the greatest potential to survive, in relation to other Indigenous languages in Canada, census data reveals a gradual decline in their use as well (Statistics Canada 2013b).

In short, many Indigenous languages have already been lost and others are threatened. Language maintenance and revitalization are thus pressing concerns. One of the innovative directions language socialization research has taken in recent years, which is likely to continue, is documentation by Indigenous university students of their own processes and experiences of learning an Indigenous language, often using auto-ethnographic methods. Two such studies are reported here.

Daniels-Fiss (2008) described the process of "learning to be a Nêhiyaw (Cree) through language." She explained how her grandparents raised her on a Cree reserve in Saskatchewan but addressed her in English, believing it would help her later in life. As an adult, she immersed herself in Cree, with the aim of not only learning the

language but also becoming culturally literate and accessing a Cree worldview. She wrote that in learning Cree “I have a language with which to talk to ancestors, as well as to pray and to communicate with all living creatures. The language provides a way back to the spirit world. I have re-learned to view the world from *nêhiyaw* eyes” (p. 244). The socialization process, interestingly, happened in part through short immersion experiences in Cree literacy camps, where Cree was learned from instructors, but also through the study of texts. Thus, adults such as Daniels-Fiss (and McIvor 2012, in another more recent auto-ethnographic study of Cree in Western Canada) have consciously become novices in order to become socialized into their ancestral cultures, languages, and ways of knowing.

Rosborough (2012), similarly, wrote about re-learning her ancestral language, Kwak’wala, a language with few speakers left but one she had been exposed to in early childhood. She poignantly described her realization of the beauty of Kwak’wala and emphasized the importance of evoking that beauty for novices engaged in the difficult work of learning a new language (see also Cranmer’s (2015) study of her own Kwak’wala learning experiences). Rosborough described her appreciation of the polysynthetic structure of the language and pondered how the linguistic structures might reflect an Indigenous worldview. She also recounted her journey in learning Kwak’wala: the struggles and joys of being a novice and the many paths she traveled to become a Kwak’wala speaker and language activist. While she has had many teachers, it is clear that she, like Daniels-Fiss and other such learners, was actively socializing herself into (and through) the language and projecting a future where she might socialize others as well. As she expressed it, “If I learn to understand and speak Kwak’wala but do not contribute actively to the life and future of our language by supporting the ways our language lives in others and in our community, my work will have little meaning” (p. 171).

Another current focus in language socialization research with Indigenous peoples living in Canada is family language policies. According to Patrick et al. (2013), these policies “incorporat[e] parental attitudes and ideologies, cultural patterns of behaviour, and intergenerational language and literacy practices” (p. 2). Patrick et al. studied these matters among Inuit families living in a large city and attending a family literacy program. The urban focus is interesting given that the number of Indigenous people living in urban centers is rising (see section “[Introduction](#)”) and is likely to result in new forms or means of language socialization. Patrick et al., for example, showed how objects traditionally found in the arctic (or replicas of the objects) prompted dialogue and multimodal exploration by Inuit parent-child dyads and, in turn, allowed for linguistic and cultural learning in both generations.

Problems and Difficulties

Indigenous peoples and non-Indigenous researchers face a number of challenges related to research on language learning, use, and socialization. One of these challenges, noted in the Introduction, is the considerable diversity between First Nations, Inuit, and Métis and within each of these groups. These differences increase

the probability that research findings from one context cannot be generalized to others. There is also diversity within communities that affects the languages children are exposed to and presumably the language practices and beliefs associated with those languages. For example, while some Indigenous people believe strongly in the importance of Indigenous languages in the education of their children, not all parents do, even when they reside in the same community (e.g., Visser and Fovet 2014). Single communities can also display important differences in practices across speakers (e.g., Crago et al. 1998; Patrick 2003).

Nonetheless, Indigenous communities have certain commonalities. Among these is a shared history of European colonization and political alliances developed to address the consequences of that history in the postcolonial era. In fact, the movement for Indigenous rights in Canada is accompanied by a political discourse that both informs and relies on the idea of a collective Indigenous identity (present in both official circles and in grassroots sociopolitical movements like Idle No More). The Assembly of First Nations (2005), for example, acknowledged that Indigenous communities are culturally diverse but “bound together by a sacred tie to the land, a value of communal interdependence and a holistic worldview” (p. 1). Thus, a challenge for researchers is to achieve a balance between respecting affirmations of Indigenous worldviews while avoiding essentialist claims about Indigenous people.

In addition to diversity within and across communities, a third challenge in conducting language socialization research relates to pressing needs in Canadian Indigenous communities (see, among others, Kay-Raining Bird 2011). Compared to the entire Canadian population, the Indigenous population is considerably younger, with about half of the people under the age of 23. The majority are living in poor material conditions. Rates of high school graduation, post-secondary education, and employment are below national averages. Housing both on and off reserves is inadequate and often crowded. Infant mortality rates are higher, and life expectancy is lower. Suicide rates are high, particularly among youth, and diseases like diabetes and tuberculosis are more prevalent than in Canada overall (Assembly of First Nations 2011). Given the human energy and material resources required to meet these very serious challenges, it is critical to consider research priorities in light of the larger social context and in conjunction with Indigenous people and representative bodies (e.g., Indigenous-controlled school boards).

Finally, theoretical challenges exist. Language socialization theories need to continue to be integrated with theoretical and empirical work in other areas that are relevant to Indigenous contexts, including research on Indigenous epistemologies, social justice, critical race theory, and decolonizing education (see Pesco 2014, for references).

Future Directions

There are a number of directions future research should take. Generally, we highly recommend that language socialization studies be carried out in a wider range of communities and contexts. As the studies reviewed here illustrate, research has been

conducted in only a small number of communities to date. Given the importance of storytelling in predominantly oral cultures (as Indigenous cultures historically were), we are particularly interested in how stories are used to socialize children and youth both to local norms for telling stories and other forms of cultural knowledge. Directly observing interactions between parents, elders, and teachers and their younger community members over time would also complement self-reports of language socialization practices, discussed in the “[Major Contributions](#)” section above. In addition to studies cited within this chapter, a recent study of Indigenous peoples in New Zealand has examined stories embedded in caregiver-child interactions and their role in socializing moral development (Reese et al. 2014). First Nations and Métis teachers within Canada have also been interviewed regarding their use of stories in the classroom. The researchers concluded that storytelling “indigenized the curriculum” (Maclean and Wason-Ellam 2006, p. 19). Such studies could provide useful starting points for further investigations.

Language socialization research in educational contexts is also critically needed, given the dearth of studies in this area. Such studies would provide insights into the educational experiences of Indigenous children and youth and could have implications for improving education. This is an important issue, given that Indigenous children, on average, are faring less well than non-Indigenous children in academic achievement (see Assembly of First Nations 2011 for data and Canadian Council on Learning 2007, for a discussion of the social, political, and economic factors leading to the disparity).

In addition to investigating language socialization in schools, we encourage research in preschool settings such as Aboriginal Head Start (AHS) and language nests. Described fully in Ball (2009), AHS aims to provide culturally responsive early education and care to Indigenous preschoolers living both on and off reserve. Nationally, about one of every ten Indigenous children between 3 and 5 years of age is now attending AHS. Language nests are emerging Indigenous language immersion programs for infants and toddlers, roughly based on the Maori nests of New Zealand. Programs of both kinds could yield interesting insights into the language socialization of young children by Indigenous caregivers and educators.

Additional areas for future research are language socialization among children or among youth and adults. Peer socialization has been surprisingly absent in much of the literature on Indigenous children in Canada (as well as in many other contexts). Yet, we know that children can act as “experts” as well as novices, in peer and multiage groupings. Furthermore, as children become involved in language revitalization, they may themselves be in an “expert” role at times, sharing their linguistic knowledge with others (such as older siblings and parents) whose Indigenous language skills are less developed (see Luykx 2005, on children as socializing agents in families). Also, it would be interesting to extend language socialization to studies of youth and adults. Except for Patrick (2003) and the auto-ethnographies of adults reviewed in the “[Work in Progress](#)” section of this chapter, such studies are rare in the Canadian context.

While we offer these ideas about future research directions, research priorities should be determined by, or in collaboration with, Indigenous communities. Ball (2009) recommended the creation of a national research and policy center devoted to

Indigenous children's development and learning in the early years, driven by Indigenous people. While such a center has yet to be created, governing bodies within Indigenous communities, research ethics committees, and research funding agencies within Canada increasingly require that Indigenous peoples have some voice in the design, implementation, and reporting of research. Thus, there are some mechanisms for non-Indigenous researchers and Indigenous community members to engage in dialogue about the directions future research might take. Ball and McIvor (2013) also suggest that "language is widely understood by Indigenous Peoples as the vehicle for the intergenerational transmission of knowledge, culture, spirituality and identity" (p. 20). If this is accurate (and we believe it is), language socialization research is likely to be of interest to Indigenous peoples and scholars within Canada. Furthermore, language socialization research, particularly the privileging of "insider" perspectives, befits Indigenous people taking their rightful place at the center of any research about them.

Cross-References

- ▶ [Language Socialization: An Historical Overview](#)
- ▶ [Language Socialization, Language Ideologies, and Language Shift Among School-Aged Children](#)

Related Articles in the Encyclopedia of Language and Education

- Brendan H. O'Connor: [Language Education and Culture](#). In Volume: Language Policy and Political Issues in Education
- Teresa McCarty: [Language Education Planning and Policies by and for Indigenous Peoples](#). In Volume: Language Policy and Political Issues in Education
- Terrence Wiley: [Policy Considerations for Promoting Heritage, Community, and Native American Languages](#). In Volume: Language Policy and Political Issues in Education
- Leanne Hinton: [Language Endangerment and Revitalization](#). In Volume: Language Policy and Political Issues in Education
- Donna Patrick: [Language Policy and Education in Canada](#). In Volume: Language Policy and Political Issues in Education
- Onowa McIvor: [Indigenous Bilingual and Revitalization-Immersion Education in Canada and the United States](#). In Volume: Bilingual and Multilingual Education

References

- Aboriginal Languages Task Force. (2005). *Towards a new beginning: A foundational report for a strategy to revitalize First Nation, Inuit and Métis languages and cultures* (Catalogue No. CH4-96/2005). Ottawa: Aboriginal Affairs Branch, Department of Canadian Heritage.

- Allen, S. E. M. (1996). *Aspects of argument structure acquisition in Inuktitut*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Assembly of First Nations. (2005). *First Nations and aboriginal peoples in Canada* (Information sheet). Ottawa: Assembly of First Nations Communications Unit. Retrieved 5 Sept 2016 from <https://fncaringociety.com/sites/default/files/docs/InfoSheet1.pdf>
- Assembly of First Nations. (2011). *Quality of life of First Nations* (Fact Sheet Series). Ottawa: Assembly of First Nations Communications Unit. Retrieved 5 Sept 2016 from http://www.afn.ca/uploads/files/factsheets/quality_of_life_final_fe.pdf
- Ball, J. (2009). Supporting young Indigenous children's language development in Canada: A review of research on needs and promising practices. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 66, 19–47.
- Ball, J., & Lewis, M. (2014). First Nations elders' and parents' views on supporting their children's language development. *Canadian Journal of Speech-Language Pathology and Audiology*, 38, 224–237.
- Ball, J., & McIvor, O. (2013). Canada's big chill: Indigenous languages in education. In C. Benson & K. Kosonen (Eds.), *Language issues in comparative education: Inclusive teaching and learning in non-dominant languages and cultures* (pp. 19–38). Boston: Sense Publishers.
- Black-Rogers, M. (1988). Ojibwa power interactions: Creating contexts for respectful talk. In R. Darnell & M. Foster (Eds.), *Native North American interaction patterns* (pp. 44–65). Ottawa: Canadian Museum of Civilization.
- Canadian Council on Learning. (2007). *Redefining how success is measured in First Nations, Inuit and Métis learning, Report on learning in Canada*. Ottawa: Canadian Council on Learning. Retrieved 26 Aug 2016 from http://www.afn.ca/uploads/files/education/5._2007_redefining_how_success_is_measured_en.pdf
- Crago, M. B. (1992a). Communicative interaction and second language acquisition: An Inuit example. *TESOL Quarterly*, 26, 487–505.
- Crago, M. B. (1992b). Ethnography and language socialization: A cross-cultural perspective. *Topics in Language Disorders*, 12, 28–39.
- Crago, M. B., Annahatak, B., & Ninguiruvik, L. (1993). Changing patterns of language socialization in Inuit homes. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly*, 24, 205–223.
- Crago, M. B., Chen, C., Genesee, F., & Allen, S. (1998). Power and deference: Bilingual decision making in Inuit homes. *Journal for a Just and Caring Education*, 4, 78–95.
- Cranmer, L. (2015). *Reclaiming Kwak'wala through co-constructing Gwanti'lakw's vision* (Doctoral dissertation). University of British Columbia, Vancouver. Retrieved from <https://open.library.ubc.ca/cIRcle/collections/ubctheses/24/items/1.0220824>
- Daniels-Fiss, B. (2008). Learning to be a “Nehiyaw” (Cree) through language. *Diaspora, Indigenous, and Minority Education*, 2, 233–245.
- Darnell, R. (1988). Introduction. In R. Darnell & M. Foster (Eds.), *Native North American interaction patterns* (pp. vi–viii). Ottawa: Canadian Museum of Civilization.
- Duff, P. (2008). Language socialization, participation and identity: Ethnographic approaches. In M. Martin-Jones, M. de Mejia, & N. Hornberger (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of language and education* (Discourse and education 3rd ed., pp. 107–119). New York: Springer.
- Eriks-Brophy, A., & Crago, M. (1993). Inuit efforts to maintain face: Elements from classroom discourse with Inuit children. *American Speech-Language and Hearing Association Monographs*, 30, 10–16.
- Eriks-Brophy, A., & Crago, M. (2003). Variation in instructional discourse features: Cultural or linguistic? Evidence from Inuit and non-Inuit teachers of Nunavik. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly*, 34, 1–25.
- Heath, S. B. (1983). *Ways with words: Language, life and work in communities and classrooms*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Hough-Eyamie, H. (1999). *The development of intentional communication: A cross-cultural study of the role of input* (Doctoral dissertation). McGill University, Montreal.
- Inuit Tapiriit Kanatami and Research and Analysis Directorate. (2007). *Knowledge and use of Inuktitut among Inuit in Canada, 1981–2001*. Catalogue: R2-468/2007E-PDF. Ottawa:

- Strategic Research and Analysis Directorate: Indian and Northern Affairs Canada. Retrieved from http://publications.gc.ca/collections/collection_2009/ainc-inac/R2-468-2007E.pdf
- Jonk, L. B., & Enns, C. (2009). Using culturally appropriate methodology to explore Dene mothers' views on language facilitation. *Canadian Journal of Speech-Language Pathology and Audiology*, 33, 34–41.
- Kay-Raining Bird, E. (2011). Health, education, language, dialect, and culture in First Nations, Inuit, and Métis communities in Canada: An overview. *Canadian Journal of Speech-Language Pathology and Audiology*, 35, 110–124.
- Luykx, A. (2005). Children as socializing agents: Family language policy in situations of language shift. In J. Cohen, K. T. McAlister, K. Rolstad, & J. MacSwan (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 4th international symposium on bilingualism* (pp. 1407–1414). Somerville: Cascadilla Press.
- Maclean, M., & Wason-Ellam, L. (2006). *When Aboriginal and Métis teachers use storytelling as an instructional practice*. A grant report to the Aboriginal Education Research Network, Saskatchewan Learning, Saskatoon: University of Saskatchewan.
- McIvor, O. (2012). *ikakwiw nihiyawiyân: I am learning [to be] Cree* (Doctoral dissertation). University of British Columbia, Vancouver. Retrieved from <https://open.library.ubc.ca/cIRcle/collections/ubctheses/24/items/1.0078368>
- Norris, M., & Jantzen, L. (2004). *From generation to generation: Survival and maintenance of Canada's Aboriginal languages within families, communities, and cities*. Ottawa: Indian and Northern Affairs Canada.
- Ochs, E. (1988). *Culture and language development: Language acquisition and language socialization in a Samoan village*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Ochs, E., & Schieffelin, B. (2008). Language socialization: An historical overview. In P. A. Duff & N. H. Hornberger (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of language and education* (Language socialization, Vol. 8, pp. 3–15). NY: Springer.
- Ochs, E., & Schieffelin, B. (2011). The theory of language socialization. In A. Duranti, E. Ochs, & B. Schieffelin (Eds.), *The handbook of language socialization* (pp. 1–21). Malden: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Patrick, D. (2003). Language socialization and second language acquisition in a multilingual Arctic Quebec community. In R. Bayley & S. Schecter (Eds.), *Language socialization in bilingual and multilingual societies* (pp. 165–181). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Patrick, D., Budach, G., & Muckpaloo, I. (2013). Multiliteracies and family language policy in an urban Inuit community. *Language Policy*, 12, 47–62.
- Peltier, S. (2014). Assessing Anishinaabe children's narratives: An ethnographic exploration of elders' perspectives. *Canadian Journal of Speech-Language Pathology and Audiology*, 38, 174–193.
- Pesco, D. (2014). Working with Aboriginal children and families: Cultural responsiveness and beyond. *Canadian Journal of Speech-Language Pathology and Audiology*, 38, 144–151.
- Pesco, D., & Crago, M. (1996). "We went home, told the whole story to our friends": Narratives by children in an Algonquin community. *Journal of Narrative & Life History*, 6, 293–321.
- Philips, S. (1983). *The invisible culture: Communication in classroom and community on the Warm Springs Indian reservation*. New York: Longman.
- Reese, E., Mele, T., & Tia, N. (2014). "Remember drawing on the cupboard?" New Zealand Māori, European, and Pasifika parents' conversations about children's transgressions. In C. Wainryb & H. E. Recchia (Eds.), *Talking about right and wrong* (pp. 44–70). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Rosborough, P. C. (2012). *Kangextola sewn-on-top: Kwak'wala revitalization and being Indigenous* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from https://circle.ubc.ca/bitstream/handle/2429/42965/ubc_2012_fall_rosborough_patricia.pdf?sequence=1
- Rushforth, R. (1988). Autonomy and community among the Bear Lake Athapaskans. In R. Darnell & M. Foster (Eds.), *Native North American interaction patterns* (pp. 112–142). Ottawa: Canadian Museum of Civilization.

- Schieffelin, B. B. (1990). *The give and take of everyday life*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Stairs, A. (1985). The developmental context of native language literacy: Inuit children and Inuktitut education. In B. Burnaby (Ed.), *Promoting native writing systems in Canada* (pp. 33–48). Toronto: OISE Press.
- Statistics Canada. (2013a). *National Household Survey (NHS) 2011. Aboriginal Peoples in Canada: First Nations People, Métis and Inuit*. Retrieved 26 Aug 2016 from <http://www12.statcan.gc.ca/nhs-enm/2011/as-sa/99-011-x/99-011-x2011001-eng.pdf>
- Statistics Canada. (2013b). National Household Survey (NHS) 2011. Aboriginal peoples and language. Retrieved 26 Aug 2016 from http://www12.statcan.gc.ca/nhs-enm/2011/as-sa/99-011-x/99-011-x2011003_1-eng.pdf
- Taylor, D. M., Osborne, E., & de la Sablonnière, R. (2012). Bilingual education in Aboriginal communities: Towards a vibrant Aboriginal identity (rev. ed.). *Encyclopedia of language and literacy development* (pp. 1–8). London: Canadian Language and Literacy Research Network. Retrieved 26 Aug 2016 from <http://www.literacyencyclopedia.ca/pdfs/topic.php?topId=260>
- Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada. (2015). *Honouring the truth, reconciling for the future: Summary of the final report of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada*. Winnipeg: National Centre for Truth and Reconciliation. Retrieved 26 Aug 2016 from http://nctr.ca/assets/reports/Final%20Reports/Executive_Summary_English_Web.pdf
- Visser, J., & Fovet, F. (2014). Reflections on school engagement: An eco-systemic review of the Cree School Board's experience. *In Education, 19*, 17–46.

Language Socialization in Japanese Communities

Haruko Minegishi Cook and Matthew Burdelski

Abstract

This chapter reviews the major research on Japanese language socialization across the lifespan, involving child first-language (L1) speakers and adult second-language (L2) learners. It begins by discussing research in Japanese language socialization starting in the mid-1980s and the early influences on this research from psychology and anthropology, and then discusses major contributions from the 1990s to the present. In relation to L1 socialization, the discussion deals with affect, honorifics and politeness, gender, narrative and literacy, and participation in classroom interaction; in relation to L2 socialization it primarily deals with pragmatic particles, speech styles (honorifics), and identity. The chapter also points out problems and difficulties in conducting Japanese language socialization and offers some solutions. The final section discusses potential directions for future research in this area.

Keywords

Empathy • Affect • Honorifics • Politeness • Gender role • Participation structure • Pragmatic particle • Interactional routine

Contents

Introduction	310
Early Developments	310
Major Contributions	311
Japanese L1 Language Socialization Research	311

H.M. Cook (✉)
University of Hawai'i, Honolulu, HI, USA
e-mail: hkcook@hawaii.edu

M. Burdelski
Osaka University, Osaka, Japan
e-mail: mburdel@let.osaka-u.ac.jp

Japanese L2 Language Socialization Research	315
Problems and Difficulties	317
Future Directions	318
Cross-References	319
References	319

Introduction

This chapter reviews the major research on Japanese language socialization across the lifespan, involving child first-language (L1) speakers and adult second-language (L2) learners. It begins by discussing research in Japanese language socialization starting in the mid-1980s and the early influences on this research from psychology and anthropology, and then discusses major contributions from the 1990s to the present. In relation to L1 socialization, the discussion deals with affect, honorifics and politeness, gender, narrative and literacy, and participation in classroom interaction; in relation to L2 socialization it primarily deals with pragmatic particles, speech styles (honorifics), and identity. The chapter also points out problems and difficulties in conducting Japanese language socialization research and offers some solutions. The final section discusses potential directions for future research in this area.

Early Developments

The theoretical perspective of language socialization grew out of linguistic anthropology and was developed by Ochs and Schieffelin and their colleagues in the mid-1980s. In Japan, however, due to the fact that there has been no tradition of ethnography (cf. Shibamoto 1987), language socialization research has not been promoted there. To date, most studies on language socialization in Japanese have been conducted by scholars who were trained in the United States, yet Japanese is perhaps an ideal language in which to investigate how novices are socialized into society through the use of language, for it has a rich morphology that encodes a great deal of social information (e.g., honorifics, pronouns, and sentence-final particles). For example, even a simple utterance such as “today is Saturday” has several variants with different degrees of politeness, formality, and other aspects of social information (cf. Matsumoto 1988). In this sense, the acquisition of Japanese “goes hand-in-hand with acquiring sociocultural knowledge” (Ochs and Schieffelin 1995, p. 74).

The 1970s saw several influential publications on Japanese culture and psychology that discussed Japanese communication patterns in contrast with those of the West (e.g., Doi 1973; Lebra 1976). For example, *omoiyari* “empathy” (Lebra 1976) and *amae* “dependence on others” (Doi 1973) were claimed to be Japanese ways of communication. These publications had a great impact on the formulation of theories of Japanese behavior and communication in the fields of anthropology, psychology, sociology, and linguistics in Western society.

The goal of the early studies was to investigate how caregivers' discursive practices socialize children into Japanese cultural patterns of behavior. Clancy's (1986) study was the first major contribution to Japanese language socialization research. It pursued the question of how young Japanese children learn to be indirect and empathize with others. Based on naturally occurring conversations between Japanese mothers and two-year-old children in Japan, she found that the mothers' discursive practices were characterized by a mixture of indirect and direct commands and were aimed at training children in empathy and conformity. In particular, the mothers' juxtaposition of indirect and direct commands conveyed to children how direct commands could be paraphrased in an indirect manner. One of the significant contributions of Clancy's study is that it demonstrates that Japanese mothers deemphasize their role as authority figure and that empathy training is part of making children behave well without foregrounding the mother's authority. Mothers' control of the child's behavior by pointing out a third party's feelings accomplishes at least two things¹: One is to make the child behave without the mother evoking cold or negative affect and the other is to make the child empathize with others (i.e., *omoiyari* training). Cook (1990) also found that mothers' use of the sentence-final particle *no* helped to deemphasize their personal will and appealed to social norms in order to control the child's behavior. For example, the sentence final *no* in a caregiver's utterance such as *teeburu o tatakanai no* evokes the social norm that people do not hit the table when having a meal rather than asserting the caregiver's personal authority (i.e., *I tell you not to hit the table.*)

In sum, early studies pointed out that the Japanese cultural values of *omoiyari* and *amae* are socialized as a result of Japanese mothers' deemphasis of their authority. Japanese mothers' particular discursive style simultaneously makes the child more sensitive to others and more dependent on the mother.

Major Contributions

Japanese L1 Language Socialization Research

Since the 1990s, L1 socialization research in Japanese has expanded its scope to include both home and school settings in order to examine the following issues: (i) affect; (ii) honorifics and politeness; (iii) gender; (iv) narrative and literacy; and (v) participation in classroom interaction.

First, as language encodes affect through lexicon, phonology, and grammatical structure among other linguistic devices, learning to express affect in culturally appropriate ways is an important part of language socialization (Ochs and Schieffelin 1989), because affect is a building block of a range of social dimensions including identity and politeness routines. As noted in the previous section, research provides

¹The third party can be co-present participants, those who are not present in the speech context, and/or even society in general (*seken*).

evidence that Japanese caregivers use a number of affective expressions to control children's behavior and that children are socialized into appropriate affective expressions quite early in life. Clancy (1999) found that by 2 years of age, Japanese children were exposed to an extensive affect lexicon. In particular, the mothers' use of *kowai* "be scary/be afraid (of)" in relation to children's actions helps children see themselves as the objects of others' evaluative affect. Suzuki (1999) also found that Japanese mothers taught children appropriate behavior through the use of the aspectual suffix *-chau*, which indexes the speaker's negative affect concerning the event or action soon to be completed (or just completed). Burdelski and Mitsuhashi (2010), who studied the use of *kawaii* "cute/adorable/lovable" in interactions at a Japanese preschool, discuss how children come to understand things in the social world as *kawaii*. They found that teachers use *kawaii* with verbal and nonverbal resources to make assessments of children's things and behaviors and to gloss children's actions towards peers. They showed that by the age of three, children were using *kawaii* to make assessments of toys and animals. Thus, through teachers' assessments, children seemed to acquire understanding of the cultural value of *omoiyari* "empathy" (discussed earlier) towards things assessed as *kawaii*.

Second, since the Japanese language has extensive honorific forms, scholars have investigated how Japanese children learn to use honorifics. Japanese honorifics are divided into two main categories: referent and addressee. While referent honorifics raise the status of referents and/or their group and lower that of speakers and/or their group, addressee honorifics (*masu* form) index the affective stance of self-presentation (Cook 2008). This is a stance that presents an on-stage display of a positive social role to the addressee. It is a particular affective stance of presenting oneself to others when one is literally or figuratively "on-stage" and aware of being watched by others. Referent honorifics are morphologically complex and rarely occur in family conversation except for some formulaic phrases, such as *itadakimasu* "I humbly accept this food/drink" and *itte mairimasu* "I will go and come back" (Burdelski 2013a; Nakamura 1996). For these reasons, except for formulaic expressions, children do not develop competence in using referent honorifics until much later in life. In contrast, caregivers at times use the *masu* form when talking to children. Researchers investigated when caregivers and children shift to the *masu* form (Burdelski 2013a; Clancy 1985; Cook 1997; Nakamura 1996). These studies found that Japanese caregivers tend to shift to the *masu* form in several well-defined contexts: when reading a story book, quoting people outside the home, engaging in a role play, issuing directives, and carrying out parental responsibilities such as correcting children's behavior and serving food. By the age of three, Japanese children learn to use the *masu* form appropriately both in real life situations as well as in imaginary play (Burdelski 2013a; Cook 1997; Fukuda 2005). For example, in interaction with caregivers at home, young children shift to the *masu* form in role play (Burdelski 2013a; Fukuda 2005) as well as when they indicate that they are a responsible, good child (Cook 1997). Preschool children shift to the *masu* form to index a heightened (negative) affective stance, such as when making objections and providing a reason for refusing a request in interaction with peers (Burdelski 2013a).

Japanese children are socialized into politeness routines from a young age. While politeness routines are important in communities around the world, “they are highly amplified” (Burdelski 2012, p. 290) in Japanese society. Caregivers and older siblings teach young children what to say and how to say it to a third party through prompting, directives, and speaking for the child (Burdelski 2012). According to Burdelski (2012), more than half of caregivers’ prompts are formulaic expressions, and before the age of three, children are able to say these expressions in performing social actions such as greeting, offering, thanking, and apologizing. This ability reflects the Japanese cultural practice that highly values using formulaic expressions in the appropriate context. Burdelski (2012) also notes that most prompting was done by elicited imitation (“say X”), which provides a model utterance to children. This practice is in line with the cultural theory of learning and socialization in Japan, which places an emphasis on mastery of *kata* “prescribed forms.” Burdelski (2013b) closely examined how children are socialized into expressions of apology (*gomen ne/gomen-nasai* “I’m sorry”/“I’m sorry-polite”) in and around households and a preschool. He found that caregivers and teachers use these expressions and prompt children to do so not only to other people but also to animals and objects in the environment, such as a stone and flower, and concluded that through the act of apology, children learn *omoiyari* “empathy” towards others, including animals and inanimate objects. Politeness is expressed not only verbally but also nonverbally. Burdelski’s (2010, 2012) studies shed light on how Japanese caregivers encourage children’s embodied performance. Modeling, verbal instruction, and tactile guidance are commonly used to teach children what to do. For example, Burdelski (2012) reported that when a child received a toy from a peer, his father instructed him to say “thank you” while pressing on his back to encourage him to bow. Morita (2003) also observed direct teaching in her study of bilingual Japanese-English speaking children in the United States. In particular, she discussed how a mother prompted her child to greet and use appropriate terms of address (e.g., *oneesan* “older sister”) to a third party adult (cf. Clancy 1986). These studies and others suggest that children’s socialization into politeness, empathy, and other culturally meaningful dispositions occurs through engagement in courses of social action with others (Burdelski 2015; Takada 2013; Takada and Endo 2015). For instance, Takada and Endo (2015) show how caregivers encourage sibling relationships by directing an older sibling to give an object (e.g., toy) to a younger sibling, by using the construction *V-te ageru* “give (something to another),” which implicitly conveys that the recipient (younger sibling) is a beneficiary and the giver (older sibling) is a benefactor who should be kind to the younger sibling.

Third, while gender roles are in general more distinct in Japanese society than in Western societies, one of the myths about the Japanese language is that there are many linguistic forms that are exclusively used by one gender. In reality, however, both men and women share a wide range of speech styles in many social contexts. Differences in speech between genders largely depend on social context. Studies have found that gender differences are socialized in interaction between preschool teachers and children as well as in peer interaction, and children as young as 3 years old have knowledge of how gender differences are indexed by linguistic forms.

Burdelski and Mitsuhashi (2010) observed that teachers made gender-specific assessments of children, their personal items and toys, mainly using *kawaii* “cute/adorable/lovable” for girls and *kakkoi* “cool” for boys. These assessments teach children different ways of constructing feminine and masculine selves. One of the questions is how boys are socialized into rough speech when the mother normally does not speak to the child in a rough manner. Nakamura (2001) contends that peers are the main source of socialization of so-called “gendered speech.” In her study, boys used a wider range of rough-sounding linguistic forms during same-sex peer play than when they spoke with their mothers. She also found that compared with other gentler play, when engaging in rough-and-tumble play with the same-sex playmate, girls increased their use of rough-sounding linguistic forms as well. From these observations, Nakamura concluded that “gendered speech” is not used exclusively by one gender and that young children are socialized by peers into the use of gendered speech in appropriate contexts.

Fourth, a question explored is how children make the transition from home to school. In Western societies, researchers consider that middle-class interactional style at home is a precursor to decontextualized language use (i.e., literacy) at school (e.g., Bernstein 1971). In Japan, there is relative continuity between language use at home and at school, but the kind of continuity differs from that found in Western societies. Minami (2002), who examined the narrative structures of Japanese children (ages 4 and 5) and their mothers, illustrates that Japanese narratives that children participate in involve short turns with incomplete sentences and frequent turn changes. This characteristic of oral narratives is carried over to the literacy activity of storybook reading in the sense that the mother’s questions and child’s answers in book-reading activities are short and often use incomplete sentences. Minami also argues that this book-reading activity at home is a precursor to school literacy in Japanese society in that a typical sequence in book-reading activities is a three-part sequence that resembles the I(nitiation)-R(esponse)-E(valuation) sequence typically found in classroom interaction in other educational cultures (cf. Mehan 1979).

Fifth, while Minami’s (2002) claim of a similarity between the three-part sequence of book-reading activities at home and the I-R-E sequence assumes that the I-R-E sequence is a normative practice in classrooms in Japan, Anderson (1995) observed differences between Japan and North America in the participation structure in elementary school classrooms. Anderson’s ethnographic study of first- and second-grade classrooms showed that in the Japanese classrooms he examined the preferred participation structure was a multiparty interactional pattern (the I[initiation]-P[resentation]-R[eaction]-E[valuation] sequence) instead of the I-R-E sequence. In the I-P-Rx-E sequence, the P and R turns were distributed to students. In P, a student gave a presentation, and in R, other students reacted to the student’s presentation. Anderson (1995) pointed out that whereas the I-R-E sequence promoted dyadic interaction between the teacher and student, the I-P-Rx-E sequence increased peer interactions in the classroom and left the teacher’s role to be that of supporter of the peer interaction among students. The encouragement of peer interactions and the supporting role of the teacher in a Japanese nursery school

were also documented by Tobin et al.'s (2009) ethnographic study. Peer cooperation in elementary school classrooms was also noted in other studies (Cook 1999). Students were reported to listen to their peer's presentations carefully so that they could give reactions. The I-P-Rx-E sequence that Anderson found is part of training for peer cooperation and peer classroom management, an important Japanese cultural value.

Studies on Japanese language socialization at home suggest that there is a continuity of multiparty participation structures between home and school. Multiparty participation structures are widely observed in and around the home in Japanese society. Through prompting, for instance, young children are encouraged to interact with co-present third parties such as siblings, peers, and visitors (Burdelski 2012, 2013a, b; Clancy 1986). Multiparty participation structures used in and around the home are perhaps an important precursor to the I-P-Rx-E sequence observed in Japanese elementary schools.

Japanese L2 Language Socialization Research

Since the mid-1990s, there has been an increase in the number of publications on Japanese L2 language socialization research. The central question asked in these studies is how learners of Japanese as a foreign language (henceforth JFL learners) are socialized into the appropriate use of Japanese and cultural expectations in Japanese society. L2 socialization studies have been conducted both in classrooms in North America and the study-in-Japan context.

Classroom research in JFL socialization deals mostly with issues of pragmatic particles and speech styles, interactional routines, and the teacher's status. Pragmatic particles and honorifics are difficult to learn solely through classroom instruction (cf. Gumperz 1996). In contrast to Japanese children, JFL learners have difficulty in learning to use pragmatic particles and speech styles appropriately (e.g., Sawyer 1992). Studies by Ohta (1994) and Yoshimi (1999) suggested that difficulties may stem from the paucity of pragmatic particles in the teacher's talk as well as differences in grammar and morphology between Japanese and English. Ohta's study (1994), which investigated pragmatic particles in first-year Japanese language classrooms in the United States, revealed fewer types and lower frequencies of the particles used in the classroom than in ordinary conversations and the impact of the teacher's teaching philosophy on their use. Drawing on Kamio's (1994) theory of territory of information, Yoshimi (1999), who analyzed JFL learners' incorrect uses of the pragmatic particle *ne*, argued that a difference in Japanese and English epistemic constraints led to the learners' improper uses. According to Kamio, in English newly received information is immediately considered shared information between the interlocutors, but in Japanese such information takes time to become the hearer's information, and, furthermore, information on others' internal states is not accessible to the hearer. American JFL learners tended to incorrectly assume that newly received information was shared information and used the particle *ne*, which is usually taught as a shared information marker, but such information is not considered as shared in Japanese.

Another important pragmatic feature in Japanese is speech style shift. Some studies examined how JFL learners are socialized into speech style shifts between the *masu* and plain forms in classrooms. Rounds et al. (1997), for example, studied teachers' style shifts in a Japanese language immersion school in the United States. Their study noted that while the teachers mostly used the *masu* form in teacher-fronted instruction, they occasionally shifted to the plain form when they spoke to students in a more intimate manner, paraphrased complex sentences, scaffolded the content matter, and gave feedback on the students' answers. This study suggests that these learners were exposed to style shifts similar to those that occur in Japanese elementary school classrooms (Cook 1996).

The language socialization model contends that novices acquire sociocultural knowledge through participation in routine language-mediated activities. From this perspective, classroom activities involve important routines for many foreign language learners. Japanese L2 socialization research has explored how interactional routines in the classroom help socialize learners into Japanese sociocultural norms (e.g., Kanagy 1999; Ohta 2001). Kanagy (1999) observed that young children in a Japanese immersion kindergarten were gradually socialized by means of the teacher's scaffolding into three culture-specific interactional routines, namely *aisatsu* "greeting," *shusseki* "attendance," and *jiko-shookai* "personal introduction." Her study contributes to our knowledge of the importance of the predictability of routine activities for language socialization.

Routine activities are also socialization tools in college-level JFL classes. Ohta's (2001) longitudinal study of a first-year Japanese language class in an American university showed how one classroom routine – an extended assessment activity – was a powerful tool for socializing learners into the Japanese cultural norm of the active listener role described above. Her study, which was framed in terms of Vygotskian socio-historical theory, analyzed how peer interactions and private speech helped learners acquire Japanese. For example, Ohta showed that peers with different language proficiencies helped each other through collaborative talk. In sum, Ohta's study is a major contribution to L2 classroom research in that it points out that a foreign language classroom is a much richer environment for language acquisition and socialization than was previously thought.

Language socialization research in Japanese study-abroad contexts explores issues of learners' social identity in Japanese society, speech styles, and bi-directional socialization processes. These studies mostly deal with Caucasian American students' linguistic behavior in interaction with Japanese people. Ethnographic studies by Siegal (1996) and Iino (2006) documented Japanese social expectations of different standards of behavior for Japanese and foreigners. For example, Siegal (1996) reported that a professor of Japanese commented that he would not correct learners' inappropriate use of Japanese because foreigners do not understand Japanese customs. In contrast, another study found that JFL learners staying with a Japanese host family learned to participate in the telling of a folk belief in Japanese society and jointly constructed a shared perspective and emotion with the host family (Cook 2006).

Study-abroad contexts provide learners with opportunities to interact with L1 speakers outside of the classroom. Researchers have found that JFL learners on a

study-in-Japan program were socialized into appropriate uses of the *masu* and plain forms in interactions with their homestay hosts (Cook 2008; McMeekin 2006). McMeekin's study, which examined the speech styles of five pairs of learners and their host families, demonstrated that learners were socialized to gradually increase their use of plain forms by participating in daily interactions with host family members who mostly spoke to them in the plain form. Cook (2008), who analyzed speech style shifts in dinnertime conversations between eight JFL learners and their host families, found that learners were implicitly and explicitly socialized into the norms of style shifts in family conversation. However, Iwasaki's (2011) study of four male learners' retrospective evaluations of their study-in-Japan experiences suggests that there are individual variations and that learners are active agents who choose a particular speech style by assessing a social identity they might want to project based on their own sociolinguistic knowledge and their individual personalities, ideologies, and identities.

Language socialization is a life-long process, and the novice is not the only party who is socialized. In this sense, socialization is a two-way process. Cook (2006) analyzed how learners' challenges encouraged Japanese host families to shift an existing folk belief that drinking *sake* goes with cherry blossom viewing to a new version, which replaces drinking *sake* with reading a book. Thus, due to interactions with the JFL learner, the Japanese host family members had opportunities to reflect on and modify their own belief systems.

The contribution of L2 socialization studies in the study-in-Japan context is that they point out that one of the problems that learners encounter in Japan is the difficulty of establishing and expressing their social identities (other than that of "foreigner"). In contrast to L1 socialization in which the end point of socialization is normally the novice's attainment of the linguistic and cultural competence of established members of the community, the end point of L2 socialization varies according to learners' goals and opportunities as well as the target community's expectations about foreigners and their language use. These studies remind us that JFL learners are not robots who simply emulate the L2 norms of speaking but are active agents who choose to display who they are in Japan utilizing the Japanese language as a resource but who may also be constrained by their social contexts.

Problems and Difficulties

As with any fieldwork-based research, problems and difficulties are invariably encountered when conducting research on Japanese language socialization. Although much of the research was conducted in the 1980s and 1990s, there have only been a few large-scale projects in the twenty-first century, including studies of L1 children's socialization (e.g., Burdelski 2010; Takada 2013) and L2 adults (Cook 2008) in Japan. One reason for this may be the difficulty in gaining access to settings in which participants will consent to having their interactions audio-visually recorded over an extended period of time. In addition, children are especially sensitive subjects whose participation in research, particularly outside the home,

such as at (pre)school, has to be approved by parents, which can sometimes be a daunting task for researchers. Another reason may be the great amount of time and effort required to conduct a language socialization study. And, as was alluded to earlier, language socialization theory is not well known in Japan, and thus scholars there do not often conduct research on language socialization (an exception being Takada 2013). Researchers outside of Japan working on Japanese language socialization, on the other hand, may not have the time or resources to conduct linguistic and ethnographic fieldwork in Japan. One solution to this problem may entail working collaboratively with colleagues residing in Japan (as in Burdelski's case) or having the participants themselves set up the recording equipment at regular intervals, such as at dinnertime (as in Cook 2008), in order to mitigate the observer's paradox (i.e., whereby the observed interactions become unduly shaped and influenced by the researcher's presence).

Despite an increase in research on Japanese language socialization over the past 15 years, there remain two main issues. One is that the aforementioned projects mainly focus on Japanese language socialization in Japan. Although in the 1990s, several studies examined children learning Japanese in an immersion school in the United States (e.g., Kanagy 1999) and adult students learning Japanese in university classrooms (e.g., Ohta 1994, 2001), since that time there has been little advancement in Japanese language socialization research in communities outside of Japan. This is the case even though there has been much educational and linguistic research conducted on children and adolescents learning Japanese as a heritage language abroad (e.g., Chinen and Tucker 2005). However, these studies tend to look at language acquisition outcomes and issues of identity using sociolinguistic interviews, rather than naturally occurring interactions using audio-visual recordings of activities in homes and classrooms that could help shed light on the dynamics of language socialization, including learner agency.

A second issue regarding the major recent projects in Japan is that they mainly focus on L1 preschool children and L2 college-aged adults from the United States. Thus, we still know very little about Japanese language socialization in relation to L1 and L2 among older children and adolescents or about adult L1-Japanese speakers' socialization in the business world and other contexts (an exception is Dunn 2011). Moreover, as studies of Japanese children have mainly focused on monolinguals, we do not yet know much about bilingual or multilingual children, adolescents, and young adults, especially their code-switching and code-mixing practices that reflect their participation in multilingual social groups and constitute their multilingual identities (an exception is Morita 2003).

Future Directions

To date, studies on language socialization in Japanese, including those reviewed above, have primarily focused on child L1 speakers in the home, preschool, and elementary school and on adult L2 speakers (university students) in classrooms and family homestays. Since language socialization is a life-long process that involves

multiple parties and modalities, a wider range of social contexts and activities needs to be investigated. Future research could examine, for instance: (i) how junior and high school students are socialized through classroom routines; (ii) how club activities in high schools and universities socialize students into becoming, for example, a *shakaijin* “competent member of society”; (iii) how training programs for new employees in companies socialize young adults into using appropriate language (e.g., honorifics) and embodied behavior with customers; (iv) how the growing number of immigrants (children and adults) in Japan are socialized in classrooms, workplaces, and other settings; and (v) how children and adolescents in Japanese heritage language classrooms outside of Japan are socialized in ways that prepare them for returning to Japan with their families. Also, more work is needed in a range of settings on socialization into reading and writing Japanese and on the role of technology in language socialization. In terms of writing, for example, it would be useful to know how classroom teachers instruct students on how to write the two phonetic syllabaries, *hiragana* and *katakana*, and “Chinese characters” or *kanji*. In terms of technology, it would be helpful, for example, to know how families residing outside of Japan use computer-mediated technology (e.g., Skype) to socialize children in interactions with family members (such as grandparents) who are residing in Japan. Finally, more work is needed on multilingual Japanese language socialization. For example, it would be beneficial to examine how families in Japan and abroad manage two or more languages in socializing children. Such studies will not only shed insight on dynamic processes of language socialization in different social contexts in which Japanese and possibly other languages are used simultaneously but also contribute to the growing domain of research on learning Japanese as an L1, L2, and heritage language.

Cross-References

- ▶ [Bi- and Multilingual Family Language Socialization](#)
- ▶ [Heritage Language Learning and Socialization](#)
- ▶ [Language Socialization and Schooling](#)
- ▶ [Language Socialization: An Historical Overview](#)
- ▶ [Pragmatic Socialization](#)

References

- Anderson, F. E. (1995). *Classroom discourse and language socialization in a Japanese elementary-school setting: An ethnographic-linguistic study*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Honolulu: University of Hawaii.
- Bernstein, B. B. (1971). *Class, codes and control: Vol. 1 Theoretical studies towards a sociology of language*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Burdelski, M. (2010). Socializing politeness routines: Action, other-orientation, and embodiment in a Japanese preschool. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 42(6), 1606–1621.

- Burdelski, M. (2012). Language socialization and politeness routines. In A. Duranti, E. Ochs, & B. B. Schieffelin (Eds.), *The handbook of language socialization* (pp. 275–295). Malden: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Burdelski, M. (2013a). Socializing children to honorifics in Japanese: Identity and stance in interaction. *Multilingua*, 32(2), 247–273.
- Burdelski, M. (2013b). “I’m sorry, flower”: Socializing apology, empathy, and relationships in Japan. *Pragmatics and Society*, 4(1), 54–81.
- Burdelski, M. (2015). Reported speech as cultural gloss and directive: Socializing norms of speaking and acting in Japanese caregiver-child triadic interaction. *Text & Talk*, 35(5), 575–595.
- Burdelski, M., & Mitsuhashi, K. (2010). “She thinks you’re *kawaii*”: Socializing affect, gender, and relationships in a Japanese preschool. *Language in Society*, 39(10), 65–93.
- Chinen, K., & Tucker, G. R. (2005). Heritage language development: Understanding the role of ethnic identity and Saturday school participation. *Heritage Language Journal*, 3(1), 27–59.
- Clancy, P. M. (1985). The acquisition of Japanese. In D. Slobin (Ed.), *The crosslinguistic study of language acquisition, volume 1, the data* (pp. 373–524). Hillsdale: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Clancy, P. M. (1986). The acquisition of communicative style in Japanese. In B. Schieffelin & E. Ochs (Eds.), *Language socialization across cultures* (pp. 213–250). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Clancy, P. (1999). The socialization of affect in Japanese mother-child conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 31, 1397–1421.
- Cook, H. M. (1990). The role of the Japanese sentence-final particle *no* in the socialization of children. *Multilingua*, 9, 377–395.
- Cook, H. M. (1996). The use of addressee honorifics in Japanese elementary school classroom. In N. Akatsuka, S. Iwasaki, & S. Strauss (Eds.), *Japanese/Korean linguistics 5* (pp. 67–81). Stanford: Center for the Study of Language and Information.
- Cook, H. M. (1997). The role of the Japanese *masu* form in caregiver-child conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 28, 695–718.
- Cook, H. M. (1999). Language socialization in Japanese elementary schools: Attentive listening and reaction turns. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 31, 1443–1465.
- Cook, H. M. (2006). Joint construction of folk belief by JFL learners and Japanese host families. In M. Dufon & E. Churchill (Eds.), *Language learners in study abroad contexts* (pp. 120–150). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Cook, H. M. (2008). *Socializing identities through speech style: Learners of Japanese as a foreign language*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Doi, T. (1973). *The anatomy of dependence*. Tokyo: Kodansha International.
- Dunn, C. D. (2011). Formal forms of verbal strategies? Politeness theory and Japanese business etiquette training. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 43, 3643–3654.
- Fukuda, C. (2005). Children’s use of the *masu* form in play scenes. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 37, 1037–1058.
- Gumperz, J. J. (1996). The linguistic and cultural relativity of inference. In J. Gumperz & S. Levinson (Eds.), *Rethinking linguistic relativity* (pp. 374–406). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Iino, M. (2006). Norms of interaction in a Japanese homestay setting: Toward a two-way flow of linguistic and cultural resources. In M. DuFon & E. Churchill (Eds.), *Language learners in study abroad contexts* (pp. 121–151). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Iwasaki, N. (2011). Learning L2 Japanese “politeness” and “impoliteness”: Young American men’s dilemmas during study abroad. *Japanese Language and Literature*, 45, 67–106.
- Kamio, A. (1994). The theory of territory of information: The case of Japanese. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 21, 67–100.
- Kanagy, R. (1999). The socialization of Japanese immersion kindergartners through interactional routines. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 31, 1467–1492.
- Lebra, T. S. (1976). *Japanese patterns of behavior*. Honolulu: University of Hawai’i Press.

- Matsumoto, Y. (1988). Reexamination of the universality of face: Politeness phenomena in Japanese. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 12, 403–426.
- McMeekin, A. L. (2006). Negotiation in a Japanese study abroad setting. In M. A. Dufon & E. Churchill (Eds.), *Language learners in study abroad contexts* (pp. 225–255). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Mehan, H. (1979). *Learning lessons: Social organization in the classroom*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Minami, M. (2002). *Culture-specific language styles: The development of oral narrative and literacy*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Morita, E. (2003). Children's use of address and reference terms: Language socialization in a Japanese-English bilingual environment. *Multilingua*, 22, 367–395.
- Nakamura, K. (1996). The use of polite language by Japanese pre-school children. In D. Slobin, J. Gerhardt, A. Kyratzis, & J. Guo (Eds.), *Social context and language: Essays in honor of Susan Ervin-Tripp* (pp. 235–250). Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Nakamura, K. (2001). Gender and language in Japanese preschool children. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 34, 15–44.
- Ochs, E., & Schieffelin, B. (1989). Language has a heart. *Text*, 9, 7–25.
- Ochs, E., & Schieffelin, B. (1995). The impact of language socialization on grammatical development. In P. Fletcher & B. MacWhinney (Eds.), *Handbook of child language* (pp. 73–94). Malden: Blackwell.
- Ohta, A. S. (1994). Socializing the expression of affect: An overview of affective particle use in the Japanese as a foreign language classroom. *Issues in Applied Linguistics*, 5, 303–325.
- Ohta, A. S. (2001). *Second language acquisition processes in the classroom: Learning Japanese*. Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Rounds, P., Falsgraf, C., & Seya, R. (1997). Acquisition of sociolinguistic competence in a Japanese immersion school. *Journal of the Association of Teachers of Japanese*, 31(2), 25–51.
- Sawyer, M. (1992). The development of pragmatics in Japanese as a second language: The sentence-final particle *ne*. In G. Kasper (Ed.), *Pragmatics of Japanese as a native and foreign language* (Technical report no. 3, pp. 83–125). Honolulu: University of Hawaii at Manoa, Second Language Teaching & Curriculum Center.
- Shibamoto, J. S. (1987). Japanese sociolinguistics. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 16, 261–278.
- Siegal, M. (1996). The role of learner subjectivity in second language sociolinguistic competency: Western women learning Japanese. *Applied Linguistics*, 17, 356–382.
- Suzuki, R. (1999). Language socialization through morphology: The affective suffix *-CHAU* in Japanese. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 31, 1423–1441.
- Takada, A. (2013). Generating morality in directive sequences: Distinctive strategies for developing communicative competence in Japanese caregiver-child interactions. *Language & Communication*, 33, 420–438.
- Takada, A., & Endo, T. (2015). Object transfer in request-accept sequence in Japanese caregiver-child interaction. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 82, 52–66.
- Tobin, J., Hsueh, Y., & Karasawa, M. (2009). *Preschool in three cultures revisited: China, Japan, and the United States*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Yoshimi, D. (1999). L1 language socialization as a variable in the use of *ne* by L2 learners of Japanese. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 31, 1513–1525.

Language Socialization in Jewish Communities

Sites of Religious, Cultural, and National Identities

Netta Avineri and Sharon Avni

Abstract

This chapter focuses on language socialization (Ochs and Schieffelin 1984) in American Jewish communities, as an example of a minority community that has historically experienced migration and displacement. It opens with a bird's-eye view of the broader field of Jewish languages, exploring how varying Jewish languages have defined and maintained Jewish practices in diasporic conditions. It then turns to research on language socialization in American Jewish communities, highlighting recent studies that reflect the differing ways in which membership in Jewish communities is negotiated through languages and linguistic practices for individuals. This synthesis of scholarship reflects the diversity of types of Jewish communities, and how first and second language socialization intersects with cultural, national, and religious Jewish identification across contexts of home, school, and informal events. It also explores the various ways that identity is negotiated and constructed through diverse language practices. Collectively, these studies provide a taste of the complexity of what it means to be defined as a speaker of Jewish culture/religion in American society. This chapter concludes with some ideas about future directions for those interested in studying the role of language(s) in Jewish life both in the United States and beyond, and what the subfield of language socialization in Jewish communities can contribute to broader discussions of language socialization and religious life.

N. Avineri (✉)

Middlebury Institute of International Studies at Monterey (MIIS), Monterey, CA, USA

e-mail: navineri@miis.edu

S. Avni

City University of New York (CUNY), New York, NY, USA

e-mail: Savni@bmcc.cuny.edu

Keywords

Jewish communities • Jewish English • Yiddish • Hebrew • Language socialization • Religious life • Identity • Language policy • Jewish culture • Migration • Displacement • Judaism • Language ideologies • Metalinguistic community • Language endangerment • Syncretism • Hybridity • Heritage language

Contents

Introduction	324
Early Developments	326
Major Contributions	327
Work in Progress	332
Problems and Difficulties	333
Future Directions	333
Cross-References	335
Related Articles in the Encyclopedia of Language and Education	335
References	335

Introduction

This chapter focuses on language socialization (Ochs and Schieffelin 1984) in Jewish communities, as an example of a minority community that has historically experienced migration and displacement. For purposes of space and clarity, we have chosen to focus here on Jewish life outside of the State of Israel and particularly those living in the United States, a spatial distinction that situates Jewish communities as diasporic. We do this intentionally for two reasons, albeit with full awareness of the semantically and politically contested meanings that the term *diaspora* has carried in the Jewish imagination (Mann 2012; Aviv and Shneer 2005; Boyarin and Boyarin 2002): first, because the vast majority of studies using the language socialization framework have been conducted on Jews living in the United States and, second, because language socialization practices in these communities are situated within the broader context of English-speaking American society. While these community members may be socialized through, by, and into Hebrew, Yiddish, or other languages prevalent in Jewish communities, they also have proficiency in English and utilize English (to varying degrees) in many aspects of their lives.

Besides being bilingual, two additional features distinguish language socialization in Jewish communities. The first already hinted at is that there is no single language that serves as a marker of Jewish identity. Knowledge of more than one language has always characterized Jewish communities, whether the Jews have been dispersed among other nations or in their homeland. Being a speaker in a diasporic Jewish community has, at different historical times, meant knowing the local vernacular spoken by non-Jewish neighbors, as well as having knowledge in a Jewish language – a list that includes not only Hebrew and Yiddish but also hybridized versions, e.g., Judeo-Spanish (see Kushner-Bishop 2004, Judeo-Arabic, Judeo-Provencal), Hasidic English (see Fader 2009), and Jewish English

(see Benor 2009), an umbrella term incorporating the many ways that Jews speak English with Hebrew and Yiddish loanwords and other distinctive features, including in phonology, syntax, and prosody (Gold 1985; Benor, personal communication). Varying Jewish languages have served as socializing agents depending on the form of Jewish identity individuals and communities embrace, and the broader social and linguistic context in which they are living.

The second distinguishing feature of language socialization in American Jewish communities is the multiplicity of the term *Jewish* itself. While Jewish can be defined as a religious affiliation, it is also understood as an ethnic, national, or cultural identity. For scholars of contemporary Jewish life, this multiplicity leads to asking what exactly is the object being studied when examining socialization into Jewish communities. Is it socialization into the theological belief system and/or the ritualistic practices of Judaism, a sense of cultural and historical belonging to the Jewish people, and/or the tenets of ethno-nationalistic identification? At times these categories may overlap, but their distinctions highlight a crucial, and often overlooked, conclusion: there is no one Jewish community. Rather, there is a constellation of communities that define their Jewishness in highly disparate ways. For this reason, it is necessary to keep in mind that while there are no clear-cut, readily agreed-upon definitions of what it means to be Jewish or what successful socialization into a Jewish community entails, the studies addressed in this chapter demonstrate how categories of Jewishness are often negotiated through first and second language practices (including language use and ideologies) that are crucial in defining the boundaries of Jewishness and serve as authenticating and legitimizing markers of Jewish membership. Not surprisingly then, the notions of “language,” “Jewish,” and “socialization” are conceptualized in varying ways in the studies we present below, in which factors such as age, gender, nationality, and level of religious observance shape how the notion of a Jewish community is understood and the type of socialization taking place.

We begin this chapter with a bird’s-eye view of the broader field of Jewish languages, exploring how varying Jewish languages have defined and maintained Jewish practices in diasporic conditions. Here, we look to scholarship outside of the traditional language socialization approach in order to underscore the ways in which language use in religiously and culturally heterogeneous settings are characterized by multilingualism, code-switching, cultural and national ideologies, and other phenomena associated with contact between a religious minority and broader society. Next, we turn to research on language socialization in American Jewish communities, highlighting a handful of recent studies that reflect the varying ways in which membership in Jewish communities is negotiated through languages and linguistic practices for individuals. Our synthesis of the existing research reflects the diversity of types of Jewish communities, and how first and second language socialization intersects with cultural, national, and religious Jewish identification. Collectively, these studies provide a taste of the complexity inherent in determining what it means to be a speaker of Jewish culture/religion in American society. We conclude with some ideas about future directions for those interested in studying the role of language(s) in Jewish life both in the United States and beyond, and what the

subfield of language socialization in Jewish communities can contribute to broader discussions of language socialization and religious life.

Early Developments

As Jews have migrated to various areas and have come in contact with non-Jewish neighbors, they have differentiated themselves through their language practices (see Peltz 2010) both intentionally for identity-marking and also as natural consequences of language contact. These specific ways of speaking, reading, and/or relating to texts have come to define and sustain Jewish communities. The intersection of language and Jewish life has found expression in both sociolinguistic scholarship and in the social science research, more broadly. Early sociolinguistic research on Jewish languages frequently considered Jewish languages to be discrete codes, focusing less on sets of language practices. Various scholars focused on particular lexical, phonological, and grammatical features of these languages (see Fishman 1985). Joshua Fishman (1980, 1985, 1994) was at the vanguard of bringing the topic of Jewish languages, and particularly a macro-level approach to the diglossic condition of eastern European Ashkenazi Yiddish-speaking Jews, into mainstream linguistic conversations. Other sociolinguists have applied a discourse analytic perspective to analyze the cultural and linguistic practices of Jewish individuals as an example of “sociability” (Tannen 1984) or reputation affirmation (Modan and Shuman 2010). Though these studies did not take a language socialization approach per se, they did go beyond a discrete code approach to considering *language practices* as central to community membership and definition. Acknowledging a range of new practices and possibilities in settings other than Israel, Spolsky (1986) considered the complexities of teaching Hebrew in the diaspora. Jewish languages have also been connected with language policy (Spolsky and Shohamy 1999) and culture (Hadda 1999).

Scholars of contemporary American Jewish life have also examined the connection between language and Jewish communal identification. Ari Kelman (2009) demonstrates how Yiddish language programming during the Golden Age of radio in interwar American cultural life became both a “venue and a vehicle for the expression of Jewish communal desires and identifications” (p. 224) for the Jewish eastern European immigrant community. Not only did these Yiddish programs constitute a community of listeners who actively engaged in discussions about what and how they ought to sound on the radio, they also invited an examination of this group’s sense of community as it took on new forms in their new host nation prior to World War II. Like Kelman, Riv-Ellen Prell, a historian of contemporary American Jewry, reveals how language practices were intricately entangled in the *havurah* movement in American Judaism during the 1960s and 1970s (Prell 1989). Part of the countercultural movement of the 1960s, early *havurot* – small groups that aimed to foster religious renewal by providing an intimate setting for prayer, study, and ritual activity outside of institutional Judaism taking place in synagogues – placed a premium on religious authenticity. Among other things, these communal

study groups sought a Judaism traditional in form, but “personal, independent, and activist” in nature. What Prell’s ethnographic research captures is how the traditional language of the daily and Shabbat liturgy became a contentious site for negotiating the boundaries between being individualist and adhering to tradition in an “authentic” way. Though not a study on language per se, Prell’s work is masterful in revealing the power of ritualized language to challenge and ultimately reaffirm communal boundaries.

The powerful nature of the sacred texts of Judaism and the ritualized practices that surround their reading and use is focus of other works in contemporary American Judaism (Boyarin 1989). Samuel Heilman’s (2001) seminal study of a group of American Orthodox Jewish men engaged in the time-honored practice of *lernen* – defined as the ritualized study of Jewish sacred books – shows how the nature and appeal of these text-centered interactions is a social drama that allows its participants to play out social relationships, as well as a cultural performance, and an interactional drama, in which participants learn what “passes for Judaism” and create a moral fellowship. Language practices during these sacred text study sessions, and specifically language choice, code-switching, topic switching, intonation, and other forms of linguistic manipulation construct the community of learners, as well as its constraints and its meanings.

Collectively, these works from scholars of American Jewish life explore how varying Jewish languages have defined and maintained Jewish religious and cultural practices in diasporic American society. Though not coming from a language socialization perspective specifically, they set the groundwork for thinking about the ways in which Jewish literacy, linguistic, and discursive means define what Jewish communal practices are and give articulation to how varying Jewish groups – Yiddish-speaking immigrants in America in the interwar years, countercultural Jewish men and women in the 1960s and 1970s, and Orthodox men studying Talmud in the 1980s – negotiate their sense of Jewish identification in American society vis-à-vis language practices.

Major Contributions

The major contributions to the literature on language socialization in American Jewish communities have demonstrated the various ways that language practices and unique patterns of interaction shape and are shaped by identities and language ideologies (see Avineri 2012; Benor 2012). This in-depth, ethnographic, longitudinal (Garrett and Baquedano-López 2002) research has considered how Jews create and reflect community membership through their language practices. Broadly speaking, language socialization in Jewish communities connects in myriad ways to key concepts at the heart of language socialization research, including identity, ideologies, agency, gender, religion and morality (see Baquedano-López 1998), multilingualism and language contact, language policy, heritage languages (see Avineri 2014a; He 2008), and language endangerment and death. More recently, language socialization research conducted in Jewish communities (Orthodox, Conservative,

Reform, cultural) has focused on first language (L1) and second language (L2) socialization across contexts of home, school, and informal events and the ways that identity is negotiated and constructed through diverse language practices. Key scholars of language socialization in Jewish communities include Avineri (2012, 2014a, b, forthcoming), Avni (2011, 2012a, b, c, 2013), Benor (2012), Fader (2009), Kattan (2009), and Kushner Bishop (2004). This research has built upon the approach to Jewish languages as discrete codes with sets of particular features by also recognizing diverse language practices, multilingualism, syncretism, hybridity, ideologies, and community formation across the life cycle.

Two earlier book-length ethnographic projects included elements of a language socialization perspective on Jewish language practices, in particular a macro-micro approach. Building upon language socialization research on dinnertime discourse (Ochs and Taylor 1996), Blum-Kulka's (1997) cross-cultural research on native Hebrew-speaking Israelis', bilingual Hebrew English-speaking American Israelis', and English-speaking Jewish Americans' dinner talk demonstrates diverse modes of discursive socialization in a range of contexts. She analyzed narrative co-construction, participant structure and topic, and power negotiation, focusing in particular on the *differences* among these groups and how these relate to macro-level historical and cultural circumstances. Blum-Kulka's cross-cultural macro-micro approach provided an important model for future Jewish community language socialization research that focuses on the various levels and layers of socialization processes. Peltz's (1997) research focused on second-generation Yiddish speakers in South Philadelphia, analyzing in particular their speech patterns as they related to issues of identity and ideology. His discussion considers the immigrant experience through the lens of language, in terms of meaning-making and community navigation. He also includes an examination of Yiddish speech patterns and an analysis of English use in Yiddish, providing a useful forebear for future language socialization research that discusses language hybridity and syncretism.

Fader's research demonstrates how gender roles, morality, and agency are negotiated through diverse language practices in a nonliberal religious community. Her ethnographic research focuses on Bobover Hasidic Jewish families in the Borough Park section of Brooklyn, New York, and her series of influential publications (Fader 2001, 2006, 2007, 2008, 2009, 2012, 2013) have illuminated the utility of the language socialization framework for studying how fundamentalist religious communities negotiate the tension between insiders and outsiders and between tradition and modernity. Focusing on the everyday interactions between mothers, female teachers, and young girls, Fader's work captures the ways in which the latter are socialized into proper Hasidic womanhood, what she refers to as a "distinctly Jewish femininity."

It is through close analysis of these daily interactions that Fader reveals how simple exchanges regarding following rules, eating lunch, picking clothing, or finding a spouse becomes religious and moral lessons. In essence, everyday talk in these mundane activities teaches these young girls how to differentiate themselves from non-Jews and reaffirm their own belief system and devotion to religious practice. Equally important, interactions with their mothers, caregivers, and teachers

teach them how to be “with it” without being modern. In other words, they learn that adherence to a prescribed code of behavior, speaking, and attire is what sustains communal boundaries and resists the intrusion of broader secular society that they perceive threatens their religious lifestyles.

Fader demonstrates how Bobover Hasidic women use diverse languages in the service of this social distinction. Depending on the context, women will strategically choose English, Yiddish, textual Hebrew, or Hasidic English (a hybrid form) and even adjust their pronunciation to safely mediate the secular world while protecting and ensuring the continuity of their religious society. Attending to this constant movement (in the form of code-switching, code-mixing, lexical borrowing, phonological features), Fader demonstrates that English, Yiddish, and Hebrew are not as compartmentalized into religious and secular domains as was once believed.

Fader’s scholarship has been instrumental in the study of religion and has extended beyond the field of Judaic studies, as it debunks the assumption that progress and modernity are inexorably linked to individual freedom, autonomy, and secularization. Arguing that Hasidic Jews have constructed an alternate modernity that does not reject or deny the notions of personal autonomy, Fader shows how this religious community socializes girls to use their autonomy to conform and reaffirm their community norms. Her utilization of a language socialization lens shows how syncretism and hybridity are valued within this community through distinctive multilingual practices.

Kattan (2009, 2010) conducted a 19-month language socialization ethnographic study of *shlichim* (emissaries) from Israel moving to the United States, focusing on the central role of language practices in the construction of transnational (Jewish) identities. He examined diverse language practices in both home and school settings, providing an in-depth picture of a small set of focal families (in the tradition of many language socialization studies before his study), finding that children in these transnational families learn to recognize and mock Americans’ non-Israeli pronunciations of Hebrew, thereby allowing them as Israelis to reinforce and blur the boundaries between Israeli and American Jews. Doing so enables them to claim Israeli authenticity.

Avni (2012a, b, c, 2013, 2014) conducted an 18-month language socialization ethnography of a non-Orthodox K-8 Jewish day school in New York, and focused on the ways that seventh and eighth grade students were socialized through language practices into identities related to sacredness, the Jewish people, and Israel. Hebrew-only language policies in this setting were analyzed in relation to a “tension between ideology and enactment” (Avni 2012b, p. 169). This body of research also examined how particular translation practices from Hebrew to English demonstrates complex language ideologies that put in stark tension the desire to use the sacred language even when it has questionable pedagogical value (Avni 2012c). Within a religious school context, Avni’s (2013) work also demonstrates how specific linguistic features in a classroom discussion about the Bible position the students and teacher within a trajectory of Jewish community identification that links ancient history to the contemporary Jewish classroom. Teacher talk (in English primarily) is analyzed in relation to community formation among students at the day school. In addition,

Avni (2014) discusses discursive socialization in a range of spaces including Israeli military cemeteries, demonstrating how “tour guide narratives” serve to socialize students into an intergenerational diasporic identity.

In her ethnography focused on second language socialization among newly Orthodox Jews, Benor (2012) examined language practices that demonstrated emerging identities, focusing on how community members set themselves apart from non-Jews and from Orthodox Jews. As summarized in Avineri’s (2015) review of literature on Yiddish language socialization,

adults who are newly socialized into Orthodox Jewish communities utilize a distinctive English language variety in some cases imbued with religious references across diverse public and private contexts. These *ba’alei teshuva* (“BT’s”), literally “those who return,” with no linguistic background in Yiddish, will infuse their English with Yiddish lexical items as referee-designed evidence of their commitment; some of these are related to religious observance while others are not (p. 138).

Benor’s research therefore highlights the central role of language in adults’ socialization and acceptance into religiously observant communities.

Avineri (2012, 2014b, forthcoming) conducted a 3-year ethnographic study of heritage language socialization practices in secular Yiddish educational contexts in California and New York. She introduced the notion of “metalinguistic community,” “a community of positioned social actors engaged primarily in discourse about language and cultural symbols tied to language” (Avineri 2012, p. ii). Metalinguistic community provides a “novel practice-based framework for diverse participants who experience a strong connection to a language and its speakers but may lack familiarity with them due to historical, personal, and/or communal circumstances” (Avineri 2012, p. ii). The research identifies five dimensions of metalinguistic community: socialization into language ideologies prioritized over socialization into language competence and use, conflation of language and culture, age and corresponding knowledge as highly salient features, use and discussion of the code being primarily pedagogical, and use of code in specific interactional and textual contexts (e.g., greeting/closings, assessments, response cries, lexical items related to religion and culture, mock language) (Avineri 2012, p. ii). The research “explores the multiple ways that metalinguistic community members engage in ‘nostalgia socialization’ into an imagined nationhood (Anderson 1983) of the Jewish diaspora, demonstrating the central role of language as identity maker and marker within multilingual contexts” (Avineri 2012, p. iii). She describes the narratives of Yiddish metalinguistic community members that demonstrate both distance from and closeness to one’s heritage (Avineri 2012), as well as the complex epistemic ecologies (Goodwin 2013) of Yiddish language learners in the diaspora (Avineri 2012). The research highlights how processes of language socialization in the Yiddish metalinguistic community emphasize Yiddish endangerment as both a discursive strategy and a phenomenological reality (Avineri 2014b). She also describes “contested stance practices” that publicly demonstrate metalinguistic community members’ language ideologies towards Yiddish varieties and source languages. Language

ideologies are therefore socialized within the metalinguistic community (Avineri [forthcoming](#)). In these ways, her research connects with classroom language socialization, language endangerment, and language ideologies through an in-depth analysis of interactions in various Yiddish educational contexts.

Further, Avineri's (2015) review of literature on Yiddish language socialization focuses on language contact, language ideologies, language learning motivations, language variation, levels of religious affiliation, identities, and hybrid and creative forms of language use within diverse contexts. What is consistent across all of the contexts that are the focus of this review is that Yiddish and its variants are used in concert with a range of other languages (e.g., English, Hebrew), as one way to demonstrate insider-outsider status. This emic-etic tension is present in all of these situations.

Other scholars not squarely in the language socialization paradigm have also explored issues related to the role of language in socialization processes. Some have focused on the role of the family in multilingual language socialization and language policy, for example, in studies of English as a heritage language in Hebrew-dominant Israel (Kayam and Hirsch 2014) and Russian-Hebrew contexts (Kopeliovich 2010). In her comprehensive research focused on Yiddish in the twentieth and twenty-first century, Soldat-Jaffe (2012) included an exploration of Yiddish books in Orthodox communities as socialization agents for children in the United States. Shandler (2008) proposed the notion of "postvernacular Yiddish":

in semiotic terms, the language's primary level of signification – that is, its instrumental value as a vehicle for communicating information, opinions, feelings, ideas – is narrowing in scope. At the same its secondary, or meta-level of signification – the symbolic value invested in the language apart from the semantic value of any given utterance in it – is expanding. (p. 4)

He focuses his analysis on contexts including classrooms and cultural events as well as on objects he calls "semiotic souvenirs" (e.g., coffee cups with popular Yiddish sayings on them, intended for broad audiences). This extension of language socialization concepts to objects and books provides a broader perspective on who and what can socialize individuals and communities.

What is important to note about all of the work cited above is that each study defines the Jewish community in distinct ways. For Fader's work (2001, 2006, 2007, 2008, 2009, 2012, 2013) in a Hasidic community, language practices, and the ways in which Hebrew, Yiddish, and English are continuously negotiated by mothers and their young children are at the core of daily determinations of what and who is Jewish or non-Jewish. It is this very distinction that gives meaning to communal boundaries and pervades how religious insiders and outsiders are defined. Though also focused on Yiddish, Avineri's work (2012, 2014a, b), in contrast, offers Jewish as a cultural category wrapped up in nostalgic attachments, through which the learning of Yiddish gives voice. Jewish, in this work, is less about theology or religious rituals, and more of a set of beliefs about reclaiming an aspect of

Ashkenazism that is perceived to be at risk of disappearing. For Benor (2012), new members of Orthodox communities engage in ongoing work to socialize themselves and others into linguistic and symbolic practices that demonstrate (both privately and publicly) an adherence to a novel Jewish religious affiliation. And finally in Avni's (2012a, b, c, 2013, 2014) work on non-Orthodox day schoolers, Jewishness is entangled with institutional and educational efforts to ensure continuity and combat perceived assimilatory processes taking place in the broader American society. In each of these studies, and others mentioned above, Jewish not only serves as an adjective that implicitly defines its members vis-à-vis others but also a set of practices in which a diasporic and minority group mobilizes its linguistic, textual, narrative, and discursive resources to forge ties across time, space, and generational experiences and constitute themselves, their relationships with one another and others, as well as their relationship to their local contexts and home in the United States more broadly.

Work in Progress

Many of the scholars discussed above have continued their research on language socialization, in many cases in different settings. Themes in this novel research include hybrid language socialization practices in new media, such as online communities. One example of this type of research is Fader's (2015) work on "double lifers" – Hasidic Jews who lose faith but remain members in their religious enclaves while engaging in chat rooms and texting services. Her research illuminates "social life and the emerging genres of Hasidic Yiddish and Hasidic English" (Fader, personal communication). More recent work by Fader focuses on gendered blogging in Yiddish and English (Fader forthcoming). Other studies show that various forms of English media about Yiddish cultural events are socializing agents into ideologies about language endangerment (Avineri 2014b).

One other study in progress is a multi-sited ethnography being conducted by Benor, Krasner, and Avni that focuses on Hebrew language ideologies and socialization at Jewish residential camps across the United States (Benor et al. 2015). Sleepaway camps located across the United States serve close to 90,000 Jewish English-speaking campers every summer and span the range of ideological and religious affiliations. In focusing on the role of Hebrew at these camps, this study seeks to extend the language socialization framework to experiential learning and leisurely contexts, which are spatiotemporally distinct from school or home life. Drawing upon their own research in Jewish camps and Yiddish educational contexts, respectively, Benor and Avineri (forthcoming) discuss the fostering of metalinguistic communities within Jewish educational settings (supplementary schools and informal Jewish educational institutions) in the United States. This research provides a more prescriptive approach to language learning in educational settings, building upon descriptive research on metalinguistic community, Jewish English, and diaspora Jewish language varieties, recognizing the realities faced by Jewish individuals

and communities in American Jewish educational settings. All of these works in progress consider evolving definitions of language, community, and context in relation to language socialization and begin to address cases in which socialization is “unsuccessful” or may lead to unintended outcomes.

Problems and Difficulties

In considering language socialization in specific cultural communities, it can be easy for languages and communities to become essentialized, as opposed to hybrid or syncretic. While recognizing that particularity and generality need to be carefully balanced, it is possible for the practices of a given community to be considered particular to that group as opposed to being considered examples of broader phenomena of interest. In the tradition of some other language socialization research, a great deal of language socialization research in Jewish communities has focused on discrete groups (e.g., new members of Orthodox communities, Hasidic Jews in Brooklyn, older adults in South Philadelphia) (see Benor 2012; Fader 2009; Peltz 1997). Though quite valuable in their own ways, this case study-oriented approach does not necessarily capture the experiences of a range of Jewish individuals and communities who are more secular and/or cultural and whose community membership may be considered more fluid. However, there have been some studies that have explored broader phenomena beyond a particular group (e.g., a metalinguistic community across diverse contexts in Avineri (2012) and transnational language practices among families in Kattan (2009)). There has also been room to grow in terms of connecting Jewish language socialization research to literature on language policy (for exceptions, see Kayam and Hirsch 2014; and Kopeliovich 2010). While much of the research cited in this chapter has focused on families and educational settings, the diasporic experience for Jewish language communities has meant that much language socialization is happening in other contexts, including informal learning contexts like weekend cultural events, heritage tourism trips to Israel and eastern Europe, philanthropic initiatives, and social and communal settings outside the purview of formal schooling. Language socialization research associated with Jewish language practices therefore needs to be situated within these spaces as well.

Future Directions

The interdisciplinary subfield of language socialization in Jewish communities is still in its early stages of development. To extend beyond its core corpus, researchers may expand beyond the American context, export the framework, and explore linguistically diverse Jewish communities throughout the world. As minority communities become increasingly globalized, it will be important for Jewish community language socialization research to consider the effects of increased migration on diverse

language practices (see Kattan 2009). To be sure, social and cultural practices of Jewish mobility are ripe for a language socialization lens, in that it can advance the understanding of initiatives such as Birthright Israel – a free 10-day heritage trip to Israel for young adults of Jewish heritage, aged 18–26, which already has surpassed a half million participants – or organized educational trips to concentration camps in eastern Europe. These efforts are embodied, ludic, and deeply rooted in nationalistic ideologies, but they are also wrapped up in narrative, discursive, and linguistic practices, which the language socialization paradigm can effectively reveal.

In addition, as language is used in and across a range of modalities, research will need to better reflect newer trends. For example, as noted earlier in this chapter, a wider set of contexts (e.g., media, online spaces) can be explored as sites of socialization for Jewish communities (see Benor 2009; Bortnick 2001; Cohen and Benor 2009; Sadan 2011). This application and expansion of the language socialization paradigm can allow for the exploration of processes of assimilation, isolation, segregation, and exclusion for Jews all over the globe. In this way, this research can draw from and contribute to broader discussions about minority communities that seek recourse in language ideologies and practices in an effort to balance the tension between social cohesion and distinctiveness. And considering the various forms of language policy in Jewish families and institutions, it will be essential to explicitly connect language policy and language socialization in future research.

Language socialization research has in many ways assumed intergenerational transmission, something that has been disrupted in the case of Yiddish and other Jewish languages, as well as many other heritage languages (see chapter ► [“Heritage Language Learning and Socialization”](#) by Agnes He’s chapter, this volume). Therefore, new theoretical frameworks need to be created to capture this reality and complexity. For example, Avineri’s analysis focused on metalinguistic community members’ language practices around Yiddish in alternative spaces (e.g., cultural events, reading groups), as opposed to focusing on families like much other Jewish language socialization research. Benor, Avni, and Krasner’s recent research on Hebrew camps described briefly in the section [“Work in Progress”](#) similarly considers socialization from a multi-sited perspective. This approach has the potential to push language socialization in new directions, through its consideration of multiple “portable” sites of socialization for Jews in diasporic contexts who move from one Jewish space (e.g., camp) to their home communities. There are also nonnormative communities of Jews that have gone virtually unnoticed in the research, including but not limited to Jews of color, Jews by choice, and messianic Jews (aka Jews for Jesus). These future directions for language socialization research in Jewish communities, focusing on alternative spaces, media, and language policy, can provide a fruitful lens for examining individuals’ and communities’ diverse language practices. Through an in-depth examination of the language ideologies and practices involved in maintaining cultural and religious identities in a range of new contexts, language socialization in Jewish communities is well positioned to contribute to broader discussions about language socialization and religious life in the twenty-first century and beyond.

Cross-References

- ▶ [Bi- and Multilingual Family Language Socialization](#)
- ▶ [Heritage Language Learning and Socialization](#)
- ▶ [Language Socialization and Schooling](#)
- ▶ [Language Socialization in Digital Contexts](#)
- ▶ [Language Socialization: An Historical Overview](#)
- ▶ [Language Socialization and Family Dinnertime Discourse](#)

Related Articles in the Encyclopedia of Language and Education

- Joshua A. Fishman: [Theoretical and Historical Perspectives on Researching the Sociology of Language and Education](#). In Volume: *Research Methods in Language and Education*
- Kendall King and Lyn Wright Fogle: [Family Language Policy](#). In Volume: *Language Policy and Political Issues in Education*
- Bernard Spolsky: [Language Policy in Education: Practices, Ideology, and Management](#). In Volume: *Language Policy and Political Issues in Education*
- Terrence Wiley: [Policy Considerations for Promoting Heritage, Community, and Native American Languages](#). In Volume: *Language Policy and Political Issues in Education*

References

- Anderson, B. R. (1983). *Imagined communities: Reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism*. London: Verso.
- Avineri, N. (2012). *Heritage language socialization practices in secular Yiddish educational contexts: The creation of a metalinguistic community*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of California, Los Angeles.
- Avineri, N. (2014a). Yiddish: A Jewish language in the diaspora. In T. G. Wiley, J. Kreeft Peyton, D. Christian, S. C. Moore, & N. Liu (Eds.), *Handbook of heritage, community, and native American languages in the United States: Research, policy, and educational practice* (pp. 263–271). New York/London: Routledge Publishers.
- Avineri, N. (2014b). Yiddish endangerment as phenomenological reality and discursive strategy: Crossing into the past and crossing out the present. In N. Avineri & P. V. Kroskity (Eds.), *Reconceptualizing endangered language communities: Crossing borders and constructing boundaries* [special issue], *Language & Communication*, 38, 18–32.
- Avineri, N. (2015). Yiddish language socialization across communities: Religion, ideologies, and variation. *Language & Communication*, 42, 135–140.
- Avineri, N. (forthcoming). Conflicted stance practices in the Yiddish metalinguistic community. In I. L. Bleaman & B.D Joseph (Eds), *Jewish language variation and contact: Fifty years after Uriel Weinreich (1926–1967)*. [Special Issue]. *Journal of Jewish Languages*.
- Aviv, C. S., & Shneer, D. (2005). *New Jews: The end of the Jewish diaspora*. New York: New York University Press.

- Avni, S. (2011). Toward an understanding of Hebrew language education: Ideologies, emotions, and identity. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 208, 53–70.
- Avni, S. (2012a). Hebrew as heritage: The work of language in religious and communal continuity. *Linguistics and Education*, 23, 323–333.
- Avni, S. (2012b). Hebrew-only language policy in religious education. *Language Policy*, 11, 169–188.
- Avni, S. (2012c). Translation as a site of language policy negotiation in Jewish day school education. *Current Issues in Language Planning*, 13(2), 76–104.
- Avni, S. (2013). Becoming a people of the book: Interactional positioning of community in bible discourse. *Journal of Jewish Education*, 79(1), 4–23.
- Avni, S. (2014). Homeland tour guide narratives and the discursive construction of the diasporic. *Narrative Inquiry*, 23(2), 227–244.
- Baquedano-López, S. P. (1998). *Language socialization of Mexican children in a Los Angeles Catholic parish*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles.
- Benor, S. B. (2009). Do American Jews speak a “Jewish language”? A model of Jewish linguistic distinctiveness. *The Jewish Quarterly Review*, 99, 230–269.
- Benor, S. B. (2012). *Becoming frum: How newcomers learn the language and culture of Orthodox Judaism*. Rutgers: Rutgers University Press.
- Benor, S. B., & Avineri, N. (forthcoming). Beyond language proficiency: Fostering metalinguistic communities in Jewish educational settings. In J. Levisohn & A. Kelman (Eds.), *Beyond Jewish identity: Rethinking concepts and imagining alternatives*. Brighton: Academic Studies Press.
- Benor, S. B., Krasner, J., Avni, S. (2015). “Ruach in the chadar” or “Ivrit bamachaneh”: Competing ideologies of Hebrew pedagogy at American Jewish summer camps. In *Network for research on Jewish education conference presentation*. New York: Hebrew Union College.
- Blum-Kulka, S. (1997). *Dinner talk: Cultural patterns of sociability and socialization in family discourse*. Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Bortnick, R. A. (2001). The internet and Judeo-Spanish: Impact and implications of a virtual community. In H. Pomeroy & M. Alpert (Eds.), *Proceedings of the twelfth British conference on Judeo-Spanish studies* (pp. 4–11). Leiden: Koninklijke Brill NV.
- Boyarin, J. (1989). Voices around the text: The ethnography of reading at Mesivta Tifereth Jerusalem. *Cultural Anthropology*, 4(4), 399–421.
- Boyarin, J., & Boyarin, D. (2002). *Powers of diaspora: Two essays on the relevance of Jewish culture*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Cohen, S. M. & Benor, S. B. (2009, October). Survey of American Jewish language and identity. Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion (HUC-JIR). Retrieved May 28, 2012, from www.bjpa.org/Publications/details.cfm?PublicationID=3874
- Fader, A. (2001). Literacy, bilingualism, and gender in a Hasidic community. *Linguistics and Education*, 12(3), 261–283.
- Fader, A. (2006). Learning faith: Language socialization in a community of Hasidic Jews. *Language in Society*, 35(02), 205–229.
- Fader, A. (2007). Reclaiming sacred sparks: Linguistic syncretism and gendered language shift among Hasidic Jews in New York. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology*, 17(1), 1–22.
- Fader, A. (2008). Reading Jewish signs: The socialization of multilingual literacies among Hasidic women and girls in Brooklyn, New York. *Text & Talk: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Language, Discourse Communication Studies*, 28(5), 621–641.
- Fader, A. (2009). *Mitzvah girls: Bringing up the next generation of Hasidic Jews in Brooklyn*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Fader, A. (2012). Language and morality. In A. Duranti, E. Ochs, & B. B. Schieffelin (Eds.), *The handbook of language socialization* (pp. 322–340). London: Wiley.
- Fader, A. (2013). Nonliberal Jewish women’s audiocassette lectures in Brooklyn: A crisis of faith and the morality of media. *American Anthropologist*, 115(1), 72–84.
- Fader, A. (2015). The treatment of doubt: Ultra-Orthodox Jews, crises of faith, and therapy. New York: CUNY Graduate Center.

- Fishman, J. A. (1980). Attracting a following to high-culture functions for a language of everyday life: The role of the Tshernovits language conference in the 'rise of Yiddish'. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 24, 43–74.
- Fishman, J. A. (1985). The sociology of Jewish languages from a general sociolinguistic point of view. In J. A. Fishman (Ed.), *Readings in the sociology of Jewish languages* (pp. 3–21). Leiden: E. J. Brill.
- Fishman, J. A. (1994). The truth about language and culture (and a note about its relevance to the Jewish case). *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 109(1), 83–96.
- Garrett, P. B., & Baquedano-López, P. (2002). Language socialization: Reproduction and continuity, transformation and change. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 31, 339–361.
- Gold, D. (1985). Jewish English. In J. A. Fishman (Ed.), *Readings in the sociology of Jewish languages* (pp. 280–298). Leiden: E.J. Brill.
- Goodwin, C. (2013). The co-operative, transformative organization of human action and knowledge. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 46(1): 8–23.
- Hadda, J. (1999). Yiddish in contemporary American culture. In G. Estraiikh & M. Krutikov (Eds.), *Yiddish in the contemporary world: Papers of the first Mendel Friedman international conference on Yiddish* (pp. 93–105). Oxford: Legenda.
- He, A. W. (2008). Heritage language learning and socialization. In P. A. Duff & N. H. Hornberger (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of language and education, Vol. 8, Language socialization* (pp. 201–216). New York: Springer Publishers.
- Heilman, S. C. (2001). *The people of the book: Drama, fellowship, and religion*. New York: Transaction Publishers.
- Kattan, S. (2009). 'Because she doesn't speak real Hebrew': Accent and the socialization of authenticity among Israeli Shlichim. *Crossroads of Language, Interaction, and Culture*, 7, 65–94.
- Kattan, S. (2010). *Language socialization and linguistic ideologies among Israeli emissaries in the United States*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of California, Berkeley.
- Kayam, O., & Hirsch, T. (2014). Socialization of language through family language policy: A case study. *Psychology of Language and Communication*, 18(1), 53–66.
- Kelman, A. Y. (2009). *Station identification: A cultural history of Yiddish radio in the United States*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Kopeliovich, S. (2010). Family language policy: A case study of a Russian-Hebrew bilingual family: Toward a theoretical framework. *Diaspora, Indigenous, and Minority Education: Studies of Migration, Integration, Equity, and Cultural Survival*, 4(3), 162–178.
- Kushner Bishop, J. (2004). *More than a language, a travel agency: Ideology and performance in the Israeli Judeo-Spanish revitalization movement*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles.
- Mann, B. E. (2012). *Space and place in Jewish studies* (Vol. 2). New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.
- Modan, G., & Shuman, A. (2010). Narratives of reputation: Layerings of social and spatial identities. In D. Schiffrin, A. De Fina & A. Nylund (Eds.), *Telling stories: Language, narrative, and social life* (pp. 83–94). Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.
- Ochs, E., & Schieffelin, B. 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). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ochs, E., & Taylor, C. (1996). 'The father knows best' dynamic in family dinner narratives. In K. Hall (Ed.), *Gender articulated: Language and the socially constructed self* (pp. 97–121). New York: Routledge Publishers.
- Peltz, R. (1997). *From immigrant to ethnic culture: American Yiddish in South Philadelphia*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Peltz, R. (2010). Diasporic languages: The Jewish world. In J. A. Fishman & O. Garcia (Eds.), *Handbook of language and ethnic identity* (pp. 135–152). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Prell, R. E. (1989). *Prayer and community: The havurah in American Judaism*. Detroit: Wayne State University Press.
- Sadan, T. (2011). Yiddish on the internet. *Language & Communication*, 31, 99–106.
- Shandler, J. (2008). *Adventures in Yiddishland: Postvernacular language & culture*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Soldat-Jaffe, T. (2012). *Twenty-first century Yiddishism: Language, identity, and the new Jewish studies*. Brighton: Sussex Academic Press.
- Spolsky, B. (1986). Teaching Hebrew in the diaspora: Rationale and goals. *Jewish Education*, 54(3), 11–20.
- Spolsky, B., & Shohamy, E. (1999). Language in Israeli society and education. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 137, 93–114.
- Tannen, D. (1984). Jewish argument as sociability. *Language in Society*, 13(3), 311–335.

Language Socialization in Korean Transnational Communities

Juyoung Song

Abstract

Language socialization (LS) in transnational communities involves complexity and multiplicity in terms of languages, ideologies, identities, and sociocultural norms including the dynamic notions of community and competence. The recent trend in transnational migration by Korean families with school-age children for English acquisition has been largely motivated by globalization and language ideologies of English in Korea. Recent LS studies reflect this new face of Korean transnationalism, bringing a broader perspective that goes beyond the micro, interactional aspects of Korean language learning and cultural understanding. The new areas include transnational youth's LS practices and their projected cosmopolitan identity, the role of English acquisition in families' class maintenance and distinction, and LS and language ideologies of capital. Exploring these various aspects of Korean, English, and bilingual language socialization practices in Korean transnational communities, this chapter discusses what it means to be competent in transnational spaces.

Keywords

Language socialization • Korean language • Transnational community • Cosmopolitan identity • Korean-English bilingual

Contents

Introduction	340
Early Developments	341
Major Contributions	342
Socialization into Korean Social Relationships and Morality	342
Cosmopolitan Belonging, Class, and Language Ideologies of Capital	345

J. Song (✉)
Murray State University, Murray, KY, USA
e-mail: jsong2@murraystate.edu

Problems and Difficulties	347
Future Directions	348
Cross-References	348
Related Articles in the Encyclopedia of Language and Education	348
References	349

Introduction

Language socialization (hereafter LS) in transnational communities involves complexity and multiplicity in terms of languages, ideologies, identities, and sociocultural norms as well as dynamic notions of community and competence. By looking at transmigrants' linguistic practices that signal simultaneous and multiple memberships beyond a local context, the research in this area expands our understanding of language learning in and across time and space. This chapter focuses on LS practices in South Korean (hereafter Korean) transnational communities, discussing Korean, English, and bilingual LS practices from a broad perspective.

LS studies examine how a person becomes a competent member of a community and the role of language in this process (Schieffelin and Ochs 1986a, b). The traditional or "first-generation LS research" (Garrett and Baquedano-López 2002) focused mostly on very young children acquiring their first language (e.g., Schieffelin and Ochs 1986a) and on the relationship between culturally specific patterns of LS practices and school achievement (e.g., Heath 1983). Since then, studies of LS have explored new areas of inquiry, particularly LS practices in linguistically and culturally heterogeneous settings (Bayley and Schecter 2003; Duff and Hornberger 2008; Duranti et al. 2012; Garrett and Baquedano-López 2002). This line of research focuses on membership, identity, and the roles of the adult/expert and the child/novice in the fluid societal and situational contexts of bi- and multilingual settings (Bayley and Schecter 2003). Building upon this multiplicity and fluidity, LS studies of transnational communities broaden the context in terms of time and space. They examine how transnational family members negotiate LS practices, particularly how they look back to the past and look forward to the future through their transnational connections and relationships with both local residents and other migrants and those in their countries of origin.

Korean transnationalism is closely related to the globalization process in Korea (Park and Lo 2012), and Korean transnational families' linguistic practices are often linked to language ideologies in Korea (Park and Bae 2009; Song 2009). Such a relationship is presumed from the definition of transnationalism itself, "the process by which immigrants forge and sustain multi-stranded social relations that link together their societies of origin and settlement" (Basch et al. 1994, p. 7). This process is considered to be associated with globalization – both the globalization of capital and grassroots reactions to this kind of globalization (Basch et al. 1994; Smith and Guarnizo 1998).

The recent trend in transnational migration by Korean families with school-age children for English acquisition has been largely motivated by globalization and

language ideologies in Korea (see Kang and Abelmann 2011; Park and Lo 2012). Recent LS studies reflect this new face of Korean transnationalism, bringing a broader perspective that goes beyond the micro, interactional aspects of Korean language learning and cultural understanding. The new areas include transnational youth's LS practices and their projected membership in cosmopolitan communities, the role of English acquisition in families' class maintenance and distinction, and LS and language ideologies of capital.

This chapter first explores LS studies of Korean children's and adults' negotiation of Korean language and culture in Korean transnational communities, especially the areas relevant to Korean social relationships and morality. Next, it reviews studies of LS that focus on class, capital, and cosmopolitan belonging and the role of English and Korean in these areas.

Early Developments

Interest in the study of Korean language acquisition and development began with cross-linguistic comparisons between Korean and other languages, focusing on how the cross-linguistic differences affect Korean learners' language learning, typically in western English-speaking countries. The topics frequently researched include Korean social hierarchy and collective social orientation.

The highly rigid and stratified Korean social structure is well reflected in the Korean language. For example, Korean has at least seven different speech levels (Sohn 1999) that reflect and define a speaker's hierarchical social position toward not only an addressee but also a referent. Other linguistic characteristics that index Korean social hierarchy include honorifics, nominal and address terms, and grammatical particles. It is said that a speaker cannot make a single sentence in Korean without locating oneself in relation to others in a hierarchy. The social and psychological orientation of the Korean language, which underlies Koreans' linguistic practices, is thought to contrast with that of Western cultures. Two key concepts, *jeong* (affectionate attachment) and *wuri* ("we," in-groupness), emphasize group harmony over individual characteristics and well-being (Choi et al. 1994). *Jeong* is an affective bond that unites *wuri* members together, and *jeong* is created when individuals experience *wuri* membership (Choi et al. 1994). In the framework of *wuri*, Koreans are expected to read others' *maum/kipwun* (heart/feelings) behind behaviors without explicit verbal references, in a similar way to Japanese *omoiyari*. These conventions of Korean culture create challenges for many transnational Korean children and youth in their Korean language learning and maintenance in a bilingual setting. Studies in Korean language learning have documented how parents, teachers, and children themselves negotiate conflicting sociocultural norms while navigating multiple social and linguistic contexts (Jo 2001; Lee 1975, 2002; Shin 2005, 2006; see also Lee and Shin 2008).

The first LS study of Korean children in the USA by Clancy (1989) focused on how Korean mothers socialized their children with Korean Wh questions. Similar to

other early studies in Schieffelin and Ochs (1986a), the study documented two very young children, aged 1 year and 8 months and 1 year and 10 months, in interaction with their mothers for over 1 year. Clancy discussed how each family's culture and the differences in the interactive functions of Wh questions affected the children's adaptation of form/function pairs. The results indicated a significant correlation between mothers and children in the use of particular form-function pairs. However, the study also indicated children's selective adaptation of forms and functions from their mothers' linguistic models, suggesting children's independent role in the socialization process.

Major Contributions

Socialization into Korean Social Relationships and Morality

Following Clancy (1989), more studies were published in the early 2000s when classroom research began to explore LS practices in Korean heritage and foreign language classrooms (e.g., Byon 2003; Han 2004; Lo 2004). Recognizing the lack of LS studies in Korean, Byon (2003) applied the LS framework to analyzing classroom interaction in a Korean as a heritage language classroom in Hawaii. Building upon Poole's (1992) study, which illuminated how an ESL teacher's classroom interactions socialized ESL students into American middle-class interactional styles, Byon examined Korean teachers' use of *-yo* (a sentence ending for a polite-speech style), typically used by a younger speaker when there is a status difference between the speaker and his or her elder or social superior. Byon showed that the use of *-yo* by the teachers in the classroom socialized Korean-American students into the hierarchical social relations in Korean culture as well as the appropriate use of the polite linguistic form. Another study by Park (2008) focused on LS of *-ta* (a sentence ending for a plain speech style). Unlike *-yo*, *-ta* is used in declarative statements directed from higher-status to lower-status speakers or between the same-status speakers (Sohn 1999). By videotaping, the use of *-ta* utterances by six three-generation Korean-American families over 15 months, Park (2008) documented how adults' frequent use of *-ta* to children, but the lack of its use to each other socializes Korean children into the directional use of speech style and the Korean social hierarchy based on age and status in the family.

Another study, by Park (2006), demonstrated how social hierarchy is constructed and maintained through Korean ritual greetings and farewells. Greetings in Korean culture are hierarchy-punctuated activities, and the selection of the appropriate greetings and farewells is complex depending on the occasion (arrival versus departure) and the addressee's status (household versus non-household member). Children's use of the greeting terms in Korean mainly relies on terms supplied by adult members, initially, until they distinguish them by themselves. Park's study revealed that grandparents play an important role in maintaining social hierarchy by

enforcing children's proper use of polite speech styles and greeting farewell rituals in the family, while parents are more lenient to children's use of a range of non-traditional expressions resulting from their bilingual and bicultural experiences.

Code-switching, a very common bilingual resource, is also a socializing tool for Korean hierarchy. Shin (2010) examined how teachers in Korean heritage language classes in a Korean church in the USA code-switched from English to Korean in the speech act of directives. The study discussed the role of such code-switching in the classroom in establishing speakers' authority in Korean social relations, which socializes Korean-American children into Korean social hierarchy.

Other studies have investigated how Korean interactions in school and at home socialize Korean learners and children into Korean moral values. Lo (2004) analyzed teachers' narratives that socialize Korean-American students into the importance of maintaining a demeanor that does not reveal private thoughts and emotions. For example, the teacher enacts *nwunchi* (tact), a "high-context communication tactic that allows a person to understand indirect or unspoken messages" (p. 250) to read students' negative thoughts and emotions, such as boredom and wandering thoughts, that are inappropriate in the classroom. The teacher's use of *nwunchi* has two functions: (1) to socialize the students into respect in Korean culture, affective restraint, and suppression of private thoughts and (2) to socialize them to use *nwunchi* to read others' unspoken emotions, attitudes, and desires. In a subsequent article, Lo (2009) again focused on the socialization of morality, highlighting the ideology of Korean respect that prioritizes teachers' feelings over students' in the classroom. The teacher's shaming narratives in the study criticized students' expressions of feelings through crying, eye gaze, and postures for irritating the teacher's *maum/kipwun* (heart/feeling), which, in turn, socialized the students into emotional restraint as a demonstration of respect and of the importance of attending to teachers' emotions or feelings in the classroom.

Teasing and shaming routines are frequent LS practices in teaching Korean language and culture. Han (2004) provided a detailed account of LS practices in a preschool in Los Angeles, focusing on teachers' use of various directives, kinship terms, affective terms, teasing, and shaming. In particular, the study found that teasing and shaming in teacher talk promote culturally appropriate behaviors by criticizing and controlling behaviors that violate Korean cultural and classroom norms. For example, a teacher's utterance "Someone needs diapers like a baby" in a preschool classroom teases a child about his/her inappropriate and immature behavior, which socializes the child to feel ashamed of this behavior and improve it by performing an age-appropriate classroom task. Han explained that the routines of shaming and teasing took place more often in older children's classrooms, whereas the use of affective terms, *ippu-* (pretty) and *meewu-* (ugly), was frequent in younger children's classrooms. Teachers' use of such affective terms in Korean conveys the teachers' approval (*ippu-*) and disapproval (*meewu-*) of the children's verbal/nonverbal behaviors. For example, "sit *ippu-ge* (prettily)" means sit down quietly, not moving and not talking, with *ippu-ge* serving as a descriptor in regulating children's participation in class activities, which socializes children into the

described behavior. Teachers' frequent teaching and shaming practices, particularly in Korean, socialize children into Korean cultural and classroom norms.

In another study on Korean morality, Park (2014) discussed Korean parents' perspectives on socializing their Korean-American children into contrasting moral values, *chaahan saram* (being a good person) in Korean culture, and being a good citizen in the USA. Parents' discourse in the study described *chaahan saram* in Korean culture as complying with others and obeying group rules and refraining from saying "no" to a requested task to instill *jeong* (affection) among members. Parents in the study pointed out a significant conflict between being good in Korean and Western cultures, which they believed creates a challenge for their children's socialization as well as a conflict among parents themselves in raising their children as successful citizens in contexts with diverse cultural orientations.

The challenge of conflicting social and language ideologies, however, offers an opportunity for dynamic and often innovative language practices (Bayley and Schecter 2003; Duff and Hornberger 2008; Duranti et al. 2012; Watson-Gegeo 2004). Song (2009) showed that Korean children in the USA negotiate the conflict through innovative linguistic practices. Due to the lack of a neutral second-person pronoun such as the English "you," Korean children need to use Korean hierarchical kinship terms (e.g., *hyeng*, brother) in addressing older friends. The 5-year-old children in Song's study created unique bilingual practices – anglicizing a Korean name and establishing its bivalency through code-switching into English – to avoid hierarchical Korean kinship terms. While other studies demonstrated that Korean adolescents and adults used code-switching between English and Korean as interactional strategies to invoke or avoid the indexical meaning associated with each code (Kang 2003; Lee 1975; Shin 2005, 2010; Shin and Milroy 2000), the children's practice in Song (2009) indicated that children as young as 5 years old understand the multiplicity in the context and participate actively in their socialization process. The fact that children in the community shared such a code-switching practice in Song's study implies that peers play an important role in transnational children's LS practices. Indeed, Yun (2008) highlighted children's peer socialization into code-switching in role-play. In the study, Korean-English bilingual children used Korean in setting up their role-playing activities in a way that was similar to how they used the meta-communicative verbs such as "pretend" or deixis such as "these" and "right here." They then used English for the language for the role-playing itself. According to Yun, peer socialization plays a major role in young children's use of this unique way of code-switching during their playtime. Thus, the code-switching examples in Song (2009) and Yun (2008) challenge the traditional roles of the adult/expert and the child/novice in the dynamic process of LS. Additionally, LS in this section also implies the bidirectionality of the LS process – Korean transnational children's dynamic "bilingual" practices affect parents and others, informing them of the multiplicity of languages and norms in the community, who then set LS goals for the children, accordingly (Lo 2009; Park 2006, 2014; Song 2009).

Cosmopolitan Belonging, Class, and Language Ideologies of Capital

Recently, a transnational migration phenomenon called *jogi yuhak* (early study abroad before college) for English acquisition has become popular among upper- and middle-class Korean families. This new transnational phenomenon has changed the face of Korean transnationalism, which has brought new practices to Korean communities (Park and Lo 2012). Those new Korean arrivals in Anglophone countries align themselves, to a great degree, with the community in Korea, in terms of educational practices and expectations, and have different language learning goals (Park and Bae 2009; Song 2010, 2012a). For them, the view of English as a means of accumulating capital and of acquiring global membership has become more prominent than the conventional view of language as a marker of a speaker's ethnonational identity (Heller 2003). Therefore, they strongly emphasize English learning within the perspective of elite bilingualism in which English language, with its associated cosmopolitan identity, is thought to be added to their Korean language and identity. Long-term immigrant families, on the other hand, tend to view the need for their mother tongue as part of their children's construction and maintenance of Korean ethnonational identity (Song 2010).

Song (2012a, b) examined these families' LS practices in the USA through a 1-year ethnographic study. Theorizing Korean families' transnational ties and future vision of their children's educational and career trajectories in terms of their imagined communities (Anderson 1991; Kanno and Norton 2003), Song (2012a) illustrated how their imagined communities influenced these families' current LS practices in their homes. Two mothers' interviews and their home interactions indicated that each family enacted different language ideologies guided by their imagined communities that they wished to join in the future in Korea through their transnational experiences, which led to divergent LS practices between these two families. Song (2012b) explored class identity in Korean transnational families and examined how two graduate student families claimed that belonging to a particular (privileged) class guided their LS practices in their homes. By emphasizing their children's learning and use of Korean instead of English, or their pragmatic and sociolinguistic competence in English instead of grammatical competence, these families attempted to construct themselves as responsible and educated intellectuals who were superior to other transnational families, particularly *jogi yuhak* families that they considered materialistic. These attempts, Song asserted, highlight and extend the underlying tension of class relations in Korean society in transnational space.

The distinction between Korean immigrant and migrant families and variation within migrant families themselves reported in Song (2010, 2012a, b) highlight the view of a minority/transnational community as heterogeneous in its members' multilayered memberships and practices, which results in various LS goals and practices. Additionally, this heterogeneity indicates that LS practices in transnational communities are linked to communities beyond the local, suggesting a community whose boundaries are not fixed.

Furthermore, the research on LS of Korean adolescents in transnational communities, particularly generation 1.5, brings a new perspective to the understanding of competence in the LS framework: What does it mean to become a competent member in a transnational community? Unlike second-generation children who are exposed to a bilingual context when they are young and receive support and guidance from their parents and teachers, generation 1.5 youth navigate different expectations and norms in their LS process often with little or no support from their families. Research shows that these youth place value on the linguistic and social capital that comes with LS and strive to transform and position themselves as global citizens who intend to acquire global capital beyond the local context.

Studies in this area illustrate that generation 1.5 students strive to distance themselves from the label “fresh off the boat” (FOB) by naturalizing their Korean identity and language and assimilating into mainstream cultures and languages (Kim and Duff 2012; Jeon 2008; Shin 2012). The struggle between English LS and Korean identity may negatively influence their maintenance and further development of their Korean language skills. Resultant negative attitudes toward Korean language learning may cause conflict with parents’ LS practices and desires for their children to maintain their Korean language and Korean ethnolinguistic identities at home (Jeon 2008). However, the struggle may also lead to the cultivation and transformation of the very characteristics of Koreanness into the transnational “coolness” features that index both cosmopolitan identity among mainstream youth and Koreanness that appeals to local Korean peer networks (Kim and Duff 2012; Shin 2012; Yi 2009). For example, in Kim and Duff (2012), two Korean-Canadian students who were struggling to enter mainstream (English-speaking) Canadian society resorted to the Korean community on their university campus, which consisted of many generation 1.5 students. Old-timers in the community who had gone through a similar process served as their primary social group, guiding these two students’ LS process and helping them gain membership in the local Korean-Canadian community. In their peer socialization, these students faced conflicting ideologies: (1) prioritizing the role of English skills in their social and academic success, which undermined their potential due to their still-developing English skills, and thus delegitimated their status as English learners – and also removed them from their Korean-speaking social networks – and (2) emphasizing Koreanness through Korean language use and cultural norms among themselves, which, in turn, limited their English LS and integration. The complexity and contradictory language ideologies in their LS eventually resulted in the socialization of these students into very conflicting practices and ideologies, enabling them to negotiate and develop identities beyond their local Korean network.

Similarly, Korean F-1 visa students, *yuhaksang*, in Shin (2012) contended with and transformed their locally assigned images as “FOBs and nerds” in the local Canadian context. By investing in, rather than avoiding, forms of capital relevant to Korean language and culture that have high value in South Korean and Asian markets, these Korean youth were able to present themselves as global cosmopolitans. Korean students in other locations also engage in similar practices. For

example, the Korean youth in Singapore in Kang (2012) claimed to be “Asian Global,” able to switch between “standard” English and a local form of English, *Singlish*. Similarly, Korean youth in the USA described in Yi (2009) were shown to negotiate and present global and transnational identities through multilingual online literacy practices.

These studies on Korean transnational youth and families illustrate the ways that transmigrants position themselves (and others) locally and globally through their engagement in linguistic practices. They suggest that LS in transnational communities is an ongoing process that requires constant development and investment in linguistic and social capital through self-observation and self-reflection on one’s practices, positions, and the dynamic contexts of language and culture (Park and Lo 2012; Urciuoli 2008). The dynamic LS process illustrated in these studies is not guided by the norms of any single community, such as local mainstream norms, those of immigrant communities, or those of communities in Korea. That is, the kind of competence required for those who are growing up and participating in transnational communities is not inherited from a single community but is constructed and reconstructed constantly from the dynamic interplay between individuals’ various social networks and ideologies of linguistic and social capital in multiple communities.

Then, how does becoming a competent member of a community work for transmigrants? The findings reported above suggest a need for a new definition of competence in transnational space that allows transmigrants to go beyond the local and claim their membership in multiple communities. While more research is needed to provide answers to this question, the studies of Korean transnational youth show flexibility in their membership and language use that allows them to shift their positions from local to global or simultaneously both, by going beyond the boundaries of nation-state and traditional ethnolinguistic categories (Ong 1999). Such flexibility is based on their language ability, reflexivity, and sensitivity to the context and capital, which can be fundamental for “transnational” competence and identity.

Problems and Difficulties

LS in transnational communities redefines the notions of community and competence. In particular, the notion of a transnational community goes beyond a traditional sense of a community in time and space as the term transnational denotes developing and maintaining multiple social relations spanning more than one location. A relevant issue is the scope of LS studies that deal with transmigrants. In order to make sense of transnational LS practices, it is important to adopt a broad scope by looking at participants’ practices in relation to their past and future communities and their transnational ties. It may be necessary to take account of not only key actors, migrants, country of origin, and country of destination but also families and those left behind and other sociopolitical organizations that indirectly impact transnational

migration, identity, and socialization (Basch et al. 1994). The fluid nature of a community and its scope may be a challenge to researchers, but recognition of this fluidity is a key to understanding transnational LS practices.

This broad approach is also important in moving away from a static view of linguistic and societal categories that often essentialize culture and identity as Korean culture or American culture and immigrant or nonimmigrant. Acknowledging the heterogeneous nature of language and society that characterizes transnational members' negotiation and reconciliation of multilayered memberships, practices, and competence or incompetence is important in future research practices.

Future Directions

One particular area that has great potential for LS study in Korean transnational communities is gender-related LS. Traditional Korean values, including *hyeonmoyangcheo* (wise mother and good wife), that define and delimit Korean women's gender roles as mothers and wives are challenged and restructured in transnational spaces. A discussion of Korean women's gender-related socialization is lacking in the literature, and online communities may serve as a very appropriate venue for exploring their LS processes. Online communities provide many useful resources for first-generation adult Korean women overseas who may have limited interaction in their local offline communities compared to those of their male counterparts and school-aged children. Online communities also offer transnational connections for both overseas Koreans and Korean nationals, and the information and opinions shared in such communities socialize both parties, transnational and domestic. Therefore, studying these interactions should provide a fuller picture of LS in transnational communities.

Cross-References

- ▶ [Bi- and Multilingual Family Language Socialization](#)
- ▶ [Heritage Language Learning and Socialization](#)
- ▶ [Language Socialization and Schooling](#)
- ▶ [Language Socialization in Japanese Communities](#)
- ▶ [Language Socialization in Children's Peer and Sibling-Kin Group Interactions](#)

Related Articles in the Encyclopedia of Language and Education

Tae-Hee Choi: [Identity, Transnationalism and Bilingual Education](#). In Volume: [Bilingual and Multilingual Education](#)

References

- Anderson, B. (1991). *Imagined communities: Reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism* (Revised ed.). New York: Verso.
- Basch, L. G., Glick Schiller, N., & Blanc, C. S. (1994). *Nations unbound: Transnational projects, postcolonial predicaments, and deterritorialized nation-states*. New York: Routledge.
- Bayley, R., & Schecter, S. (Eds.). (2003). *Language socialization in bilingual and multilingual societies*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Byon, A. S. (2003). Language socialization and Korean as a heritage language: A study of Hawaiian classrooms. *Language, Culture, and Curriculum*, 16(3), 269–283.
- Choi, S.-C., Kim, U., & Choi, S. H. (1994). Individualism, collectivism, and child development: A Korean perspective. In P. Greenfield & R. Cocking (Eds.), *Cross-cultural roots of minority child developments* (pp. 227–257). Hillsdale: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Clancy, P. (1989). A case study in language socialization: Korean Wh-questions. *Discourse Process*, 12(2), 169–192.
- Duff, P. A., & Hornberger, N. (Eds.). (2008). *Encyclopedia of language and education, volume 8: Language socialization* (2nd ed.). New York: Springer.
- Duranti, A., Ochs, E., & Schieffelin, B. B. (Eds.). (2012). *Handbook of language socialization*. Malden: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Garrett, P., & Baquedano-López, P. (2002). Language socialization: Reproduction and continuity, transformation and change. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 31, 339–361.
- Han, N. (2004). *Language socialization of Korean-American preschoolers: Becoming a member of a community beyond the family*. Unpublished dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles.
- Heath, S. B. (1983). *Ways with words: Language, life, and work in communities and classrooms*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Heller, M. (2003). Globalization, the new economy, and the commodification of language and identity. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 7(4), 473–492.
- Jeon, M. (2008). Korean heritage language maintenance and language ideology. *Heritage Language Journal*, 6(2), 206–223.
- Jo, H.-Y. (2001). ‘Heritage’ language learning and ethnic identity: Korean Americans’ struggle with language authorities. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, 14, 26–41.
- Kang, A. (2003). Negotiating conflict within the constraints of social hierarchies in Korean American discourse. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 7(3), 299–329.
- Kang, Y. (2012). Singlish or Globish: Multiple language ideologies and global identities among Korean educational migrants in Singapore. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 16, 165–183.
- Kang, J., & Abelmann, N. (2011). The domestication of South Korean pre-college study abroad (PSA) in the first decade of the millennium. *Journal of Korean Studies*, 16, 89–118.
- Kanno, Y., & Norton, B. (2003). Imagined communities and educational possibilities: Introduction. *Journal of Language, Identity, and Education*, 2(4), 241–249.
- Kim, J., & Duff, P. A. (2012). The language socialization and identity negotiations of generation 1.5 Korean-Canadian university students. *TESL Canada Journal*, 29(6), 81–102.
- Lee, D. (1975). Some problems in learning Korean second person pronouns. In H. Sohn (Ed.), *The Korean language: Its structure and social projection* (pp. 19–32). Honolulu: Center for Korean Studies, University of Hawaii.
- Lee, J. S. (2002). The Korean language in America: The role of cultural identity in heritage language learning. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, 15(2), 117–133.
- Lee, J. S., & Shin, S. J. (2008). Korean heritage language education in the United States: The current state, opportunities, and possibilities. *Heritage Language Journal*, 6, 153–172.
- Lo, A. (2004). Evidentiality and morality in a Korean heritage language school. *Pragmatics*, 14(2/3), 235–256.
- Lo, A. (2009). Lessons about respect and affect in a Korean heritage language school. *Linguistics and Education*, 20, 217–234.

- Ong, A. (1999). *Flexible citizenship: The cultural logics of transnationality*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Park, E. (2006). Grandparents, grandchildren, and heritage language use in Korean. In K. Kondo-Brown (Ed.), *Heritage language development: Focus on East Asian immigrants* (pp. 57–86). Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Park, E. (2008). Intergenerational transmission of cultural values in Korean American families: An analysis of the verb suffix “-ta”. *Heritage Language Journal*, 6(2), 21–53.
- Park, H. (2014). *Socialization of morality as a cultural value in young children: Perspectives of first generation Korean American mothers*. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Washington, Seattle.
- Park, J. S.-Y., & Bae, S. (2009). Language ideologies in educational migration: Korean *jogi yuhak* families in Singapore. *Linguistics and Education*, 20, 366–377.
- Park, J. S.-Y., & Lo, A. (2012). Transnational South Korea as a site for a sociolinguistics of globalization: Markets, timescales, neoliberalism. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 16, 147–164.
- Poole, D. (1992). Language socialization in the second language classroom. *Language Learning*, 42, 593–616.
- Schieffelin, B. B., & Ochs, E. (1986a). Language socialization. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 15, 163–191.
- Schieffelin, B. B., & Ochs, E. (Eds.). (1986b). *Language socialization across cultures*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Shin, H. (2012). From FOB to cool: Transnational migrant students in Toronto and the styling of global linguistic capital. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 16, 184–200.
- Shin, S.-Y. (2010). The functions of code-switching in a Korean Sunday School. *Heritage Language Journal*, 7(1), 91–116.
- Shin, S. J. (2005). *Developing in two languages: Korean children in America*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Shin, S. J. (2006). High-stakes testing and heritage language maintenance. In K. Kondo-Brown (Ed.), *Heritage language development: Focus on East Asian immigrants* (pp. 127–144). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Shin, S. J., & Milroy, L. (2000). Conversational codeswitching among Korean-English bilingual children. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, 4(3), 351–383.
- Smith, M. P., & Guarnizo, L. E. (Eds.). (1998). *Transnationalism from below*. New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers.
- Sohn, H. (1999). *Korean*. London: Routledge.
- Song, J. (2009). Bilingual creativity and self-negotiation: Korean American children’s language socialization into Korean address terms. In A. Reyes & A. Lo (Eds.), *Beyond yellow English: Towards a linguistic anthropology of Asian Pacific America* (pp. 213–232). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Song, J. (2010). Language ideology and identity in transnational space: Globalization, migration, and bilingualism among Korean families in the USA. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 31, 23–42.
- Song, J. (2012a). Imagined communities and language socialization practices in transnational place: A case study of two Korean “study abroad” families in the United States. *Modern Language Journal*, 96, 507–524.
- Song, J. (2012b). The struggle over class, identity, and language: A case study of South Korean transnational families. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 16, 201–217.
- Urciuoli, B. (2008). Skills and selves in the new workplace. *American Ethnologist*, 35, 211–228.
- Watson-Gegeo, K. A. (2004). Mind, language, and epistemology: Toward a language socialization paradigm for SLA. *Modern Language Journal*, 88(3), 331–350.
- Yi, Y. (2009). Adolescent literacy and identity construction among 1.5 generation students: From a transnational perspective. *Journal of Asian Pacific Communication*, 19(1), 100–129.
- Yun, S. (2008). Role-play and language socialization among bilingual Korean children in the United States. *Simulation and Gaming*, 39(2), 240–252.

Language Socialization in Latino Communities

Robert Bayley

Abstract

This chapter examines key language socialization studies in North American Latino communities, with an emphasis on work that shows the diversity found among the many different groups who trace their heritage to the Spanish-speaking countries of the Americas. Studies include work focusing on language socialization practices in communities, families, religious organizations, schools, and voluntary organizations in various regions of the United States as well as in Canada. The chapter concludes with suggestions for a number of promising areas for future research including research in the “new Latino diaspora” in the US South, in indigenous communities, and among Deaf Latinos as well as in the many communities where dialects of Spanish and different Latino cultures are in contact with one another.

Keywords

Teasing • Bilingual Socialization • California • Texas • Ethnography • Chicago • Vancouver • Edmonton • East Harlem • Spanish • Hispanic • Latino • San Antonio • California • Proposition 227 • Michoacán • Rancheros • Ranchero • Franqueza • Respeto • Relajo • Los Angeles • Catholic • Pentecostal • Mexicanization • Chicanoization • Central Americans • Dominicans • Providence, Rhode Island • African American • MexiRicans • Deaf Latinos

Contents

Introduction	352
Early Developments	352
Major Contributions	354
Intra-Latino Contact	358

R. Bayley (✉)

Department of Linguistics, University of California, Davis, Davis, CA, USA

e-mail: rjbayley@ucdavis.edu

Future Directions	359
Cross-References	361
Related Articles in the Encyclopedia of Language and Education	361
References	361

Introduction

With its focus on how people are socialized by and through language into their own and new communities, language socialization has proven to be highly productive for the study of bi- and multilingual contexts. Over the past few decades, research using this framework has been particularly enlightening for our understanding of language and socialization practices in North American Latino communities. Scholars have examined the relationship between language socialization practices in the home, the community, and schools and whether children and youth maintain and continue to develop their heritage language or shift to English dominance (Baquedano-López and Hernández 2011; Farr 2006; Guardado 2008, [forthcoming](#); Schecter and Bayley 2002; Zentella 1997). As well, studies have explored the complex issues that surround race and Latino ethnicity in areas of traditional Latino settlement in the Northeast of the United States (Bailey 2002, 2007; Zentella 1997) and among the rapidly growing Latino population of the South (e.g., Carter 2013). Finally, scholars have also explored the role of religion in socializing Latino youth (Baquedano-López 2001; Ek 2005). In fact, the volume of work has been greater than can be covered in a single chapter. Therefore, this chapter is necessarily selective and focuses on representative work that highlights the diversity of North American Latino communities and how studies of such communities have enriched our understanding of language socialization more generally.

Early Developments

Language socialization emerged as a framework in the 1970s and early 1980s in works such as Heath's (1983) study of African American and white communities in the Carolina Piedmont, Ochs' (1988) study of language acquisition in Samoa, and Schieffelin's (1990) study of language acquisition among the Kaluli in Papua New Guinea. As Kulick and Schieffelin (2004) note, work in language socialization was intended to address the lack of attention to culture in language acquisition research and the parallel lack of attention to language in child socialization studies. Kulick and Schieffelin summarize the key characteristics of language socialization studies: "They should be ethnographic in design, longitudinal in perspective, and they should demonstrate the acquisition (or not) of particular linguistic and cultural practices over time and across contexts" (p. 350). Scholars interested in exploring language in Latino communities were quick to respond to the new framework. This section will explore two pioneering works: Eisenberg's (1986) study of teasing in Mexican

immigrant families and Vasquez, Pease-Alvarez, and Shannon's (1994) study of Mexican immigrants and Chicanos in northern California.

Eisenberg (1986) focused on the role of teasing in two Mexican immigrant families in northern California. Through a detailed study of teasing interactions between adults and young children, a common early focus in language socialization, she addressed three questions:

1. Why do adults choose to tease children and thus possibly create uncertainty in the child about whether the teasing might be true?
2. What are children learning through such interactions about the nature of talk and the way relationships are expressed through talk?
3. How do the children learn to become active participants in the teasing?

Eisenberg examined interactions between adults and two girls, aged 21 and 24 months at the beginning of the study. As it is typical in studies of language socialization, she gathered extensive data, recording interactions between family members and the girls for approximately 2 h every 3 weeks for a full year. Through detailed analysis of representative teasing interactions, Eisenberg showed how teasing is used as a form of play, to control children's behavior, and to convey messages about the nature of social relationships. In her analysis, Eisenberg attended both to the linguistic details of teasing interactions as well as to the social roles of the participants. Moreover, the longitudinal perspective gained through an extended period of data collection in participants' homes allowed her to trace the children's development. She noted that over the course of a year, the two girls developed different teasing routines with specific individuals and that they increased their own participation. By the end of data collection, the girls had begun to tease others although, as Eisenberg (1986) noted, "their initiations were still infrequent, highly routinized, and usually occurred when they themselves had just been teased or had observed someone teasing someone else" (p. 193).

While Eisenberg (1986) concentrated on how children are socialized into cultural and linguistic norms through a single type of interaction, Vasquez et al. (1994), based on the three authors' dissertation research undertaken in the Mexican immigrant and Chicano community of "East Side" [a pseudonym] in northern California, offer a much fuller picture of bilingual socialization than could be accomplished in a single chapter. The authors concentrated on three distinct areas of East Side community life. Pease-Alvarez volunteered in a community preschool and Shannon examined language use in a bilingual elementary school classroom. Vasquez was a research assistant in a school-based university research project. The broad perspective provided by comparing their experiences in examining socialization in different contexts enabled Vasquez et al. to present detailed descriptions of the events in the lives of their study participants, such as family discussions about problems of living in a new country or the visit of a mother and daughter to the doctor, with the daughter acting as translator or language broker. Through detailed description of the multiple ways that children were socialized into the different cultural worlds they inhabited, Vasquez et al. showed how Eastside children developed considerable flexibility in

language use. Vasquez et al. note that in the Mexicano¹ community they studied, “differences in language use patterns are not always as clear-cut as research among other ethnolinguistic minorities would suggest” (p. 6). Rather, they portray a community whose members at times “use language in ways that are reminiscent of patterns found in schools and middle-class communities; other times their uses of language clearly reflected their Mexican heritage (e.g., their use of folklore rhymes, riddles)” (p. 7). Their work adds substantially to our understanding of language socialization by showing in detail how children acquire the communicative competencies required by the multiple worlds they must navigate.

Major Contributions

Given the size and importance of the North American Latino population, as well as the increasing Latino presence in academia, it should not be surprising to find that recent decades have seen the appearance of a number of major ethnographic studies of Latino communities in various regions of the USA and Canada. These include Zentella’s (1997) study of Puerto Rican children growing up on a single block (*el bloque*) in New York City’s East Harlem, Schecter and Bayley’s (2002) study of language socialization in Mexican-origin families in northern California and south Texas, Farr’s (2006) multisite ethnography of a transnational *ranchero* community, and Baquedano-López’s (2001) and Ek’s (2005) studies of Latino children’s socialization into Catholic and Pentecostal religious practices. Other important work focuses on mixed-origin Latino communities. Studies include Potowski’s (2016) study of children of mixed Mexican and Puerto Rican parentage in Chicago and Guardado’s (2008; forthcoming; Guardado and Becker 2013) work on language socialization and language ideologies among Latino immigrants and their children in Vancouver and Edmonton, Canada.

Zentella’s (1997) study of *el bloque* in a high poverty community in East Harlem spanned 14 years. While she provided an overview of all the families on the block, including the differing patterns of Spanish and English use, she focused in detail on five grade-school girls, ranging in age from 6 to 11 at the beginning of the study, who formed a primary social network. Zentella showed in detail the diverse paths they took as they moved through childhood to young womanhood. Like other major studies in language socialization (e.g., Heath 1983), Zentella presented clear evidence showing that the ways of socializing children typical of the US middle class are far from universal. She noted that studies conducted in Puerto Rico in the 1970s showed that there was “little child-centered accommodation or segregation from adult activities” (p. 218) either among the rural or urban poor. This pattern continued

¹The choice of terms used to refer to various populations who trace their origin to Latin America is admittedly complex (see Bayley 2014). Vasquez et al. use the term “Mexicano” to refer to the Mexican origin population of East Side, most of whom had been in the United States for less than 20 years, because that was the preferred term in the community.

among the New York families she observed where adult speech “was not cut up into little chunks so as to render in more digestible, because parents believed the best way for their children to be a cultural member was to provide adult models. It was the child’s responsibility to learn how and when to fit in. . .” (p. 243).

While the Spanish language provides a unifying factor for the diverse North American Latino communities, the superordinate terms “Hispanic” or “Latino” may mask the diversity found in Latino communities. In fact, a recent survey of a well-stratified sample of the US Latino population found that only 29% of the respondents believed that Hispanics shared a common culture, while 69% felt that Hispanics have many different cultures (Taylor et al. 2012, p. 17). This cultural diversity extends to Latinos who share a national origin, as work by Schecter and Bayley (2002) and Farr (2006) has shown.

Schecter and Bayley (2002) studied language use in Mexican-origin families in south Texas and northern California. Their study, which began in 1994, was prompted by the relative lack of attention to families’ own concerns for their children’s bilingual development in debates about the merits of different types of educational programs for language minority students. By focusing on families of different immigrant generations and differing socioeconomic status in the two states with the largest Mexican-origin populations, they aimed to capture some of the diversity of the community and to show how language socialization, “instantiated in language choice and patterns of use. . . characterized by ambiguity and flux, is both a dynamic and fluid process” (pp. xv-xvi), particularly in communities where more than one language is involved. Importantly, the two research sites, San Antonio, Texas and the San Francisco Bay area in California, differed in crucial ways that previous research had found important in promoting language maintenance or shift. Specifically, San Antonio has a Latino majority, with most Latinos being of Mexican origin, while in the San Francisco area, Latinos are one group among many. In addition, in the 1990s, the San Antonio Latino community had far fewer recent immigrants than the Bay Area. The majority of Mexican-origin San Antonians trace their roots to the northern Mexican states that border Texas, while Californians of Mexican origin tend to come from central Mexico. Thus, the distance to their areas of origin is much greater for Mexican-origin Californians than for their counterparts in Texas. Finally, when Schecter and Bayley were conducting their research, California, in contrast to Texas, had adopted an official English-only policy and voters passed a series of ballot initiatives aimed at restricting immigrant and minority rights, culminating in 1998 with Proposition 227, which banned bilingual education in all but a few schools.²

Schecter and Bayley’s (2002) study included 40 families, 20 at each site, each with at least one parent of Mexican-origin and one child in fourth to sixth grade. They conducted detailed interviews with children and parents in all of the families and, on the basis of the family profiles, selected four families at each site for

²In November 2016, California voters overwhelmingly passed Proposition 58, which restored bilingual education.

ethnographic case studies. Not surprisingly, they found considerable diversity in language practices and aspirations for children among the families in both the larger sample and in the case studies. They also found that quite a few families changed their practices over time. For example, the Villegas [a pseudonym] family in northern California originally followed the advice of their daughter's kindergarten teacher, who counseled against speaking Spanish at home so to avoid problems in school. Later, however, in response to a visit from the child's paternal grandmother, who was alarmed by her granddaughter's lack of Spanish, the parents shifted to a policy of insisting on Spanish in the home. Nevertheless, because Mr. and Mrs. Villegas valued school achievement, they made an exception to the Spanish-only policy for school-related topics.

Overall, Schecter and Bayley (2002) found that in all of the families they studied, Spanish was tied to alignment with a Mexican identity, which participants defined in many different ways. However, families pursued transmission of the language in a variety of ways and adapted different strategies that changed over time as the circumstances of their lives changed.

Farr (2006), in a 15-year study of a multigenerational social network in a transnational community in Chicago and Michoacán, Mexico, presents a detailed ethnography of a community where many language practices run counter to stereotypical images of Mexican formality, collectivism, and hierarchical social relations both within and beyond the family. The *rancheros*, rural Mexicans who usually work their own land in small rural communities and who, although of mixed indigenous and European heritage, generally identify with the non-indigenous side of their heritage, constitute about 20% of the larger Mexican society, and many immigrants to the United States are from this background. Farr concentrates on three characteristic ways of speaking in *ranchero* communities: "*franqueza* (frankness, directness, or candor), *respeto* (respect), and *relajo* (a carnivalesque communicative event in which people 'joke or fool around')" (p. 16).

Franqueza indicates a way of speaking that reflects an egalitarian, individualist ideology, in contrast to the indigenous people whom *rancheros* view as communally oriented. Moreover, *franqueza* is found in interactions where it would seem to violate established family or social hierarchies. For example, Farr (2006) quoted an 8-year-old girl's reaction to her older brother's wincing in pain when she applied lime to bumps that appeared on his arm after he gathered avocados on the *ranchito*: "*¡Aguántese, si es hombre!* (Handle it if you're a man!)" (p. 17).

Respeto reflects respect for authority according to age and gender hierarchies as instantiated, for example, by the use of the formal third person singular pronoun *usted* instead of the informal *tú* or the use of formal titles. Farr commented that many students from *ranchero* backgrounds might be very deferential to authorities in school yet assertive and independent at home or elsewhere. While *franqueza* and *respeto* are ways of speaking that affirm aspects of the social order, *relajo*, according to Farr (2006), "provides a space for disorder, for violating boundaries and normal rules for behavior and interaction" (p. 17). As such, it offers a sanctioned means for criticizing the established order while at the same time reaffirming it.

Several recent studies of language socialization have examined the role of religion in Latino communities. Baquedano-López (2001), for example, described how children in a Los Angeles Catholic parish were socialized into a Mexican identity through participation in a core narrative, the story of the Virgin of Guadalupe, patroness of Mexico. Ek's (2005) work on language socialization in a mixed-Mexican-Central American Pentecostal congregation in Los Angeles provides another example of the role of religious affiliation. Ek observed that within the congregation, Spanish was associated to some extent with "*el camino*" (God's path) and English with "*el mundo*" (the secular world). However, the division was not entirely clear-cut. For example, the pastor stopped children from watching a Central American parade and warned youth against watching *telenovelas* (Spanish language soap operas), which he viewed as morally destructive. Ek showed how young people, as they are socialized into a Pentecostal identity through Spanish, are socialized to use Spanish in religious ways, including greetings and address terms that signal Pentecostal identity. Nevertheless, Ek observed that the young people in the church she studied speak more English every year. Furthermore, she noted that the church socializes young people into a universal Christian identity rather than into national identities. Perhaps as a consequence, the language variety of the largest group in the church tends to be valorized and the language used at church promoted a "Mexicanization" or '*Chicanoization*' of Central Americans, obscuring and replacing their national identity" (p. 90).

Research in Latino communities has also contributed to challenging the binary conception of race that has long been prevalent in the USA. In work on Dominicans in Providence, Rhode Island, Bailey (2002, 2007), for example, showed how many Latino communities reject the binary classification of African American-white. Bailey (2007) observed that although "Dominicans recognize and label individual differences in physical appearance — and privileges accrue to individuals with lighter skin — there is no sense of ethnicity based on, or symbolized by, relative degrees of African or European ancestry" (p. 158). Indeed, the complexities of Latino racial and ethnic identities are well summed up by a New York community activist, who stated: "I am Dominican by nationality, Latino because I speak Spanish, and Black due to the African heritage" (Itzigohn and Dore-Cabral 2000, p. 241).

Recently Carter (2013) studied contact between Latino and African American adolescents in a multiethnic North Carolina middle school. He documented the appropriation of African-American English (AAE) grammatical features such as third person present tense singular -s absence, copula deletion, and past copula leveling. Carter showed that the use of AAE features by Latino youth reflected not only the degree of contact between the two groups, but that it also contributed to identity-based work. For example, one young Latino used AAE to challenge the black-white ethnic dichotomy that has characterized the South. Carter (2013) argued that the use of AAE helped the young man to "articulate a particular type of *latinidad* [Latino-ness] . . . that significantly overlaps in the social and geographic space in which AAE is normative, but at the same time is self-consciously 'Mexican' and rooted in local gang culture" (p. 83).

Intra-Latino Contact

While much of the work discussed so far focused on language socialization practices within communities of a single national origin, Latino communities are increasingly sites of language and cultural contact, not only between Spanish and English but also between different Spanish dialects and different Latino cultural traditions. Otheguy and Zentella (2012), for example, in a large-scale study of variation in the use of Spanish subject personal pronouns by speakers of six different national origins in New York City, showed how the Spanish of New York-born Latinos is converging. Further, the frequent contact among Latinos of different national origins leads in some cases to intermarriage. For example, Potowski (2016; Potowski and Matts 2008) examined the language practices of one such group, MexiRicans, children of mixed Mexican and Puerto Rican parentage in Chicago, from the perspective of dialect and cultural contact. Although based primarily on interviews rather than ethnographic observation, Potowski's work has important implications for our understanding of language socialization practices in an increasingly diverse North American Latino population. Potowski (2016) showed how MexiRican youth incorporate the symbols of both Puerto Rican and Mexican culture into their lives. For example, family meals combine elements of both cuisines, and young people buy jewelry or other decorative items such as rear-view mirror hangers with both Mexican and Puerto Rican flags, and many youth attend both Puerto Rican and Mexican parades and other celebrations.

Guardado (2008, 2009, [forthcoming](#)) studied a very different kind of Latino community than those discussed so far. Not only does his work deal with Canada, where Latinos represent a relatively small portion of the immigrant population, but also in contrast to the participants in Zentella (1997), Farr (2006), and many of the participants in Schecter and Bayley (2002), the Vancouver families Guardado studied tend to be middle class. Moreover, they represent a variety of different national origins including Argentina, Chile, Colombia, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Mexico, and Puerto Rico. As well, the Vancouver families differed in their length of residence in Canada, which ranged from a year to more than 20 years, while their children ranged in age from infancy to 18 years.

Guardado (2008) conducted fieldwork in three community groups, all designed to facilitate cultural maintenance: *El Grupo Scouts Vista*, a coeducational scout troop, *El Centro de Cultura* (The Cultural Center), a small parent-organized heritage language program, and *La Casa Amistad* (Friendship House), a parent-organized language and cultural center. Guardado shows how the families used the organizations they had created as safe spaces to resist assimilation and where children could be socialized into Spanish language ideologies. He also shows how children, subject to the countervailing pressures from the dominant society, sometimes resisted their parents' attempts at socialization.

As the first major studies of language socialization in Canadian Latino communities, Guardado's (2008, 2009, [forthcoming](#)) work makes several important contributions. First, the nature of the population he studied, comprised of people from many different Spanish-speaking countries with many different dialects and cultural

traditions, allowed him to offer a different perspective on the question of Spanish maintenance than that found in most studies of speakers of a single national origin. No longer is Spanish maintenance tied to a particular national identity or to the importance of the family (although he emphasized these issues as well), but rather it serves to unify Latin American immigrants generally, as in the highly nuanced accounts of the organizations parents established to assist in their efforts to transmit their language and culture to their children. Second, by concentrating on educated families, including some with relatively ample resources, Guardado presented a portrait of a portion of the Latino community that has been relatively neglected. Finally, he contributed to language socialization theory by showing clearly how children act as agents of socialization.

Future Directions

Research in language socialization has documented the diversity of socialization practices and patterns of language use in the many different Latino communities in North America. However, much remains to be done. First, researchers have understandably concentrated on the larger Latino groups. Many smaller groups, however, remain to be studied. As noted above, although there are clear similarities among the various Latino groups in the USA and Canada, there are also many differences, not only in national origin but also in social class, religious and educational background, and aspirations for the next generation. Latino immigrants also differ in the circumstances under which they migrated to North America. For example, while many immigrants leave their home countries to secure better opportunities for their children, others migrate to escape political persecution, such as the Chilean families in Edmonton studied by Becker (Becker 2013; Guardado and Becker 2013). The Edmonton families moved to Canada after the 1973 coup that ousted the democratically elected socialist government of Salvador Allende. Studies in communities that have yet to receive a great deal of attention, such as Puerto Ricans and Central Americans in the US southwest, have considerable promise for informing us about what kinds of language socialization practices are common among all Latinos, which are common among all members of a particular national or regional group, and which are particular to distinct locations.

Otheguy and Zentella (2012) in New York, Hernández (2002) in Houston, and Bayley, Cárdenas, Treviño Schouten, and Vélez-Salas (2012) in San Antonio, among others, have documented instances of intra-Latino dialect contact and accommodation with respect to particular linguistic forms. However, we have had fewer studies that explore the influence of different patterns of socialization in intra-Latino contact situations. Potowski's (2016) work on MexiRicans in Chicago is an excellent beginning, but further studies of other communities where intra-Latino contact is prevalent would advance our understanding.

Among the more striking demographic developments in the first decades of the 21st century is the spread of the Latino population to the US southeast, a region that previously had a very small Latino population. Research has shown that speakers

differ in the extent to which they accommodate to Southern speech norms. Wolfram, Carter, and Moriello (2004), for example, in a study conducted in North Carolina, show how even within the same family, speakers may differ in the extent to which they adopt southern vernacular features. They discuss a brother and sister of Mexican parentage who differ markedly in the use of monophthongal /ai/, a clear marker of southern speech. The brother, who identifies strongly with the local non-Latino jock culture and uses many southern vernacular forms in his speech, produces the monophthongal variant at a rate of 62.8%. The sister, who produced only a single monophthongal token, is much more oriented toward mainstream American institutional values. Works such as Wolfram et al. (2004) and Carter (2013), discussed earlier, suggest that the new Latino communities of the South offer rich opportunities for work in language socialization.

Three other types of communities offer particular promise for future research: undocumented immigrants in the United States, indigenous people from Spanish-dominant countries who speak a language other than Spanish, and Deaf Latinos.³ First, how do families with members who lack official status in the United States navigate the increasingly hostile anti-immigrant climate in many areas of the country? Clearly the prospect of deportation must affect how parents socialize children, but we have little documentation on what those effects are. Equally clearly, given possible legal pitfalls for study participants, such studies will need to be carried out by researchers who are themselves trusted members of the community. Second, although I have used the term Latino to refer to people with origins in the Spanish-speaking countries of the Americas, many migrants to North America are indigenous and may well speak an indigenous language as their first language (Ruiz and Barajas 2012). Children from such families face particular problems in both communities and schools where they may have to master Spanish for use in the community and English for school, while at the same time they must acquire the cultural competence associated with two cultures that differ substantially from the culture of the home. Deaf Latinos constitute another population of people who must confront the difficulties of acquiring more than one language as well as becoming familiar with more than one additional set of cultural conventions. Latinos constitute an increasing percentage of the US school-age Deaf population. Although there have been studies of language contact in Deaf Latino communities (Quinto-Pozos and Adam 2015), to date we lack studies of language socialization among Deaf Latinos. As Gerner de García (1995) shows in a study of three Puerto Rican and Dominican families, Deaf children in such families must navigate an exceeding complex linguistic and cultural milieu, with not only two spoken languages but also with different sign languages and differing Deaf and hearing cultural norms.

Language socialization research is distinguished by its focus on the ways that linguistic and cultural practices are inextricably intertwined. Given the linguistic and cultural diversity of US and Canadian Latino communities discussed here, these

³Following convention, I use uppercase *Deaf* to refer to people who are culturally Deaf. Lowercase *deaf* refers to audiological status rather than cultural deafness.

communities offer many opportunities for further research. Moreover, such research has the potential not only to enrich our understanding of language socialization, but also to benefit educational practice by informing educators about the aspirations and cultural and linguistic practices that Latino students bring to school.

Cross-References

- ▶ [Bi- and Multilingual Family Language Socialization](#)
- ▶ [Heritage Language Learning and Socialization](#)
- ▶ [Language Socialization and Schooling](#)
- ▶ [Language Socialization in Working Families](#)
- ▶ [Language Socialization, Language Ideologies, and Language Shift Among School-Aged Children](#)
- ▶ [Signed Language Socialization in Deaf Communities](#)

Related Articles in the Encyclopedia of Language and Education

- Marcia Farr: [Literacies and Ethnolinguistic Diversity: Chicago](#). In Volume: [Literacies and Language Education](#)
- Olga Kagan and Kathleen Dillon: [Issues in Heritage Language Learning in the United States](#). In Volume: [Second and Foreign Language Learning](#)
- Wayne Wright and Thomas Ricento: [Language Policy and Education in the USA](#). In Volume: [Language Policy and Political Issues in Education](#)

References

- Bailey, B. (2002). *Language, race, and negotiation of identity: A study of Dominican Americans*. New York: LFB Scholarly Publishing.
- Bailey, B. (2007). Shifting notions of identity in a Dominican American community. *Latino Studies*, 5, 157–181.
- Baquedano-López, P. (2001). Creating social identities through doctrina narratives. In A. Duranti (Ed.), *Linguistic anthropology: A reader* (pp. 343–358). Malden: Blackwell.
- Baquedano-López, P., & Hernández, S. J. (2011). Language socialization across educational settings. In B. A. U. Levinson & M. Pollack (Eds.), *A companion to the anthropology of education* (pp. 197–211). Malden: Blackwell.
- Bayley, R. (2014). Demographic categories in sociolinguistic studies of US Latino communities. *Lang Linguist Compass*, 8, 536–547.
- Bayley, R., Cárdenas, N., Treviño Schouten, B., & Vélez-Salas, C. M. (2012). Spanish dialect contact in San Antonio, Texas: An exploratory study. In K. Geeslin & M. Díaz-Campos (Eds.), *Selected proceedings of the 14th Hispanic Linguistics Symposium* (pp. 48–60). Somerville: Cascadilla Proceedings Project.
- Becker, A. (2013). *Political ideology and heritage language development in a Chilean exile community: A multiple case study*. Unpublished MA thesis, University of Alberta.
- Carter, P. M. (2013). Shared spaces, shared structures: Latino social formation and African American English. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 17, 66–92.

- Eisenberg, A. (1986). Teasing: Verbal play in two Mexicano homes. In B. B. Schieffelin & E. Ochs (Eds.), *Language socialization across cultures* (pp. 182–198). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Ek, L. (2005). Staying on God's path: Socializing Latino immigrant youth to a Christian Pentecostal identity. In A. C. Zentella (Ed.), *Building on strength: Language and literacy in Latino families and communities* (pp. 77–92). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Farr, M. (2006). *Rancheros en Chicagoacán: Language and identity in a transnational community*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Gerner de García, B. (1995). Communication and language use in Spanish-speaking families with Deaf children. In C. Lucas (Ed.), *Sociolinguistics in Deaf communities* (pp. 211–252). Washington, DC: Gallaudet University Press.
- Guardado, M. (2008). *Language socialization in Canadian Hispanic communities: Ideologies and practices*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of British Columbia.
- Guardado, M. (2009). Speaking Spanish like a Boy Scout: Language socialization, resistance, and reproduction in a heritage language scout troop. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 66, 101–129.
- Guardado, M. (forthcoming). *Discourse, ideology, and heritage language socialization: Micro and macro perspectives*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Guardado, M., & Becker, A. (2013). Fostering heritage languages and diasporic identities: The role of grassroots initiatives in Alberta and British Columbia. In K. Arnett & C. Mady (Eds.), *Minority populations in Canadian second language education* (pp. 55–70). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Heath, S. B. (1983). *Ways with words: Language, life, and work in communities and classrooms*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Hernández, J. (2002). Accommodation in a dialect contact situation. *Filología y Lingüística*, 28, 93–110.
- Itzigohn, J., & Dore-Cabral, C. (2000). Competing identities? Race, ethnicity and panethnicity among Dominicans in the United States. *Sociological Forum*, 15, 225–247.
- Kulick, D., & Schieffelin, B. B. (2004). Language socialization. In A. Duranti (Ed.), *The handbook of linguistic anthropology* (pp. 349–368). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Ochs, E. (1988). *Culture and language development: Language acquisition and language socialization in a Samoan village*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Otheguy, R., & Zentella, A. C. (2012). *Spanish in New York: Language contact, dialect leveling, and structural continuity*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Potowski, K. (2016). *IntraLatino language and identity: MexiRican Spanish*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Potowski, K., & Matts, J. (2008). MexiRicans: Interethnic language and identity. *Journal of Language, Identity and Education*, 7, 137–160.
- Quinto-Pozos, D., & Adam, R. (2015). Sign languages in contact. In A. C. Schembri & C. Lucas (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics and Deaf communities* (pp. 29–60). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Ruiz, N., & Barajas, M. (2012). Multiple perspectives on the schooling of Mexican indigenous students in the U.S.: Issues for future research. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 35, 125–144.
- Schecter, S. R., & Bayley, R. (2002). *Language as cultural practice: Mexicanos en el norte*. Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Schieffelin, B. (1990). *The give and take of everyday life: Language socialization of Kaluli children*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Taylor, P., Lopez, M. H., Martínez, J. H., & Velasco, G. (2012). *When labels don't fit: Hispanics and their views of identity*. Washington, DC: Pew Hispanic Center.
- Vasquez, O. A., Pease-Alvarez, L., & Shannon, S. M. (1994). *Pushing boundaries: Language and culture in a Mexicano community*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Wolfram, W., Carter, P., & Moriello, B. (2004). Emerging Hispanic English: New dialect formation in the American South. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 8, 339–358.
- Zentella, A. C. (1997). *Growing up bilingual: Puerto Rican children in New York*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell.

Language Socialization in Francophone Communities

Kathleen C. Riley

Abstract

This chapter on francophone language socialization defines *la francophonie* as the many nations, neighborhoods, and institutions where a variety of French is spoken as a result of the political and cultural reach of the French state, ranging from regions of France and its overseas territories to parts of the world marked by prior colonization such as Québec and creole-speaking parts of the Caribbean. Reviewed here are studies that illuminate how French in its many varieties (from the “standards” taught in classrooms and other institutions to the French-related vernaculars used in homes and streets) are socialized, as well as how the associated behaviors, ideologies, and identities are reproduced and transformed via social interaction in these settings throughout *la francophonie*. The chapter highlights research that employs classic language socialization methodology – that is, research which entails long-term ethnographic fieldwork as well as the recording, transcription, and analysis of natural discourse among “novices” and “experts.” However, because this form of intensive language socialization research is still rare within *la francophonie*, other studies are considered as well – that is, research that was conducted primarily through surveys, interviews, generalized observations, and various forms of testing, in order to reconstruct the forces and processes involved in language socialization within a particular speech community. The chapter promotes the growing tendency to integrate a politically focused sociolinguistic analysis into the language socialization studies conducted in francophone settings.

K.C. Riley (✉)
Rutgers University, New York, NY, USA
e-mail: kriley1125@gmail.com

Keywords

French • Francophonie • Language socialization • Language ideologies • Symbolic capital • Habitus • Communicative competence • Speech community • Language shift • Bilingualism • Multilingualism • Code switching • Creoles • Standard varieties • Vernacular varieties

Contents

Introduction	364
Early Development	365
Major Contributions	366
Where French First Developed and Still Dominates: The Metropole (and Its Immigrants)	366
Where French, Empowered by the State, Dominates Indigenous Languages: Provence to Tahiti	369
Where French Was Dispossessed (Usually by English) but Remains Vital: Canada, Etc.	370
Work in Progress	373
Problems and Difficulties	374
Future Directions	375
Cross-References	376
Related Articles in the Encyclopedia of Language and Education	376
References	377

Introduction

To examine how language socialization occurs within a community marked by a shared language or language family (e.g., Riley 2014), one must first define the wider linguistic community in which access to that language is the norm as well as the specific speech communities in which varieties of that language are acquired and used. Secondly, one must examine how communicative resources and other socio-cultural practices and values are developed via linguistic interaction within these specific locales in ideologically organized ways. Finally, one must review research that has shed light on the topic even if the approach does not completely fulfill the requirements of the language socialization paradigm.

In this chapter, I define the wider community as *la francophonie* and its specific locales as the nations, regions, neighborhoods, and institutions where some variety of French is spoken as a result of the political and cultural reach of France over many centuries. I review studies that illuminate how French (from the “standards” required by institutions to the French-related vernaculars, code-switching codes, and creoles used elsewhere) are socialized as well as how the associated behaviors, ideologies, and identities are reproduced and transformed via social interaction throughout *la francophonie*. The chapter highlights research that employs classic language socialization methodology, involving long-term ethnographic fieldwork and the recording, transcription, and analysis of natural discourse among “novices” and “experts.” However, research that has been conducted primarily through surveys, interviews, generalized observations, and

testing is also included here in order to reconstruct the forces and patterns of language socialization found in particular speech communities throughout the broader linguistic community.

Early Development

The language socialization paradigm was formulated in the 1980s in the English-speaking world (primarily the USA and England) and spread only slowly to the francophone world (France, Québec, etc.). Works in French or about francophone communities referring to *la socialisation langagière* or citing the work of Ochs and Schieffelin appeared rarely, even after 2000. Nonetheless, even in the 1970s, sociolinguistic investigations of everyday francophone interactions began to explore some of the same terrain as later language socialization studies. Grounded in the theoretical framework of Bourdieu (1982) and Bourdieu and Passeron (1970), this research framed language and culture as resources that are acquired in structurally constrained linguistic marketplaces (*la marchée linguistique*) and addressed how ideologies about language (*représentations linguistiques*) influence the socialization process as well as the symbolic capital of the acquired resources. In this way, the elite transmit and maintain their own *habitus* (their deeply embodied linguistic and cultural practices and values) to the continued disadvantage of those who are politically and economically disadvantaged. This (neo)Marxist vision of language (re)production has had its impact on more recent contributions to language socialization research both within and beyond *la francophonie*.

These sociolinguists used some of the same methods as classic language socialization studies. Few immersed themselves as anthropologists do – eating, sleeping, and working alongside community members – or employed their subjects in the reflexive task of transcribing their own everyday interactions. However, many attempted to observe, record, and analyze “natural discourse” in their field sites, rather than simply conducting surveys or interviews. This ethnographically informed version of sociolinguistics is exemplified by Heller’s (2011) multisited research in Canada. Especially in a French-speaking school in Heller (1994), she employed long-term ethnographic observation and fine-grained discourse analysis to study how youth acquired and negotiated the sociolinguistic resources and ideologies to which they were exposed in this French-speaking institution.

By contrast with early language socialization research, sociolinguists of this ilk were investigating the relationship between macro-political economic forces and individuals’ linguistic engagements within a range of (semi-)formal institutions, whereas language socialization researchers were focusing on the impact of ethnolinguistic routines and norms on children’s development within more domestic settings. In other words, the sociolinguists’ emphasis was on the sociopolitical nature of identity formation rather than on the culturally shaped developmental process. However, Bourdieu has not only inspired the research of a number of scholars working in French-structured educational settings (see Jaffe 1999; Heller and Martin-Jones 2001) but also contributed to how language socialization scholars in francophone

settings began framing their questions in new and more political ways. These have begun more and more to integrate a focus on how individuals are socialized to develop culturally appropriate ways of speaking, thinking, and behaving, with an analysis of how macro-political economic structures and ideologies influence individuals' acquisition of linguistic resources and strategies for negotiating stance, status, and identity.

Major Contributions

Ethnographic studies of language socialization were first conducted in francophone contexts in the 1990s (Schieffelin 1994; Doucet 2003; Garrett 2005; Paugh 2012; Riley 2007). Scholars studying related phenomena in French-dominant school contexts were using similar methods (Jaffe 1999; Heller and Martin-Jones 2001; Salaün 2010; Ndayipfukamiye 2001; Monada and Gajo 2001). Around 2000, researchers began to cite the language socialization paradigm in a range of francophone settings, from domestic to institutional, but without employing language socialization methods (Williams and Riley 2001; Riley 2013; Lamarre and Rossell Paredes 2003; Lamarre et al. 2015; Patrick 2003; McAll 2003; Roy 2003; Van Den Avenne 2001). Despite their differences, all of this work has contributed to our understanding of how individuals develop language and cultural knowledge via language in *la francophonie*.

These studies could be categorized by settings or participants (e.g., homes vs. schools or peers vs. hierarchies) or by their focus on the socialization of language(s) and language use or socialization of related sociocultural factors (e.g., values and identities). However, while never losing sight of these facets, this review is organized according to the political economic structures and language ideologies that influence the socialization and construction of lives and relationships. Thus, I begin with mainland France and other settings, such as Switzerland, where French has a long history of being the official language. Next, I look at the impact of French in regions of the world where this language has come to dominate other languages (from Provence to the Caribbean), both in informal and institutional settings (i.e., from homes to schools to workplaces). Finally, I identify situations in which the French language has been disempowered by other empires (usually Anglophone) or because French-speaking immigrants have moved into societies where some other language (usually English) is dominant.

Where French First Developed and Still Dominates: The Metropole (and Its Immigrants)

Most language socialization studies conducted with native French speakers in the metropole have been food-focused. The family meal studies first organized by Ochs via the UCLA Sloane Center's CELF program (<http://www.celf.ucla.edu/>) have become a model and/or source of comparison for such food-and-language socialization studies elsewhere in the world (see chapter ► [“Language Socialization and](#)

Family Dinnertime Discourse” by Blum-Kulka, this volume). However, in France, because food and meals are understood to be the archetypal venue for explicitly socializing children, researchers are not always conscious (despite Bourdieu!) that this means of socializing children is a culturally specific and historically constructed process.

For instance, the study by Morgenstern et al. (2015) presents a fascinating analysis of the ritualized and frequently explicit routines through which parents socialize their children to eat dinner appropriately: both the order and content of the courses. The children develop an understanding that they must finish their plates so that everyone can move on to the next course; they also learn the value and proper means of eating the appropriate amount of the appetizer course, where most of the (assumed to be dispreferred) vegetable matter of the meal is found: to try at least some of it and not just play with it.

A similar study of mealtime discourse in a privileged suburb of Paris (Riley 2009) revealed many of the same culturally salient means of structuring children’s acquisition of pragmatic resources and sociocultural knowledge. This indicates the apparent stability of these strategies and the efficacy of their transmission within this region and class of people. However, as a non-native researcher, I was sensitive to some distinctive nuances in the socialization practices. Thus, a comparison of my research in France and French Polynesia (Riley 2016) reveals how all children learn to negotiate norms of sharing and consuming food, but the specific rules they learn and how they learn them are distinct. For instance, the art of critique is learned early in France (see Riley 2009), in contrast with the art of teasing found in the Marquesas (Riley 2012).

Rabain-Jamin and Sabeau-Jouannet (1995, 1997) conducted one language socialization study with French-speaking parents in France that was not food-focused. Instead, they compared the infant-directed communications of French-speaking mothers and Wolof-speaking mothers from Senegal, both in the Paris region. The focus was explicitly on cross-cultural differences in the ideologies of caregiving as manifested by socializing practices (e.g., the use of “baby talk” or physical interaction, direct visual and verbal address, use of pronouns, or pronoun-like particles in the case of Wolof, in directives).

The majority of language-specific socialization studies conducted across domestic and institutional settings within the metropole have focused on immigrant populations. For instance, Ghimenton and Costa (2016) studied the language socialization patterns of educated Italians working and studying in Paris and Grenoble. These researchers explicitly apply language socialization theory and method, collecting natural discourse during mealtimes (though the foodways are not the focus of analysis here) in order to research how the parents socialized their children’s multilingual competencies and sociocultural knowledge about behaving appropriately at home and school.

An article by Leconte and Mortamet (2005) manifests familiar themes from the language socialization paradigm by examining the influence of the different *cultures d’apprentissages* (i.e., the home cultures’ methods of socializing children) of multilingual adolescents arriving in France from sub-Saharan Africa and Central Asia.

The authors analyze how these adolescents apply different strategies for acquiring French in their *classes d'accueil* (classes for integrating immigrants into schools).

Similarly, Leconte (2005) applies the lens of *socialisation langagière* (language socialization) to examining the narrative capacities of 5–6 year old children of immigrants from north and sub-Saharan Africa and Turkey at a public school in Rouen (France), assessing their linguistic competence in French and the sociocultural import of the stories they choose to tell – usually traditional French *contes*, such as the *Three Little Pigs* or *Little Red Riding Hood*, presumably learned from older sisters. But Leconte also elicits and interprets stories such as a description of life in Tunisia or a traditional tale from Senegal.

In another study of *classes d'accueil*, in the French-speaking region of Neuchâtel, Switzerland, Mondada and Gajo (2001) investigate the socialization of immigrants from a wide range of socioeconomic and ethnic backgrounds, identifying how the multilingual resources of these students from many cultural backgrounds could be treated by teachers as useful pedagogical tools, rather than impediments.

Finally, focusing on an older cohort of immigrants, Van Den Avenne (2001) found that Malian adults who arrived in France as young adults expressed contradictory feelings in a series of *entretiens interactifs* (i.e., interviews conducted and analyzed as situated interactions). The analysis of their discourse revealed that their early years of heterogeneous language socialization in Mali led them to believe that the acquisition and usage of multiple languages just comes on its own and that transmitting one's home language to one's children should be the natural by-product of good child-rearing. By contrast, the symbolic violence experienced since arriving in France has led them to revoice the dominant discourse about the monolingual standard: their choice of using French over their mother tongue to socialize their children is justified as necessary for their children's well-being in France.

By contrast with these studies of immigrants who face society-wide stigmatization, Jeanneret and Zeiter (2013) focused on an adult Dutch immigrant to Lausanne, who had recommenced her study of French at a university in order to better integrate with her Swiss husband's family, friends, and surrounding community. However, this study too finds evidence of tensions over identity affecting the immigrant's desire to learn and transmit French to the next generation. Appealing to the notion of *socialisation langagière*, the study analyzed the student's *biographie langagière* (linguistic biography) which included her reflections on social moments of linguistic insecurity and resistance to social *minoritisation*. Here, the concept (*minoritisation*) refers to the feeling of linguistic impotence derived from a lack of linguistic competence, which drove her attempts to acquire French while also raising her daughter bilingual by speaking Dutch to her.

Kinginger's (2008, 2013) research resembles the previous study in its research design: questionnaires, interviews, journal keeping, and language assessment are used to assess the differential acquisition of communicative competence by American students in French study abroad programs. She concluded that success and failure stems from both dominant discourses and individual predispositions connected with the value of social engagement, cultural immersion, and language learning in general, as well as sentiments specific to the historical moment – for

instance, the influence of anti-American sentiment, globalized media forms, and consumerism.

Relatively affluent, adult students studying French at a university, as in Kinginger's work, represent a very different pool of subjects from immigrants who arrive at all ages from the global south and east and from a wide spectrum of political and economic backgrounds. Nonetheless, comparing these groups provides an opportunity to investigate the many sociocultural variables influencing the French language socialization of *les étrangers* (foreigners) within the metropole and this by contrast with how the French socialize their own.

Where French, Empowered by the State, Dominates Indigenous Languages: Provence to Tahiti

Ideologies of monolingualism – i.e., assumptions that a society only flourishes when unified by a common language that facilitates communication and inhibits the influx of corrosive foreign ideas – have deep and specific roots in France, being the result of republican idealism and nationalist pragmatism (see Costa and Lambert 2009). These ideologies have spread along with the language throughout the French colonial and postcolonial francophone world (Riley 2011).

Many studies conducted in these contexts are, not surprisingly, concerned with the transmission of indigenous languages in the face of the ideological force and socializing practices of the dominant language (i.e., French). For instance, Costa (2017) has examined in depth the impact of these ideologies on the reported beliefs and practices of Occitan activists in Provence, Southern France. Similarly, Corsica presents a similar pattern of activist concern over the loss of language (as symbol and essential element of Corsican identity) due to the imposition of French schooling in the early twentieth century and diminishment of familial transmission of Corsican since then. Jaffe's work (Jaffe 1999, 2009) focuses primarily on ideological debates, status planning by the regional government, and the institutional transmission of language through schools and other media. However, much of her research provides a window on language socialization – i.e., a study of the interactive processes through which language ideologies and practices are developed by children and adults.

In the Caribbean and Pacific, there are a number of studies of the impact of French language and schooling policies on both linguistic practices and formations of psyche and identity by indigenous and creole peoples. For instance, Léglise and Migge (2007) edited a volume of papers that touch on these topics in French Guiana (e.g., studies aimed at improving the quality of French education for the Guyanese from various backgrounds). Similarly, Salaün (2010, 2012, 2015) has studied the impact of French schooling in both New Caledonia and Tahiti. As with the Caribbean work, none of these explicitly take a language socialization approach to examining how linguistic and cultural competence are acquired (or not) in these French-structured contexts. Instead, they survey the ethnohistoric and sociopolitical contexts, assess linguistic and literacy competence, and collect psycholinguistic data

based on tests and interviews. However, one study from an overseas province that approaches language socialization research is Tessoneau's (2005) investigation of politeness formulae in Guadeloupe. Employing an ethnography of communication method (but without recorded and transcribed examples), he traced differences between traditional and contemporary society and how basic principles of facework were transmitted across the generations despite some changes in the actual formulae.

My own ethnographic study of multilingual socialization in the Marquesas (Riley 2007, 2012, 2016; Riley and Tetahiotupa 2006) was designed to understand how (bi) cultural identities and the communicative competence to utilize both French and Marquesan across various contexts were developed by children and adolescents at home and at school. Through the process of transcribing everyday child-caregiver discourse with the aid of the caregivers, I came to understand how French language ideologies, learned at school, have influenced parents' socialization routines as well as activists' attempts to revive "pure" Marquesan and block children from acquiring *charabia* – i.e., "mixed-up" language.

Finally, a number of studies have been undertaken in postcolonial contexts in which French is the official language used in schools and other formal contexts, while indigenous or alternative languages are being spoken at home and in other public spheres. Doucet's (2003) ethnographic study of language and schooling in Haiti focused on the language ideologies and metalinguistic talk about the two languages spoken there, French and Kreyòl, thus laying the groundwork for the sorts of ideological analyses needed in order to understand politically contextualized language socialization processes.

Ndayipfukamiye's (2001) study of code switching in two schools in Burundi, one rural and one urban, examined not only the relative status in general terms of the two official languages, French and Kirundi. It also used transcribed discourse to examine how the children's dominant language, Kirundi, was used to reinforce comprehension, while French was used to frame and mark the lesson (in this case about thatched-roofed vs. multistory buildings). Even more complex is the situation studied by Moore in (2006), where she explicitly adopted a language socialization paradigm to focus on both everyday interactions in the home, primarily in Fulfulde, but also pedagogical interactions in French-medium state schools and Arabic-medium Qur'anic schools. The contrast between the latter two contexts was striking, not only in the goals of schooling but also in the socializing practices employed and the cultural ideologies undergirding these (see Moore's chapter ► "[Multilingual Socialization and Education in Non-Western Settings](#)" this volume).

Where French Was Dispossessed (Usually by English) but Remains Vital: Canada, Etc.

French has been a powerful language in the global marketplace, and French language ideologies have structured the acquisition of French in many parts of the world for several centuries. However, the world dominance of French was brought up short by English in the nineteenth century. In particular, French Canada submitted

to English domination, followed by a number of other small colonies in the Caribbean, North America, Africa, and the Pacific. Nonetheless, I begin this section with studies in Québec (the only province where French was declared, in 1977, the official language) and then move on to Canadian provinces where the status of French is primarily protected by federal legislation intended to maintain the equal status (at least symbolically) of the two languages, before moving on to areas of the world where French no longer has any official purchase.

Québec has been the site of several sociolinguistic studies since the Quiet Revolution of the 1960s. For example, Heller's (2011) study of the ideologies governing bilingual usage in a Montreal brewery in the 1970s identified the contexts in which new forms of interaction in several varieties and mixtures of the two languages (along with the stances and identities associated with these) were socialized and negotiated. And McAll's (2003) survey of studies focused on transformations in the status and use of French in various Montreal workplaces shed light on how the political economy constructed settings that constrained the value of knowing and learning French.

Another focus in Québec has been on how the (then) new language laws affected First Nations people and allophones (i.e., immigrant speakers of other languages). For instance, Patrick (2003) studied the influence of language attitudes and usage patterns on the socialization and acquisition of French, English, and Inuktitut in public and private settings in Nunavik. With respect to allophones, two similar projects on the multilingual socialization histories and code-switching patterns of youth in Montreal emerged in the early 2000s (Lamarre and Rossell Paredes 2003; Lamarre et al. 2015; Riley 2013). While not full-scale language socialization research, the studies did undertake structural and ideological analyses about how and why young people have learned to value, develop, and use the linguistic resources afforded them in this richly heteroglossic time and place.

One school-based study (Lafontaine and Le Cunff 2006) contrasted the socialization of oral skills in francophone preschool, primary, and secondary schools in France and Québec. This study interviewed teachers and analyzed filmed interactions to understand teachers' means of assessing and promoting these skills with the goal of improving pedagogy. The findings revealed some interesting similarities (possibly a cultural inheritance) in the pedagogical styles in France and its erstwhile colonial offshoot.

Outside Québec, studies related to francophone language socialization have touched on several themes, including how Francophones manage to retain their francophone identities given their minority status within a sea of English speakers. For instance, Roy's (2003) study examined a call center in a southern Ontario town with a small community of Francophones. Using ethnography and interviews, she examined the factors that allowed for the reproduction of French in this community.

Schools are an obvious site for studying tensions over which languages will be valued how and acquired by whom. Heller (1994) looked at how French and English were deemed variously useful to students at a French school in Toronto, depending in part on the speaking context (in or out of class), the topic (school material vs. global English youth culture) and participants' identities as Anglophones,

Franco-Ontarians, Québécois, or Francophones from elsewhere in the world. A more recent report on francophone education in Ontario (Dalley and Villella 2015) suggested that the situation has not changed significantly for the students, as the diversity of linguistic and cultural francophone backgrounds continues to create problems in the formation of linguistic competence and community.

One recent study (Marshall and Bokhorst-Heng 2016) of the attitudes of teachers in a French immersion program in New Brunswick indicated that purist ideologies about the relative value of various Frenches (Parisian French vs. Québécois French vs. Chiac, a variety of Acadian French) were contributing to students' linguistic insecurities. Investigating a similar issue in a school in Moncton, Boudreau and Perrot (2005) interviewed teachers and analyzed classroom discourse in order to understand the consequences of these ideological pressures on the students' acquisition of standard French and/or Chiac. And in an ethnographic study of French immersion programming in Calgary, Alberta, Roy (2010) found that students, teachers, and parents were awash in official Canadian discourses about the difficulty of acquiring true "bilingualism," thus hampering the Anglophone students' acquisition of French.

One more theme relevant to French language socialization in Canada has to do with the tensions between older francophone communities and many newer francophone immigrants. Visible minorities in particular confront racist attitudes when attempting to integrate within established francophone communities. For instance, Gérin-Lajoie's (2006) volume presented work done on multilingualism and plural identities in Canadian schools, while Carlson Berg's (2014) collection examined how non-mainstream (non-white, non-Christian, and non-heterosexual) francophone students are excluded.

Similarly, Carlson Berg (2010) discussed the challenges to integrating immigrant Francophones into the Saskatchewan school system. The first hurdle was that immigrants judged the Canadian schooling style as too relaxed compared to their home countries (e.g., no corporal punishment, mainstreamed learning), leading to substandard academic results and the loss of children's respect for their elders. Secondly, although the Fransaskois (francophone minority in that western Canadian province) had themselves suffered stigmatization from Anglophone society, they were not above applying similar exclusionary thinking to other minorities. However, tensions such as these do not always arise within francophone communities in Canada, as is evidenced by Salaün's (2015) study based on interviews with New Caledonian students at a technical mining college in Québec. These students positively assessed the teaching style and content of this program by contrast with their French education in New Caledonia (in the South Pacific).

Finally, several language socialization studies have been conducted in parts of the world where French has no official status and yet holds its appeal for individual families and whole villages. For instance, Williams and Riley (2001) examined how French-Canadians in New England, USA, maintained the French language over several generations via traditional institutions brought with them from Québec (*français à la maison!*, church-and-school-centered villages, newspapers and aid associations). Language shift to English resulted from the breakdown of these

institutions following World War II and the encroachment of American norms via state education and more mobile employment opportunities. Schieffelin (1994) researched another immigrant group to the USA with ties to French. Her study of the socialization routines of a Haitian family in New York City revealed the ways in which a child's development of French, Kreyòl, and English was scaffolded by the caregivers' use of code-switching and translation.

In two studies situated in the Caribbean, Garrett (2005) and Paugh (2012) researched islands, St. Lucia and Dominica, respectively, where the French and British traded places as colonial powers for centuries before the islands achieved independence from the British. This history left a legacy of English as the official language and a French-based creole as the vernacular in many rural villages. Both Garrett and Paugh found that village children were being socialized to use the officially prestigious English not only at school but also at home. Nonetheless, the vernacular creole retained its covert value for the adults, associated as it was with local identity and intimate interactions, this being an ideology that the children also acquired.

Work in Progress

Since 2000, studies in *la francophonie* have increasingly used the language socialization paradigm to focus not only on how children are socialized by their elders (older siblings, parents, teachers, etc.) but also on how young peers socialize each other in less institutional settings and in multiple languages. Much of this research has manifested an increasingly explicit concern with social justice – not only in looking at immigrants and other oppressed populations but also in looking at the power relations that operate within groups according to age, gender, and class.

For instance, Paugh (2012) recorded and analyzed the interactions of children among themselves in Dominica, showing the influences that even small children can have through playful interactions on the direction of language shift in a society marked by (post)colonial inequalities. Similarly, other researchers have dug more deeply into this area of peer socialization and the agency of youth in francophone settings. Lamarre and her colleagues (Lamarre and Rossell Paredes 2003; Lamarre et al. 2015) have engaged in a complex analysis of language socialization across the life trajectory by employing a longitudinal approach that focuses on the multiplex *mudes* (or nodes) in which individuals are socialized to use languages. Lamarre's research goal is to explore how linguistic resources may be acquired and lost, repertoires developed and redeveloped, beyond the home and school across an individual's lifetime and in response to many structural-ideological and personal-happenstantial factors.

Lambert and Trimaille (2011) have studied the language socialization of adolescent immigrants in afterschool (Trimaille 2003, 2007) and school programs (Lambert 2005) in France in order to understand how they negotiate a sense of identity in the face of structural violence. Similarly, although not employing a language socialization framework, Tetrault's (2015) work has explored how immigrant youth in

France forge their semiotic codes and identities through peer interactions. Finally, Barnèche (2005), again without explicitly analyzing language socialization processes, has focused on youth in Noumea, New Caledonia, and the role they are playing in the transmission of the vernacular languages in opposition to French.

One other important avenue of work has been a return to and elaboration on the earlier dinnertime discourse socialization studies in France. However, the field has now been widened, first of all to include studies of contexts of food production and exchange as well as food preparation and consumption. For instance, Jaffe (2016) has examined how tourists to Corsica are socialized by vendors at farmers market and by culinary tour guides to understand the authenticity and authority of local foods (honey, sausage, etc.). Similarly, Riley (2016) has been looking at how children in the Marquesas are socialized to value imported food commodities over traditional foods, even as traditional foodways continue to be transmitted while growing, preparing, and consuming these foods. Implicit in much of this work is an interest not only in food as another semiotic modality alongside language but also in its connections to issues of environmental and social justice.

Problems and Difficulties

Generally speaking, conducting ethnographic studies of language socialization in the (now) traditional sense can be difficult because the projects require a great deal of time and energy, first of all to undertake the long-term fieldwork that allows for an analysis of the context within which socializing interactions take place and second to complete the transcription of the many hours of natural discourse collected for the analysis of both normative patterns and developmental changes. This process is especially difficult because this transcription is best accomplished with the aid of a participant from the community of practice under study.

In the case of French language socialization studies, some of these difficulties are somewhat alleviated by the fact that more and more francophone researchers themselves are undertaking these studies and are already competent in the language(s) of interest. However, within immigrant and (post)colonial francophone settings, the variety of French spoken and the ways of speaking it (for instance, alternating between French and other languages) may be quite distinct from the “standard” variety used (in “standard” ways) by the researcher, unless the researcher is in fact a scholar native to that community. Additionally, external researchers need time to develop sensitivity to the ideological and structural differences and must be prepared to be socialized in the field to develop a range of linguistic resources and practices needed for interacting appropriately in the communities of practice they are studying (e.g., Riley 2009, 2012). Finally, the perspective of a community participant is invaluable and contributes immeasurably to the overall data collected, and the process of constructing collaborative research relationships, though time-consuming, is in and of itself illuminating.

Some fascinating language socialization research could be accomplished within *la francophonie* if research teams were formed out of scholars trained in the classical

language socialization tradition and scholars working within an explicitly political-economic sociolinguistic tradition, especially if any of these were themselves members of the community under study. For instance, I have collaborated with Edgar Tetahiotupa, a Marquesan sociolinguist working on bilingual education in French Polynesia (1999), on some preliminary analyses (Riley and Tetahiotupa 2006). This has brought our methodological talents and theoretical insights together while also drawing on the contrast between insider and outsider perspectives in these specific locales.

Future Directions

Ideally, future work in language socialization in *la francophonie* will continue to push the boundaries of what has been done, expanding the methods used along with the settings and participants, and the modalities and ideologies studied. Additionally, we should more perfectly merge the language socialization paradigm first formulated by Anglophone scholars with a form of political sociolinguistics that emerged in the French metropole.

With respect to communicative modes, consider a whole issue of *Glottopol* (Sabria 2016) devoted to sign language in *la francophonie*. One study was situated in Quebec, looking at the impact of various schooling options on the amount of oral production practiced by deaf Quebecois (Luna and Parisot 2016). Another study looked at the impact of the alternation between French and LSBF (the francophone Belgian sign language) on the learning of hearing and deaf children in a Belgian primary school (Ghesquière and Meurant 2016). Though both of these articles considered the impact of social factors, language ideologies, and communicative practices on the learning process in these francophone settings, neither study was based on ethnographic fieldwork or analyses of socializing discourse. Ideally, future work will bring the language socialization lens and methodology to bear in such contexts.

Another way to push into unfamiliar territory would be to record and analyze interactions among adults in work and recreation settings. Earlier studies by Heller (1994) and Roy (2003) have initiated this genre of research (in a brewery and call centers, respectively); however, neither recorded, transcribed, and analyzed interactions over developmental time as is done in the work of classic language socialization studies with children. An important aspect of this endeavor would be that of exploring the distinction between a simple socializing interaction and those in which socialization – i.e., structural transformation at the level of language or identity – is occurring. For instance, in Koven's (2007) work with Portuguese immigrants to France, she focused on the construction and presentation of identity by these young women who say they feel themselves to have developed different identities via their different languages (French for modern and assertive, Portuguese for polite and submissive). More recently, Koven and colleagues (Miller et al. 2011) alluded to the possibility of applying a language socialization approach by collecting and

analyzing bilingual narratives at different points in time, thus providing insight into the formation of these different identities over developmental time.

Finally, I will end with a call for more work that explicitly integrates analysis of the ontogenetic development of individuals with the historical transformation of francophone societies. For instance, work by Paugh (2012) in the creole-speaking Caribbean, my own research in the Marquesas (2007, 2011, 2012), and Moore's (2006) research in Cameroon contextualize analyses of childhood language socialization with ethnohistoric research into sociolinguistic practices and ideologies. Furthermore, as we continue to return to our field sites to work with our familiar participants, we are able to watch transmission across generations – i.e., over real time. These studies merge the political sociolinguistic tradition of Bourdieu with the developmental language socialization paradigm of Ochs and Schieffelin. The latter began with a bottom-up, domestic focus on children as agents acquiring and sometimes transforming the social and linguistic norms of their elders. By contrast, the sociolinguistic tradition of Bourdieu stressed the top-down impact of structural and institutional constraints (e.g., of schools, religions, and socioeconomic systems). However, both are true and mutually constitutive forms of analysis of these dialectic and dialogic processes of transformation, and both are now needed in order not only to understand but also to respect humanity in all its diversity.

Cross-References

- ▶ [Bi- and Multilingual Family Language Socialization](#)
- ▶ [Heritage Language Learning and Socialization](#)
- ▶ [Language Socialization and Family Dinnertime Discourse](#)
- ▶ [Language Socialization and Schooling](#)
- ▶ [Language Socialization in Children's Peer and Sibling-Kin Group Interactions](#)
- ▶ [Language Socialization in Study Abroad](#)
- ▶ [Language Socialization, Language Ideologies, and Language Shift Among School-Aged Children](#)
- ▶ [Language Socialization: An Historical Overview](#)
- ▶ [Multilingual Socialization and Education in Non-Western Settings](#)

Related Articles in the Encyclopedia of Language and Education

Paul Garrett: [Researching Language Socialization](#). In Volume: Research Methods in Language and Education

Monica Heller and Mireille McLaughlin: [Language Choice And Symbolic Domination](#). In Volume: Discourse and Education

Kendall King and Lyn Fogle: [Family Language Policy](#). In Volume: Language Policy and Political Issues in Education

Sandra Lee McKay: [Sociolinguistics And Language Education](#). In Volume: Second and Foreign Language Education

- Thomas Ricento: [Researching Historical / Political Perspectives on Language, Education and Ideology](#). In Volume: Research Methods in Language and Education
- Anna Verschik: [Language Contact, Language Awareness And Multilingualism](#). In Volume: Language Awareness and Multilingualism

References

- Barnèche, S. (2005). Vie urbaine et transmission des langues à Nouméa [Urban life and the transmission of languages in Noumea]. *Glottopol*, 5, 67–91.
- Boudreau, A., & Perrot, M.-E. (2005). Quel français enseigner en milieu minoritaire ? Minorités et contact de langues : Le cas de l'Acadie [What French should be taught in minority contexts? Minorities and language contact: The Acadian case]. *Glottopol*, 6, 7–21.
- Bourdieu, P. (1982/1991). *Ce que parler veut dire*. Paris: Fayard. *Language and symbolic power* (trans: Thompson, J. B.). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Bourdieu, P., & Passeron, J.-C. (1970/1990). *La reproduction: Eléments pour une théorie du système d'enseignement*. Paris: Editions de Minuit. *Reproduction in education, society and culture* (2nd ed.) (trans: Nice, R.). Los Angeles: SAGE.
- Carlson Berg, L. (2010). Experiences of newcomers to Fransaskois schools: Opportunities for community collaboration. *McGill Journal of Education / Revue des sciences de l'éducation de McGill*, 45(2), 287–304.
- Carlson Berg, L. (2014). *La francophonie canadienne dans toutes ses couleurs et les défis de l'inclusion scolaire [Canadian francophonie in all its colors and the challenges of educational inclusion]*. Laval: Presses de l'Université Laval.
- Costa, J. (2017). *Revitalising language in Provence: A critical approach*. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Costa, J., & Lambert, P. (2009). France and language(s): Old policies and new challenges in education. Towards a renewed framework? In *CIDREE yearbook: Language policy and practice in Europe – Emerging challenges and innovative responses* (pp. 15–26). Brussels: CIDREE/DVO.
- Dalley, P., & Villella, M. (2015). La formation à l'enseignement en Ontario français [The education of teachers in French Ontario]. *Formation et profession*, 23(3), 156–162.
- Doucet, R. C. (2003). *Language ideology, socialization and pedagogy in Haitian schools and society*. PhD dissertation, New York University.
- Garrett, P. (2005). What a language is good for: Language socialization, language shift, and the persistence of code-specific genres in St. Lucia. *Language in Society*, 34(3), 327–361.
- Gérin-Lajoie, D. (Ed.). (2006). La contribution de l'école au processus de construction identitaire des élèves dans une société pluraliste [School's contribution to the process of identity construction of students in a pluralist society]. *Education et francophonie*, 34(1), http://www.acef.ca/c/revue/pdf/ACELF_XXXIV_1.pdf
- Ghesquière, M., & Meurant, L. (2016). L'envers de la broderie. Une pédagogie bilingue français-langue des signes [The backside of the embroidery: A case of bilingual (French and sign language) pedagogy]. *Glottopol*, 27, 95–111.
- Ghimenton, A., & Costa, L. (2016). Code-switching et socialisation plurilingue au sein de trois familles italo-phones en France [Code-switching and multilingual socialization at home among Italian-speaking families in France]. In M. Langner & V. Jovanovic (Eds.), *Facetten der Mehrsprachigkeit. Reflets du plurilinguisme* (pp. 97–117). Bern: Peter Lang.
- Heller, M. (1994). *Crosswords: Language, ethnicity and education in French Ontario*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Heller, M. (2011). *Paths to postnationalism: A critical ethnography of language and identity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Heller, M., & Martin-Jones, M. (Eds.). (2001). *Voices of authority: Education and linguistic difference*. Westport: Ablex.
- Jaffe, A. (1999). *Ideologies in action: Language politics on Corsica*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Jaffe, A. (2009). Stance in a Corsican school: Institutional and ideological orders. In A. Jaffe (Ed.), *Stance: Sociolinguistic perspectives* (pp. 119–145). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Jaffe, A. (2016). *Labels, cultural and moral orders: Schooling consumers to premium prices for Corsican charcuterie*. Minneapolis: American Anthropological Association Conference.
- Jeanneret, T., & Zeiter, A.-C. (2013). Socialisation langagière et agentivité du sujet [Language socialization and agency of the subject]. *Bulletin Suisse de Linguistique Appliqué [special issue]*, 63–75. http://www.vals-asla.ch/cms/fr/bulletin/numeros_parus.html.
- Kinginger, C. (2008). Language learning in study abroad: Case studies of Americans in France. *Modern Language Journal, Monograph Series, 1*, 1–124.
- Kinginger, C. (2013). Language socialization in study abroad. In C. Chapelle (Ed.), *The encyclopedia of applied linguistics*. Malden: Blackwell. doi:10.1002/9781405198431.wbeal1121.
- Koven, M. (2007). *Selves in two languages: Bilinguals' verbal enactments of identity in French and Portuguese*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Lafontaine, L., & Le Cunff, C. (2006). Les représentations de l'enseignement de l'oral [Representations of the teaching of oral competence]. *Québec français, 141*, 87–89.
- Lamarre, P., & Rossell Paredes, J. (2003). Growing up trilingual in Montreal: Perceptions of college students. In R. Bayley & S. R. Schecter (Eds.), *Language socialization in bilingual and multilingual societies* (pp. 62–80). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Lamarre, P., Lamarre, S., & Lefranc, M. (2015). *La socialisation langagière comme processus dynamique [Language socialization as a dynamic process]*. Québec: Conseil supérieur de la langue française. <http://www.cslf.gouv.qc.ca/publications/pubf329/f329.pdf>
- Lambert, P. (2005). Les répertoires plurilectaux de jeunes filles d'un lycée professionnel. Une approche sociolinguistique ethnographique, Thèse de doctorat sous la dir. de J. Billiez, Université Stendhal Grenoble 3.
- Lambert, P., & Trimaille, C. (2011). *Sociolinguistique des pratiques langagières de jeunes en France et language socialization: Potentialité des contacts. [The sociolinguistics of youth language in France and language socialization: Potential bridges]*. Montreal: American Anthropological Association Conference.
- Leconte, F. (2005). Récits d'enfants bilingues [Stories of bilingual children]. *Glottopol, 5*, 27–43.
- Leconte, F., & Mortamet, C. (2005). Les représentations du plurilinguisme des adolescents scolarisés en classe d'accueil [Representations of multilingualism by adolescents in immigrant welcome classes]. *Glottopol, 6*, 22–57.
- Léglise, I., & Migge, B. (Eds.). (2007). *Pratiques et représentations linguistiques en Guyane : Regards croisés [Linguistic practices and ideologies in French Guiana]*. Paris: IRD Editions.
- Luna, S., & Parisot, A.-M. (2016). Méthodes d'enseignement institutionnelles québécoises : Effets sur la production d'oralisations en LSQ chez les aînés sourds [The effects of Quebecois institutional teaching methods on the oralization of Quebec sign language by deaf elders]. *Glottopol, 27*, 112–129.
- Marshall, K. K., & Bokhorst-Heng, W. (2016). *Caught in the cultural abyss: french immersion teacher discourse in the context of unequal power relations*. Orlando, FL: AAAL Conference.
- McAll, C. (2003). Language dynamics in the bi- and multilingual workplace. In R. Bayley & S. R. Schecter (Eds.), *Language socialization in bilingual and multilingual societies* (pp. 235–250). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Miller, P. J., Koven, M., & Lin, S. (2011). Language socialization and narrative. In A. Duranti, E. Ochs, & B. B. Schieffelin (Eds.), *Handbook of language socialization* (pp. 190–208). Malden: Blackwell.
- Mondada, L., & Laurent, G. (2001). Classroom interaction and the bilingual resources of migrant students in Switzerland. In M. Heller & M. Martin-Jones (Eds.), *Voices of authority: Education and linguistic difference* (pp. 235–268). Westport, CT: Ablex Publishing.

- Moore, L. C. (2006). Learning by heart in Koranic and public schools in northern Cameroon. *Social Analysis: The International Journal of Cultural and Social Practice*, 50(3), 109–126.
- Morgenstern, A., Debras, C., Beupoil-Hourdel, P., Le Mené, M., Caët, S., & Kremer-Sadlik, T. (2015). L'art de l'artichaut et autres rituels: Transmission de pratiques sociales et alimentaires dans les diners familiaux parisiens [The art of the artichoke and other rituals: Transmission of social and dining practices during Parisian family dinners]. *Anthropology of Food*, 9. <https://aof.revues.org/7836> on 7/15/16
- Ndayipfukamiye, L. (2001). The contradictions of teaching bilingually in postcolonial Burundi: From nyakatsi to maisons en étages. In M. Heller & M. Martin-Jones (Eds.), *Voices of authority: Education and linguistic difference* (pp. 101–115). Westport, CT: Ablex Publishing.
- Patrick, D. (2003). Language socialization and second language acquisition in a multilingual arctic Quebec Community. In R. Bayley & S. R. Schecter (Eds.), *Language socialization in bilingual and multilingual societies* (pp. 165–181). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Paugh, A. (2012). *Playing with languages: Children and change in a Caribbean village*. New York: Berghahn Books.
- Rabain-Jamin, J., & Sabeau-Jouannet, E. (1995). Genèse des marques de la personne en français et en wolof : Les premier dialogues mère-enfant [The origins of person markers in French and in Wolof: The first mother-child dialogues]. *La Linguistique*, 31(1), 65–79.
- Rabain-Jamin, J., & Sabeau-Jouannet, E. (1997). Maternal speech to 4-month-old infants in two cultures: Wolof and French. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, 20(3), 425–451.
- Riley, K. C. (2007). To tangle or not to tangle: Shifting language ideologies and the socialization of Charabia in the Marquesas, French Polynesia. In M. Makihara & B. B. Schieffelin (Eds.), *Consequences of contact: Language ideologies and sociocultural transformations in Pacific societies* (pp. 70–95). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Riley, K. C. (2009). Who made the soup? Socializing the researcher and cooking her data. *Language and Communication*, 29(3), 254–270.
- Riley, K. C. (2011). Language socialization and language ideologies. In A. Duranti, E. Ochs, & B. B. Schieffelin (Eds.), *Handbook of language socialization* (pp. 493–514). Malden: Blackwell.
- Riley, K. C. (2012). Learning to exchange words for food in the Marquesas. In L. Coleman (Ed.), *Food: Ethnographic encounters* (pp. 111–125). Oxford: Berg Publishers.
- Riley, K. C. (2013). L'idéologie hétéroglossique et l'identité dialogique à Montréal [Heteroglossic ideologies and dialogic identities in Montreal]. In C. Trimaille & J.-M. Eloy (Eds.), *Idéologies linguistiques et discriminations [Linguistic ideologies and discriminations]* (pp. 59–83). Paris: Harmattan.
- Riley, K. C. (2014). Language socialization. In C. Fäcke (Ed.), *Manual of language acquisition* (pp. 69–86). Berlin: Walter De Gruyter.
- Riley, K. C. (2016). Learning to talk while eating: Food-and-language socialization in the Marquesas and France. Invited lecture at the 50th Anniversary of the Anthropology Department, CUNY Graduate Center, New York.
- Riley, K. C., & Tetahiotupa, E. (2006). *Learning to use Charabia in the Marquesas*. Montreal: American Association for Applied Linguistics.
- Roy, S. (2003). Bilingualism and standardization in a Canadian call center: Challenges for a linguistic minority community. In R. Bayley & S. R. Schecter (Eds.), *Language socialization in bilingual and multilingual societies* (pp. 269–285). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Roy, S. (2010). Not truly, not entirely. . . *Pas comme les francophones* [Not like the francophones]. *Canadian Journal of Education*, 33(3), 541–563.
- Sabria, R. (Ed.). (2016). Les langues des signes. Langues minoritaires et sociétés [Sign languages. Minority languages and societies]. *Glottopol*, 27 [special issue].
- Salaün, M. (2010). Un colonialisme glottophage ? L'enseignement de la langue française dans les écoles indigènes en Nouvelle-Calédonie (1863–1945) [Colonial linguicide? Teaching French at indigenous schools in New Caledonia]. *Histoire de l'éducation*, 128, 53–77.

- Salaün, M. (2012). Quand la langue d'origine rencontre la forme scolaire : Le cas du tahitien en Polynésie française [When the home language meets the school variety: The case of Tahitian in French Polynesia]. *Revue française d'éducation comparée*, 8, 185–206.
- Salaün, M. (2015). Des Kanak au Québec. L'expérience de de jeunes autochtones calédoniens en formation aux métiers de la mine à Rouyn et à de Sept-Îles. [The experience of young Caledonians while training for mine employment in Rouyn and Sept-Îles]. *Recherches amérindiennes au Québec*, 44(2–3), 55–62.
- Schieffelin, B. B. (1994). Code-switching and language socialization. In J. Duchan, L. Hewitt, & R. Sonnenmeier (Eds.), *Pragmatics: From theory to practice* (pp. 20–42). Prentice Hall: New York.
- Tessoneau, A. L. (2005). Learning respect in Guadeloupe: Greetings and politeness rituals. In S. Mühleisen & B. Migge (Eds.), *Politeness and face in Caribbean creoles* (pp. 255–282). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Tetahiotupa, E. (1999). *Bilinguisme et scolarisation en Polynésie française*. Doctoral thesis, Université de Paris I. [Bilingualism and Schooling in French Polynesia].
- Tetraut, C. (2015). *Transcultural teens: Performing youth identities in French cités*. Malden: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Trimaillé, C. (2003). *Approche sociolinguistique de la socialisation langagière d'adolescents* [A sociolinguistic approach to the language socialization of adolescents]. Ph.D dissertation, Université Stendhal – Grenoble III.
- Trimaillé, C. (2007). Stylisation vocale et autres procédés dialogiques dans la socialisation langagière adolescente [Vocal stylization and other dialogic processes in adolescent language socialization]. *Cahiers de Praxématique*, 47, 183–206.
- Van Den Avenne, C. (2001). De l'expérience plurilingue à l'expérience diglossique: Migrants maliens en France [From multilingualism to diglossia: Malian migrants in France]. *Cahiers d'Études africaines*, 163–164, 619–636. <http://etudesafriaines.revues.org/112>
- Williams, R. S., & Riley, K. C. (2001). Acquiring a slice of Anglo-American pie: A portrait of language shift in a Franco-American family. In R. D. González & I. Melis (Eds.), *Language ideologies: Critical perspectives on the official English movement, History, theory, and policy* (Vol. 2, pp. 63–90). Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Part VI

Language Socialization in Additional Communities and Contexts

Signed Language Socialization in Deaf Communities

Carol J. Erting and Marlon Kuntze

Abstract

Language socialization in Deaf communities is unique in ways that are challenging for language socialization theory. Worldwide, indigenous signed languages emerge wherever Deaf individuals have sustained social interaction among themselves, but historically they have been stigmatized and marginalized. Most Deaf children are born into non-Deaf households without access to signed language from birth, often acquiring a signed language through informal social networks in later years. Following the recognition of signed languages as bona fide linguistic systems in the 1960s, ethnographic studies documented language socialization in a variety of contexts: families, educational settings, Deaf clubs, isolated Deaf/non-Deaf rural communities, and transnational events. As evidence of the linguistic status of natural signed languages mounted, political movements championing the rights of Deaf people as linguistic and cultural minorities led to the establishment of bilingual education programs for Deaf children. Simultaneously, changes in educational policy and advances in technology and medicine began to negatively affect patterns of signed language socialization. Most Deaf children are now educated in local school settings where signed languages are usually absent, and the dominant discourses promoting the techno-medical eradication of Deaf people threaten to obfuscate and trivialize the Deaf child's need for optimal language socialization in natural signed languages and majority spoken languages. One surprising characteristic of signed language communities is their tenacity in the face of efforts to suppress and eradicate them, especially given the discontinuity of traditional caregiver-to-child language socialization across generations. Signed language socialization studies in such circumstances promise contributions to theory building offered by few communities.

C.J. Erting (✉) • M. Kuntze
Gallaudet University, Washington, DC, USA
e-mail: carol.erting@gallaudet.edu; marlon.kuntze@gallaudet.edu

Keywords

Deaf communities • Deaf children • Visually-based culture • Visually-based language • Access to signed languages • Signed language socialization • Deaf community • Indigenous signed languages • Residential schools • Deaf teachers • Deaf parents • Transnational • Deafhood • Deaf identity • Medical-scientific establishment • Techno-medical eradication

Contents

Introduction	384
Early Developments	385
Major Contributions	386
Work in Progress	389
Problems and Difficulties	390
Future Directions	392
Cross-References	393
Related Articles in the Encyclopedia of Language and Education	393
References	394

Introduction

Language socialization in Deaf¹ communities is unique in ways that are challenging for language socialization theory. Most members of the DEAF-WORLD² have not followed a straightforward path to identification with and participation in the community. A small percentage of Deaf children are born into Deaf families where everyday interaction occurs within a visually based culture through a visually based language that has evolved and been passed down from one generation to the next. For these children, the process of language socialization is similar to that of most children; only the modality differs. But for the majority of Deaf children, who are born to non-Deaf parents who do not expect their child to be deaf, early access to signed languages is absent. Since these children do not hear, they cannot fully participate in the spoken language socialization environment their parents naturally provide. And because signed languages have been stigmatized historically and Deaf communities have been oppressed, marginalized, and, as some would argue, colonized by non-Deaf majorities (Ladd 2003; Markowicz and Woodward 1978), the primary sites of signed language socialization for most Deaf people have been community institutions such as Deaf schools and Deaf clubs. Deaf people acquire signed language and become oriented to the DEAF-WORLD primarily by coming into contact with peers and elders in the Deaf community, which may not occur until later in childhood, adolescence, or even adulthood.

¹The authors use capital Deaf (with a capital D) throughout the chapter to portray Deaf people through an anthropological perspective, except when denoting an individual's hearing status.

²DEAF-WORLD (Lane et al. 1996) denotes a community not defined by geography or ethnicity that consists of speakers who use an indigenous signed language as a primary language.

Early Developments

Indigenous signed languages have emerged naturally whenever and wherever Deaf individuals have had the opportunity for frequent and sustained social interaction among themselves. With the establishment of residential schools for Deaf students in Europe during the eighteenth century, access to signed languages greatly increased for Deaf people, especially for Deaf children. Those residential schools and the linguistic communities they gave rise to provided institutional stability and continuity of language socialization across generations.

Signed languages were not viewed as bona fide linguistic systems until William C. Stokoe's (1960) groundbreaking publication *Sign Language Structure* demonstrated that they were constructed and patterned in linguistically rule-governed ways like all other naturally occurring languages. Building on the revolutionary work of Stokoe and his colleagues in the USA and Tervoort (1961) and his colleagues in Europe, social scientists investigated not only the linguistic structure of natural signed languages but also the social and cultural aspects of these visually based linguistic communities. Theoretical and descriptive studies during the 1970s and 1980s began to portray signing Deaf people from a cultural perspective, as thriving in visually based communities, in contrast to the prevailing pathological, medicalized view of Deaf people that situated them on the margins of spoken language communities. The sociocultural view of Deaf people emphasized the centrality of natural signed languages and shared experiences, not degree of hearing loss, in constituting Deaf social identities, social organization, and cultural values (Baker and Battison 1980; Meadow 1972; Washabaugh 1981). Most Deaf communities, at least in the USA, were described as bilingual and diglossic. Natural signed languages were used in informal, intimate interactions (labeled the low variety or L in the literature on diglossia), and English-influenced signed language varieties were used in formal social settings, such as classrooms, church services, lectures, and conversations with nonnative signers (labeled the high variety or H in the diglossic literature). Within the DEAF-WORLD, it was argued that the social reality of Deaf people was indexed by a natural signed language, while the spoken language of the larger community in its various forms indexed the non-Deaf world (Nash and Nash 1981).

Writing about socialization to the Deaf linguistic community at a time in American education when the majority of Deaf children attended residential schools, Meadow (1972) suggested that there were three transition points in the life cycle of Deaf individuals when they may be socialized to the signed language community. They are:

- (i) Infancy (the child born into a signing family)
- (ii) The time of enrollment in a residential Deaf school (the child born into a non-signing family who typically entered the residential school between the ages of 5 and 13)
- (iii) The time of graduation from a non-signing high school and subsequent entry into the workforce, access to signing Deaf co-workers or socializing at Deaf club

Early research on American Sign Language (ASL) acquisition was conducted on children with Deaf signing parents providing the first systematic description of language socialization processes in Deaf ASL-using families. While only a few of these early studies described the sociocultural context of language acquisition, findings included documentation of systematic modifications of parental signing to infants and toddlers not unlike child-directed speech in spoken languages (Kantor 1982), a young Deaf child's code-switching between ASL and varieties of signing that incorporate English grammatical structures (Williams 1976), and an account of the complex interaction of languages and modalities that supports the acquisition of written English in an ASL dominant home context (Maxwell 1984).

Other researchers examined language socialization processes in educational contexts where varying combinations of spoken languages, English-influenced signing, and natural signed languages were utilized. Microanalysis of Deaf children interacting in these multilingual and bimodal contexts revealed that language socialization took place primarily in the visual modality, a fact that was lost on many non-Deaf teachers of Deaf children (Cicourel and Boese 1972; Preisler 1983). One early ethnographic study investigated how language use by adults, both Deaf and non-Deaf, and young Deaf children indexed cultural values, social identity, and other aspects of sociocultural knowledge, demonstrating that the use of ASL indexed affiliation with the DEAF-WORLD and its values, while the use of manually coded English (MCE) referenced non-Deaf world contexts, interpretations, and values (Erting 1982/1994).

Major Contributions

During the past three decades, as evidence of the linguistic status of natural signed languages mounted, political movements championing the rights of Deaf people as linguistic and cultural minorities led to:

- (i) The establishment of bilingual education programs for Deaf children
- (ii) The selection in 1988 of the first Deaf president of Gallaudet University, the world's oldest university for Deaf students located in Washington DC
- (iii) The first Deaf Way international conference and festival in 1989 celebrating Deaf cultures, histories, languages, and arts
- (iv) The recognition and teaching of natural signed languages as foreign languages in high schools and universities (Erting et al. 1994)

Paradoxically, during this same period, a new trend emerged to move Deaf children from large regional programs where signing is more likely to thrive into small local school settings where signing is usually largely absent. As a result, Deaf students have been increasingly isolated from signing peers and adult Deaf role models and thus denied opportunities for signed language socialization during their formative years.

Ethnographic research on Deaf communities is of critical interest for language socialization research, especially as it illuminates social and linguistic processes in specific activity settings. During the 1980s and 1990s, ethnographic studies of Deaf people's lives provided insight into a variety of language socialization contexts: families, educational settings, Deaf clubs, Deaf minority communities, and isolated Deaf/non-Deaf rural communities. Blackburn's (2000) ethnographic study illustrated the complexity of language socialization in the Deaf community from the vantage point of a 4-year-old Deaf child in a large non-Deaf family, a family who sought to transform itself into a visually oriented, bilingual, bicultural entity. The researcher lived with the family for 10 months documenting how the parents, siblings, and the child himself dealt with a variety of complex and challenging communicative, linguistic, and social situations that face mixed families with Deaf and non-Deaf members, even those who have adopted a proactive and positive stance toward the child's visual worldview.

Despite the fact that residential schools for Deaf children were historically the primary sites for language socialization to the Deaf community, only a few ethnographic studies exist that illuminate the complex social, cultural, and linguistic processes at work in these settings. Evans and Falk (1986) published the first in-depth study in the USA that focused on daily life in a residential school. Their observations and interpretations echoed the pervasive negative attitudes toward the indigenous or natural signed language (ASL) and culture of Deaf people. They reported that while ASL was the preferred language of the children, the non-Deaf adults who worked with them did not often use the language, and when they did, they often used it poorly; few could understand the signed language of the children. Unfortunately, these researchers themselves did not observe and report peer language socialization processes in any detail.

Reilly and Reilly's (2005) study of Deaf children at a residential school in rural Thailand during 1991–1992 focused on the children's use of the indigenous signed language outside the classroom. They documented the transmission of culture and knowledge from the older children to their younger peers. This process, labeled the Deaf way of education by the authors, is supported by a social organization and processes of language socialization created by the children over time. Narrative played a central role in how Deaf children learned from each other about the world, about themselves, and their place in the society. Students, who were recognized by their peers as sign masters, relayed the news, acted as interpreters, and created extended narratives with complex plots that captivated students 1–3 years younger for as long as 30 min at a time. Other contexts for language socialization were participatory gatherings that were "dialogic and egalitarian activities by students of equal social status" (Reilly and Reilly 2005, p. 189) including conversational circles, verbal dueling, and games and sports.

Studies of educational settings where Deaf adults as teachers or assistants interact with Deaf children reveal the critical role these adults play in language socialization. Deaf teachers are more likely to create the opportunities in classroom contexts for Deaf children to experience full membership in the bilingual Deaf classroom community through language, action, and participation. Furthermore, the social context

of the classroom where a natural signed language is used is the only setting where many Deaf children have the opportunity to acquire a signed language with the teacher and native signers as their primary linguistic model. Ethnographic research suggests that the most effective teachers are the ones who are proficient in a natural signed language, understand Deaf children's strengths as visual learners, and promote linguistically rich, visually based dialogic engagement in classroom activities.

One domain that has received increased attention in recent years is bilingual classrooms where the signed languages and written forms of the spoken language are utilized as languages of instruction. Regardless of the type of setting or educational level of the students, Deaf adults in several studies code-switched between a natural signed language and a variety of signing more closely aligned with spoken language structures to engage in extended dialog with students. They drew upon their Deaf cultural knowledge to mediate learning the language of reading and writing (Johnson and Erting 1989; Ladd 2003). L. Erting (2006), in her ethnographic study of Deaf teachers sharing books with preschool Deaf children in ASL, identified specific, culturally based literacy practices used to co-construct meaning with Deaf children from linguistically and ethnically diverse backgrounds. These practices included connecting ASL and written English and translating English text into child-directed ASL, which, according to the teachers, help scaffold children's ASL development, emergent literacy, and cognitive development.

Bagga-Gupta's (1999–2000) ethnographic research in Swedish high school classrooms for Deaf students challenged the educational policy of strict separation of the Swedish Sign Language and Swedish. Taking a sociocultural approach to her exploration of everyday life in these classrooms, she explored the ways in which teachers and students co-constructed visual literacy events through interaction using the cultural tools available to them. Deaf and hearing actors in these visually organized settings chained and mixed the two languages in dynamic, complex, complementary ways that helped make written Swedish more fully accessible to Deaf students. These findings are not unlike ethnographic evidence from ASL/English Deaf home environments where signing Deaf parents draw upon ASL, fingerspelling, and printing and mouthing of spoken English words in complex and patterned ways to co-construct meaning with their very young Deaf children growing up bilingually. Kuntze (2000) examined how a Deaf teacher wove English vocabulary and structure into ASL while giving a lecture on China's Great Wall and in so doing, helped his middle school students prepare for reading their textbook on the subject. The teacher used code-switching as a pedagogical tool, making targeted English words and phrases accessible and comprehensible for the students by embedding them into ASL translations and explanations.

For some Deaf people who are not exposed to signed language during childhood, Deaf clubs serve as one acculturation site where newcomers learn how to be Deaf. Deaf clubs are cultural institutions within Deaf communities that have historically served as regular gathering places where Deaf people socialize with one another and exchange information. While Deaf clubs are currently in decline in the Western world, Hall's (1991) ethnographic study of folklore in an American Deaf club reveals how central the Deaf club was to members' lives and how diligently

members worked to socialize young Deaf people from various educational and linguistic backgrounds to ASL and the values so important to them, often through mentor relationships. Drawing upon traditional stories, personal narratives, riddles, jokes, and sign play, mentors guided newcomers in their acquisition of the linguistic and cultural knowledge they needed to live their lives as culturally Deaf people. Deaf people often regarded the club as their second home, a place where they could express freely their sense of a shared heritage and a shared future and through which they could connect with other Deaf communities across space and time.

The first large scale study of adult hearing offspring of Deaf parents (commonly known as CODAs, short for Children of Deaf Adults) was published by a CODA scholar (Preston 1994). Preston interviewed 150 CODAs between the ages of 18 and 80 across the USA. He concluded that despite the bilingual proficiency of many of his informants, there was a pervasive sense of cultural marginality due in large part to the history of conflict between the two language groups and what CODAs regard as an artificial choice between two cultural identities, Hearing or Deaf. One factor contributing to the sense of cultural marginality experienced by some CODAs may be the ambivalence that some Deaf parents feel regarding their hearing children's language needs. This ambivalence may result in an idiosyncratic approach to communication wherein single elements from the signed language and the spoken language are inserted into a single language base resulting in restricted access to and participation in the signed language socialization process (Cramér-Wolrath 2013).

Work in Progress

Research in progress on language socialization in Deaf communities is characterized by its cross-cultural and transnational emphasis as well as its more explicitly ethnographic orientation. In Monaghan et al. (2003), studies of Deaf communities and their signed languages from the USA, Central and South America, Europe, Asia, and Africa are juxtaposed. Taken together, the studies reveal the multilingual and multicultural nature of worldwide Deaf communities within the context of a unique transnational visually oriented languaculture (Uhlig 2015). While historical circumstances, the larger sociopolitical and economic opportunity structure, and local cultural and linguistic traditions have fostered intriguing differences among Deaf communities and their language socialization practices and trajectories, there are indications of cross-cultural commonalities. For example, educational institutions, hereditary deafness, and urban density are all factors that contribute in culturally specific ways to the formation of Deaf communities across the globe. Visual orientation to the world and signed languages are central to those Deaf communities – even when speech-based communication has a significant role. Signed languages and Deaf communities repeatedly are shown to be resilient, having survived brutal campaigns to obliterate them (Baynton 1996; Lockwood 2014; Müller de Quadros et al. 2014).

Within the context of globalization, Breivik (2005) utilized life stories of Deaf Norwegians to explore issues of language and identity formation and in the process

discovered the transnational nature of Deafhood and Deaf identities. He gave an account of how Deaf people from different parts of the world attending transnational events such as the Nineteenth Deaflympics (a word invented to mean the Deaf Olympics) in Rome in the summer of 2001 quickly established ad hoc linguistic and communicative conventions by which they were able to bond socially. In addition to the commonality of experiences that signing and being Deaf in a non-Deaf world gives rise to, the ability to bond helps foster translocal and even transnational Deaf identity. Breivik's exploration of the relationship between languages and Deaf identities through Deaf life stories illustrates the challenges inherent in employing an ethnocultural model for understanding the formation of Deaf identity based on center vs. periphery analyses (with more Deaf at the center and less Deaf at the margins). Breivik argued that this model is problematic since the extent to which exposure to a signed language and a community of signers influences what it means to be Deaf varies depending on when the signed language community is introduced in the life of an individual as well as the extent to which one has access to that community.

Studies of the Nicaraguan Deaf community have offered intriguing insights into signed language socialization processes. Since the late 1970s when the government established a school and members of the Nicaraguan Deaf community began to have sustained contact, each new cohort of children has played a critical role in the development of Nicaragua Sign Language (NSL) and the emergence of Nicaragua's signing communities. While bidirectionality in socialization has long been acknowledged, Senghas et al. (2005) demonstrated this bidirectionality with respect to the regularization of spatial co-reference, a grammatical device in NSL whereby signs produced in a given location in space indicate a common referent. They argued that no single cohort of Deaf children created NSL. Instead, "the sociocultural influence of Deaf Nicaraguan adolescents and adults interacted with the language-receptive and language-creative mental abilities of preadolescent children" (p. 304), which contributes to the developing grammaticalization of the new language.

Problems and Difficulties

Changes in educational policy as well as advances in technology and medicine have changed the patterns of signed language socialization. The vast majority of Deaf children are now educated without access to Deaf teachers and the signing Deaf community. Wilkens and Hehir (2008) argued that the looming problem in the education of Deaf students is the dwindling access Deaf children now have to social capital in the form of Deaf teachers and Deaf peers. Winn (2007) raised a related concern that the common practice in Australia of putting Deaf children in an inclusive setting without viable signed language models is creating a "subgroup of people who have been disenfranchised in developing effective communication skills" (p. 69). Developments in computer and communications technologies such as email, text and video messaging, videophones, and video relay services have resulted in greater access for Deaf people to each other and to the world at large.

At the same time, advances in communication technologies have been cited as one of the reasons for the decline of Deaf clubs in recent years.

In addition, medically related technologies are giving rise to renewed efforts to suppress signed languages and signing communities. The advent of nearly universal newborn infant hearing screening has been heralded as a success, making possible the early identification of many more deaf and hard of hearing children than in the past. However, instead of referring families with deaf infants to educational programs where the entire family may acquire and learn signed language, the medical system puts a majority of these infants on track toward cochlear implantation – now occurring at increasingly younger ages – and speech-only “intervention” programs (Johnson 2006; Johnston 2004). Advocates of these programs most often stridently oppose providing these deaf children and their families with the linguistic and cultural resources that facilitate early exposure to a natural signed language despite mounting scientific evidence that progress in spoken language acquisition and literacy is enhanced by early signed language socialization (Mellon et al. 2015). Ironically, research documenting the benefits of early exposure to signing for hearing children and their parents has resulted in popular enrichment programs largely for socioeconomically advantaged segments of the USA and western European nations (Goodwyn and Acredolo 1998; Snoddon 2014).

As is so often the case in the education of Deaf children, a false dichotomy has been resurrected between two idealized versions of Deaf identity and their related educational philosophies: speech-only approaches versus visually based pedagogies utilizing a natural signed language and the written form of a spoken language as the primary languages of instruction. In fact, Johnson (2006) argues, the outcome of cochlear implantation is actually a population of Deaf students with great variation in functional hearing ability and spoken language use, not unlike the non-implanted population. Some children develop enough functional hearing to participate in spoken language socialization opportunities in an unimpeded manner; many do not. The bilingual education movement in Deaf education is based not only on the recognition of Deaf communities as bilingual and multicultural but also on empirical evidence that when Deaf children grow up in a natural signed language environment, they “acquire language in a complete and timely way, while developing age-appropriate cognitive, physical and social capacities” (Johnson 2006, p. 44). Further, there is ample ethnographic evidence that Deaf people embrace linguistic and cultural diversity and utilize a range of linguistic and cultural tools in their communities of practice across the globe.

The medical-scientific establishment continues to dominate the public discourse about Deaf people as disabled and damaged, and genetic modification to eliminate Deaf offspring is now regarded as inevitable. The challenge for Deaf communities and their ethnographers remains – to overcome the power imbalance, to challenge the privileged “voices” in the debate which are never Deaf “voices” (Padden and Humphries 2005), and to contest the prevailing medical-scientific discourse on “deafness” with a discourse of Deafhood, the process whereby Deaf people struggle to come to an understanding of what it means to become and to be a Deaf person in a Deaf community (Ladd 2003).

Future Directions

Since language is both the content and the medium for socializing children and newcomers to effective participation in a sociocultural group, complex and intriguing issues for language socialization theory emerge in the case of the Deaf community. One dilemma has been that of the persistent simplistic question as to whether the majority of deaf children (born to hearing parents) are to be socialized into the speaking community of their hearing parents or into the signing community. The reality is that most deaf children are primarily visually oriented, and because of their inherently limited access to the speaking community, they eventually become part of the signing community where their identity as a signing people with a history and future is discovered, anchored, and cherished. Of course, they also belong to and participate in the larger speaking community, and technological advances have made access to that community and the majority language(s) less problematic.

The World Federation of the Deaf reports that signed language is repressed in many countries, and its use is not permitted in education (Haualand and Allen 2009). Furthermore, up to 90% of the world's Deaf children and adults have never been to school and are thus more or less illiterate. Perhaps more serious than the lack of formal education is the denial of opportunities for language socialization that educational institutions afford. Mweri (2014) argues that in Kenya since the policy guiding mother tongue (MT) education in schools does not address signed languages and the education of Deaf children, the use of the Deaf child's MT, Kenyan Sign Language, is largely ignored. Instead, the emphasis remains on teaching the Deaf child to speak. Mweri asserts that the denial of the use of Kenyan Sign Language is in "direct contravention of article 26 of the universal declaration on Human Rights" (p. 3), preventing Deaf children from acquiring access to an education. Anglin-Jaffe's (2013) study of Deaf children as peer educators in boarding schools in Nicaragua and Thailand suggests that peer-based experiential and dialogic interaction are acts of resistance toward the punitive, didactic policies and practices banning sign languages and Deaf culture in their oralist schools.

One area that future work in language socialization research will need to address is the fundamental question of the kinds of family, educational, and community contexts that are necessary to enable Deaf children to use languages as social and cognitive tools. We need to understand how homes, schools, and communities can provide Deaf children with critical opportunities from the time they are born to engage in the socially and culturally co-constructed discourse so necessary for optimal linguistic, cognitive, and social/emotional development. There is a sense of urgency as scientific and medical discourses regarding the techno-medical eradication of Deaf people threaten to obfuscate and trivialize the need to identify, understand, and implement the necessary and sufficient conditions for optimal language socialization in natural signed languages and majority spoken languages.

Studies of some small, isolated villages outside of the USA with a substantial hereditary, signing Deaf population (Branson et al. 1996; Johnson 1991; Nonaka 2007, 2012; Zeshan and de Vos 2012) and ethnohistorical research on Martha's Vineyard (Groce 1985) have demonstrated alternative possibilities for the future of

Deaf/non-Deaf interaction. These small, face-to-face communities incorporate Deaf people and signed language as a taken-for-granted part of village life. While signed language socialization processes have not yet been sufficiently documented in these settings, research evidence indicates that non-Deaf and Deaf villagers acquire signed languages and a visual orientation to communication with varying degrees of competence as part of the linguistic and cultural repertoire of the community. Perhaps it is conceivable to envision a future with new communities such as these in other contexts and even on a larger scale. Today we see considerable evidence of the growing popularity of signed languages outside of traditional Deaf community social arenas. In the USA, the number of parents learning signs for early communication with their non-deaf babies is on the rise, and opportunities to learn a signed language as a foreign language in K-12 programs are expanding.

Finally, a cross-cultural investigation of patterns and constraints in signed language socialization in Deaf communities offers the opportunity to identify factors that remain constant across different sociocultural and linguistic circumstances and those that yield to pressure for change. One surprising characteristic of signed languages and their communities is their tenacity in the face of efforts by non-signing majorities to suppress and eradicate them, especially given the discontinuity of traditional caregiver-to-child linguistic and cultural transmission across generations. The resilience of signed languages in terms of their ability to appear where there were none before and to survive under dismal conditions is evidence of their unique niche within the diversity of human languages. Signed language socialization studies in such circumstances promise contributions to theory building offered by few communities. At the same time, it is also necessary and valuable to investigate signed language socialization in Deaf communities where signed language is valorized, treasured, and promoted as a member of the family of human languages. Research in these socio-cultural settings offers opportunities to validate as well as reevaluate existing language socialization theory. Further, additional signed language socialization data will help us envision possible futures for Deaf communities.

Cross-References

- ▶ [Language Socialization and Multimodality in Multilingual Urban Homes](#)
- ▶ [Language Socialization and Schooling](#)
- ▶ [Multilingual Socialization and Education in Non-Western Settings](#)

Related Articles in the Encyclopedia of Language and Education

- Sangeeta Bagga-Gupta: [Signed Languages in Bilingual Education](#). In Volume: Bilingual and Multilingual Education
- Gladys Tang: [Sign Bilingualism in Deaf Education](#). In Volume: Bilingual and Multilingual Education

References

- Anglin-Jaffe, H. (2013). Signs of resistance: Peer learning of sign languages within 'oral' schools for the deaf. *Studies in Philosophy of Education*, 32, 261–271.
- Bagga-Gupta, S. (1999–2000). Visual language environments: Exploring everyday life and literacies in Swedish deaf bilingual schools. *Visual Anthropology Review*, 15, 95–120.
- Baker, C., & Battison, R. (1980). *Sign language and the Deaf community: Essays in honor of William C. Stokoe*. Silver Spring: National Association of the Deaf.
- Baynton, D. (1996). *Forbidden signs: American culture and the campaign against sign language*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Blackburn, L. (2000). The development of sociolinguistic meanings: The worldview of a deaf child within his home environment. In M. Metzger (Ed.), *Bilingualism and identity in Deaf communities* (pp. 219–254). Washington, DC: Gallaudet University Press.
- Branson, J., Miller, D., & Marsaja, I. (1996). Everyone here speaks sign language, too: A deaf village in Bali, Indonesia. In C. Lucas (Ed.), *Multicultural aspects of sociolinguistics in deaf communities* (pp. 39–57). Washington, DC: Gallaudet University Press.
- Breivik, J. (2005). *Deaf identities in the making: Local lives, transnational connections*. Washington, DC: Gallaudet University Press.
- Cicourel, A., & Boese, R. (1972). Sign language and the teaching of deaf children. In C. Cazden, V. Johns, & D. Hymes (Eds.), *Functions of language in the classroom* (pp. 32–62). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Cramér-Wolrath, E. (2013). Parallel bimodal bilingual acquisition: A hearing child mediated in a Deaf family. *Sign Language Studies*, 13, 516–540.
- Erting, C. (1982). Deafness, communication, and social identity: An anthropological analysis of interaction among parents, teachers, and Deaf children in a preschool. *PhD dissertation*, American University, Washington, DC, *Dissertation Abstracts International* (43), 11, 3641. (UMI No. 8306972). Published in 1994 as *Deafness, communication, social identity: Ethnography in a preschool for deaf Children*. Burtonsville: Linstok Press.
- Erting, L. (2006). *Beyond strategies: Book sharing the Deaf way*. DVD. Washington, DC: Laurent Clerc National Deaf Education Center, Gallaudet University.
- Erting, C., Johnson, R., Smith, D., & Snider, B. (Eds.). (1994). *The Deaf way: Perspectives from the international conference on Deaf culture*. Washington, DC: Gallaudet University Press.
- Evans, A., & Falk, W. (1986). *Learning to be Deaf*. New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Goodwyn, S., & Acredolo, L. (1998). Encouraging symbolic gestures: Effects on the relationship between gesture and speech. In J. Iverson & S. Goldin-Meadows (Eds.), *The nature and functions of gesture in children's communication* (pp. 61–73). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Groce, N. (1985). *Everyone here spoke sign language: Hereditary deafness on Martha's Vineyard*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Hall, S. (1991). Door into Deaf culture: Folklore in an American Deaf social club. *Sign Language Studies*, 73, 421–429.
- Haualand, H., & Allen, C. (2009). *Deaf people and human rights*. Helsinki: World Federation of the Deaf and Swedish National Association of the Deaf.
- Johnson, R. (1991). Sign language, culture, and community in a traditional Yucatec Maya village. *Sign Language Studies*, 73, 461–478.
- Johnson, R. (2006). Cultural constructs that impede discussions about variability in speech-based educational models for deaf children with cochlear implants. *Perspectiva*, 24, 29–80. n. Especial (July/December), Florianopolis, Federal University of Santa Catarina, Brazil.
- Johnson, R., & Erting, C. (1989). Ethnicity and socialization in a classroom for deaf children. In C. Lucas (Ed.), *The sociolinguistics of the Deaf community* (pp. 41–83). New York: Academic.
- Johnston, T. (2004). W(h)ither the deaf community? Population, genetics, and the future of Australian sign language. *American Annals of the Deaf*, 148(5), 358–375.

- Kantor, R. (1982). Communicative interaction: Mother modification and child acquisition of American Sign Language. *Sign Language Studies*, 36, 233–282.
- Kuntze, M. (2000). Codeswitching in ASL and written-English contact. In K. Emmorey & H. Lane (Eds.), *Signed language research: An anthology to honor Ursula Bellugi and Edward Klima* (pp. 287–302). Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Ladd, P. (2003). *Understanding Deaf culture: In search of Deafhood*. Buffalo: Multilingual Matters.
- Lane, H., Hoffmeister, R., & Bahan, B. (1996). *A journey into the DEAF-WORLD*. San Diego: Dawn Sign Press.
- Lockwood, E. (2014). Effective Deaf action in the Deaf community in Uruguay. In H.-D. Bauman & J. Murray (Eds.), *Deaf gain: Raising the stakes for human diversity* (pp. 321–340). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Markowicz, H., & Woodward, J. (1978). Language and the maintenance of ethnic boundaries in the deaf community. In R. Wilbur (Ed.), *Sign language research, a special issue of communication and cognition* (Vol. 11, pp. 29–38).
- Maxwell, M. (1984). A deaf child's natural development of literacy. *Sign Language Studies*, 44, 191–224.
- Meadow, K. (1972). Sociolinguistics, sign language, and the deaf subculture. In T. O'Rourke (Ed.), *Psycholinguistics and total communication: The state of the art* (pp. 19–33). Washington, DC: American Annals of the Deaf.
- Mellon, N., Niparko, J., Rathmann, C., Mathur, G., Humphries, T., Napoli, D., Handley, T., Schambler, S., & Lantos, J. (2015). Should all deaf children learn sign language? *Pediatrics*, 136(1), 170–176.
- Monaghan, L., Schmaling, C., Nakamura, K., & Turner, G. (2003). *Many ways to be Deaf: International variation in Deaf communities*. Washington, DC: Gallaudet University Press.
- Müller de Quadros, R., Strobel, K., & Masutti, M. (2014). Deaf gains in Brazil: Linguistic policies and network establishment. In H.-D. Bauman & J. Murray (Eds.), *Deaf gain: Raising the stakes for human diversity* (pp. 341–355). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Mweri, J. (2014). Diversity in education: Kenyan sign language as a medium of instruction in schools for the deaf in Kenya. *Multilingual Education*, 4, 1–14.
- Nash, J., & Nash, A. (1981). *Deafness in society*. Lexington: Lexington Books.
- Nonaka, A. (2007). *Emergence of an indigenous sign language and a speech/sign community in Ban Khor, Thailand*. Ph.D. Dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles.
- Nonaka, A. (2012). Language socialization and language endangerment. In A. Duranti, E. Ochs, & B. Schieffelin (Eds.), *The handbook of language socialization* (pp. 610–630). Malden: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Padden, C., & Humphries, T. (2005). *Inside Deaf culture*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Preisler, G. (1983). *Deaf children in communication: A study of communicative strategies used by Deaf children in social interactions*. Laholm: Trydells Tryckeri.
- Preston, P. (1994). *Mother father Deaf: Living between sound and silence*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Reilly, C., & Reilly, N. (2005). *The rising of lotus flowers: Self-education by Deaf children in Thai boarding schools*. Washington, DC: Gallaudet University Press.
- Senghas, R., Senghas, A., & Pyers, J. (2005). The emergence of Nicaraguan Sign Language: Questions of development, acquisition and evolution. In J. Langer, S. Parker, & C. Milbrath (Eds.), *Biology and knowledge revisited: From neurogenesis to psychogenesis* (pp. 287–306). Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Snoddon, K. (2014). Baby sign as Deaf gain. In H.-D. Bauman & J. Murray (Eds.), *Deaf gain: Raising the stakes for human diversity* (pp. 133–145). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Stokoe, W. (1960). Sign language structure: An outline of the visual communication system of the American Deaf. *Studies in Linguistics: Occasional Papers 8*, Buffalo: University of Buffalo. (Reprinted 1976, 1993. Silver Spring, Linstok Press).

- Tervoort, B. (1961). Esoteric symbolism in the communication behavior of young deaf children. *American Annals of the Deaf*, 106, 436–480.
- Uhlig, A. (2015). The notion of the nation compared: Deafhood and Indianness. In P. Dörrenbächer & M. Neuburger (Eds.), *Nationalism and identities among indigenous people: Case studies from North America* (pp. 217–246). New York: Peter Lang.
- Washabaugh, W. (1981). Sign language and its social context. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 10, 237–252.
- Wilkens, C. P., & Hehir, T. P. (2008). Deaf education and bridging social capital: A theoretical approach. *American Annals of the Deaf*, 153(3), 275–284.
- Williams, J. (1976). Bilingual experiences of a Deaf child. *Sign Language Studies*, 10, 37–41.
- Winn, S. (2007). Sign language acquisition and use by single-generation deaf adults in Australia who attended specific educational settings for deaf and hard of hearing children. *Sign Language Studies*, 8(1), 59–71.
- Zeshan, U., & de Vos, C. (Eds.). (2012). *Sign languages in village communities*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter and Ishara Press.

Language Socialization in Digital Contexts

Jonathon Reinhardt and Steven L. Thorne

Abstract

Language socialization researchers investigate language use and learning in informal and formal or instructed digital contexts, demonstrating the importance of understanding digitally mediated creative expression and language use as tools for identity development and management. They employ a variety of approaches that draw from applied linguistics and sociolinguistics, communication studies, and educational and linguistic anthropology and employ commensurate longitudinal, ethnographic, and cross-cultural methodologies. Building on early studies illuminating the nature of socialization online through email, discussion boards, and websites, more recent work has examined language socialization in newer digital contexts and interest communities such as fan fiction, online multiplayer gaming, and social networking. To account for emergent and hybrid linguistic activity in new online transnational contexts, some researchers have found commensurate frameworks in recent research on the sociolinguistics of globalization.

Keywords

Digital literacies • Social media • Identity • Multiplayer online gaming • Social networking • Internet sociolinguistics • Informal learning • Multiliteracies • Transnationalism • Fan fiction

J. Reinhardt (✉)
University of Arizona, Tucson, AZ, USA
e-mail: jonrein@email.arizona.edu

S.L. Thorne
Portland State University, Portland, OR, USA

University of Groningen, Groningen, Netherlands
e-mail: sthorne@pdx.edu

Contents

Introduction	398
Digital Identities, Literacies, and Communities: Early Developments	398
Emerging Frameworks for New Digital Contexts: Major Contributions	400
Multiplayer Online Games	401
Social Networking	402
Work in Progress: Sociolinguistic Approaches and Language Socialization	403
Problems and Ongoing Challenges	405
Future Directions	406
Cross-References	407
Related Articles in the Encyclopedia of Language and Education	407
References	407

Introduction

In an era of mobile and pervasive computing, the processes of language socialization (LS), “by which novices or newcomers in a community or culture gain communicative competence, membership, and legitimacy in the group” (Duff 2007, p. 310), are often partially or fully mediated by digital technology. Just as they do offline, novices interact in online contexts with established members of speech communities to develop recognized semiotic repertoires and sensitivity to expected forms of communication, normative patterns of interaction, and status- and situation-appropriate presentations of identity.

In the second edition of this encyclopedia volume, Lam’s (2008) chapter, “Language Socialization in Online Communities,” provided a clear and concise discussion of research on LS in digital contexts until the mid-2000s. She identified several studies that foregrounded “(1) the role of language practices in the formation of culture and community online, (2) socialization in transnational and diaspora networks as facilitated by the Internet; and (3) language ideology and language change in online contexts” (p. 305). Since that publication, researchers have continued to conduct investigations on language use and learning from language socialization perspectives, in both informal and formal or instructed contexts. They employ a variety of approaches that draw from applied linguistics and sociolinguistics, communication studies, and educational and linguistic anthropology and employ commensurate longitudinal, ethnographic, and cross-cultural methodologies (Garrett and Baquedano-López 2002). Researchers have continued to explore the trajectories outlined by Lam. In this chapter we highlight an expansion of theoretical and methodological repertoires, especially those informed by recent developments in sociolinguistics, and focus particularly on empirical studies that examine digital social networks, fandom, and online gaming environments.

Digital Identities, Literacies, and Communities: Early Developments

Early explorations of computer-mediated communication (CMC) posited the emergence of “netspeak” (Crystal 2001) or homogenized language varieties that developed in tandem with the use of online media such as email and Internet Relay Chat (IRC).

As Herring (1999) has noted, basic principles of turn taking in face-to-face communication, such as precisely alternating turns and the “no gap, no overlap” principle, are largely suspended in synchronous written communication. Participants in these settings must learn how to negotiate relevance making and often distinctive styles of participation and language use, many of which differ substantially from earlier forms of written expression. In response, researchers began developing new methodological frameworks for analysis of online discourse, such as Herring’s (2004) Computer-mediated discourse analysis, which have resulted in new insights into learning and socialization in digital environments. As digital contexts continue to emerge, the trend of innovating and adapting new theoretical and methodological approaches continues (e.g., Herring 2015).

Relatively early research in the 1990s focused on the power of anonymity in digital, generally text-mediated environments, and the seemingly extraordinary capability of participants to construct relationships and identities and to produce with others distinctive social ontologies (e.g., Rheingold 1993). Turkle (1995), for example, described Internet information technologies as “doing more than providing an evocative object for our self-reflection . . . it is the basis for a new culture of simulation and a fundamental reconsideration of human identity” (p. 321). One of Turkle’s informants contrastively described his real life (RL) and digital “realities” as follows: “RL is just one more window and it’s not usually my best one” (p. 13). While relative anonymity is still common in many online settings, in contrast to reports from Turkle’s informants in the early 1990s, the contemporary era of ubiquitous forms of mediated communication, social networking technologies, multiplayer online gaming, and Internet interest communities illustrate a tendency toward interactional and social dynamics that interpenetrate with, and amplify, offline identities (Miller and Slater 2000).

Early digital context research illuminated the nature of socialization online, through language use and interaction as well as new hybrid modalities that afforded the development of new literacies and identities. Warschauer’s (1999) early work examined differences in electronic literacy development among learners of English and Hawaiian with varying degrees of access to technology and learning resources. Findings showed that technology was intertwined with complex sociocultural ecologies of literacy, which countered claims that technology had deterministic effects of its own. Warschauer was among the first to operationalize the New London Group’s (1996) concept of *multiliteracies*, which has since become a widely used conceptual framework for research on LS in digital contexts, as well as for LS-informed pedagogical approaches. The notion of multiliteracies – that literacy practices are multimodal, situated, and dynamic – conceptualizes literacy as a form of social action that contests traditional conceptualizations of literacy as primarily orthographic and static.

An early treatment of online second-language socialization as a matter of identity work is presented in Hanna and de Nooy’s (2003) description of the forays onto *Le Monde* online discussion boards by English and American learners of French. The board community favored those students who participated according to French norms of interaction over those who foregrounded self-referential classroom-nurtured identities; in other words, those who practiced Frenchness by “performing it

through participation in a cultural practice” (p. 81) were more successful than those who positioned themselves as second-language (L2) learners interested in practicing French. In sum, the paper showed that learners’ classroom practices and expectations may not transfer to authentic communicative contexts if learners are not willing or able to present identities and affinities that are valued by online communities of practice.

While neither Warschauer (1999) nor Hanna and de Nooy (2003) identified their work as LS per se, they utilized ethnographic techniques, examined language development over time, and adopted socially informed theoretical frameworks – three key features of LS methodology. An early researcher to explicitly adopt an LS approach and demonstrate its capacity for conceptualizing linguistically mediated social processes in digital contexts was Lam, who carried out several studies of Chinese immigrant teenagers. In her 2004 work, Lam examined the language used by two adolescent Chinese immigrants to the USA in a bilingual Chinese and English chat room. She found that the two used a hybrid form of English and romanized Chinese to represent their dual linguistic identities and differentiate themselves from monolingual speakers of either language. New sorts of dynamic, translingual identities thus emerged in the online community, identifiable as “neither the social categories of English-speaking Americans nor those of Cantonese-speaking Chinese communities” (Lam 2004, p. 45). Lam’s operationalization of the concept of *translingualism* is noteworthy as it reflects trends in the field that were beginning to acknowledge ontological shifts in sociolinguistics research brought on by globalization.

Emerging Frameworks for New Digital Contexts: Major Contributions

Research on LS in digital contexts since the mid-2000s continues trajectories initiated in earlier work with a focus on literacies as social practice, emphasis on identity, and adaptation of new frameworks from a variety of fields. Just as earlier work had focused on the technologies of email, discussion boards, and websites, more recent work has examined LS in newer digital contexts and interest communities such as fan fiction, online multiplayer gaming, and social networking.

In fandom communities such as fan fiction sites, authors invent, share, and critique new storylines and art based on popular cultural tropes and themes. While the practice has existed since the 1960s, it has accelerated with the advent of the global Internet – *fanfiction.net*, the largest online fan fiction community, claims 2.2 million subscribers and offers writings in 30 languages. A pioneer in socialization research in the area, Black (2008) drew on multiliteracies-informed concepts like “design” to analyze adolescent English language learners’ participation in online fan fiction communities. Black argued that these spaces afford learners motivating opportunities to learn and practice English by networking with new audiences and foregrounding a shared interest in a particular fandom, thus allowing for the emergence of new social identities. Black’s observations are echoed by Yi (2008), who

explored the out-of-school online literacy practices of Korean immigrant teenagers engaged in relay writing, a group writing activity where participants contribute story pieces and relay them to others, offer compliments, and give commentaries and critiques. Yi found evidence that the participants invested notable effort in the practice, ultimately co-constructing a shared identity for their diaspora community.

Multiplayer Online Games

Multiplayer online games have grown in popularity to become a multi-billion dollar global industry. Recognizing the symbolic, often linguistic activity emergent in these new contexts, researchers have noted the suitability of LS frameworks for examining the social and cultural learning processes that occur in, through, and around online games. Many studies have taken a multiliteracies-informed perspective, inspired by scholars like Steinkuehler (e.g., 2008), whose research on learning in online gaming communities argues that the complex and negotiated diversity of social practices around digital gaming should be understood as literacies. Thorne et al. (2012) findings on the lexicogrammatical, register, and genre diversity of game texts and interactions empirically support this assertion. An ecological, gaming-as-literacies perspective has afforded new insights into informal learning. For example, Chik (2014) followed Chinese learners of English and Japanese as they collaboratively participated in a variety of gaming and L2 literacy practices involving translation and mutual instruction. Chik argues that these practices, usually unrecognized in schools, can potentially bridge formal and informal L2 learning because games afford autonomy of location and control, and at the same time they function as independent pedagogical objects.

Thorne (2008) argued that online multiplayer gaming contexts, especially “massive” contexts where players can meet and team up with strangers, can serve as spaces for multilingual literacy practice, transcultural exchange, and informal language learning. In a transcript he analyzed, players met when one asked another, in Russian, if his avatar needed help to accomplish the in-game quest or task. The American player used peripheral resources outside the game, namely, a chat with a Ukrainian-speaking friend, to engage in translanguaging introductions and conversation. Similarly, Piirainen-Marsh and Tainio (2009) examined translanguaging practice in two Finnish children as they played a game together and moved from repetition of the English game dialogue to anticipation, elaboration, and recontextualization. This study also illustrates the agency and multimodal nature of literacies inherent to playing digital games successfully, whether solo or multiplayer.

In an ethnographic study of university students’ interaction within the popular multiplayer online game *World of Warcraft* (Blizzard Entertainment), Browell (2007) documented learners’ engagement in a variety of patterned activities that involved leveling up and improving one’s character, an aesthetically pleasing immersive experience, and socialization processes associated with the movement from newcomer to expert status within the game space. In particular, Browell asserts

that the mentoring and collaborative cultures evident in this commercial gaming world were especially powerful developmental practices that should be explicitly replicated in new educational gaming projects.

Rama et al.'s (2012) examination of the interplay of gaming and L2 proficiencies in L2 development also illustrate the complexities of socialization processes in online gaming communities. Using qualitative classroom research methods, the researchers documented an intermediate-level L2 Spanish learner's experience with *World of Warcraft* and found the learner was able to leverage his high gaming proficiency to participate successfully in a guild, in this case an online Spanish-speaking group of players. Contrastively in the same study, a higher proficiency L2 Spanish user with lower gaming proficiency did not fare as well, because of her unfamiliarity with gaming jargon and norms of play, suggesting that socialization into the gaming community has the potential to offer a dynamic languaging space that promotes goal-directed expert-novice collaboration, but that language ability is not the only, or necessarily the most important, factor in successful social integration and socialization processes.

Social Networking

LS research in multiplayer online gaming contexts has shown that games can serve as multimodal texts and practices with which, and in which, players socialize, thereby serving as spaces for transcultural interaction and socio-collaborative learning. With similar findings, researchers have studied informal and formal LS in social networking contexts, employing and adapting concepts from multi-literacies, language and identity, and sociolinguistics research. For example, recognizing the potential for social networking to promote situated language socialization, Mills (2011) developed and implemented *Facebook*-mediated global simulation scenarios for advanced university level French learners. Over a semester, students developed simulated characters and interacted through them online, thereby gaining awareness of genre, register, voice, and identity. Situated learning theory (Wenger 1998) provided a framework for conceptualizing the joint enterprise, mutual engagement, and shared repertoire that emerged from the social network-mediated activity and arguably afforded a community of practice. Also informed by situated learning principles, Reinhardt and Zander (2011) designed a pedagogy for developing social network-mediated language awareness in an intensive English program. Using LS methodologies, they assessed the impact of instruction associated with the use of social networking platforms as it intertwined with socialization into classroom community practices and broader institutional discourses, the latter defined in large part by test preparation and the English-as-an-International-Language ideologies promoted by the program. The implementation results were mixed. While the majority of the students were already frequent users of online social networks and participated vigorously in the project, others resisted the use of social media in part because the activity was not seen as relevant to the situated identity they associated with being a student, namely,

performing well on high stakes tests and focusing on formal genres of written language use.

Noteworthy research has examined how users present and develop transcultural, polylingual identities as they socialize in, and are socialized into, new mediated communities. In one example, Pasfield-Neofitou (2011) examined the long-term use of a variety of social networking tools by learners of Japanese using a social realism lens, where agency is understood in contrapuntal contrast to social structure. Pasfield-Neofitou found that in contrast to early claims that online anonymity and neutrality afford learning, her participants made strategic use of their Japanese learner and English speaker identities as affordances for learning and interaction. Learners recognized the benefits of virtual immersion and understood that tools varied considerably with regard to their utility for learning particular linguistic domains – for example, when and where to use English or present learner identities and where a focus on common affinities might transcend language choice. In a similar way, albeit in a formal intervention, Klimanova and Dembovskaya (2013) used Norton's (2000) concept of "investment" and Prensky's (2009) idea of "digital wisdom" to examine how learners of Russian and native-speaking telecollaboration peers deftly presented and developed identities in the social network *Vkontakte*. Through an analysis of transcripts and interviews, the researchers showed how some participants were able to overcome the limitations of low proficiency and invest in the "social enhancements" (p. 83) offered by the social networking tools, including "various forms of discursive practices (e.g., status updates, profile wall postings, private messaging tools) and in various semiotic modes of self-expression, such as photos, avatars, choice of language input, and use of punctuation marks to express emotions" (p. 81).

Perhaps in response to the challenge of new contexts, these studies push theoretical and methodological boundaries by borrowing and combining frameworks. For example, Chen (2013) explored how two multilingual L1 Chinese writers positioned their identities and became socialized into local and home communities through *Facebook*. Qualitative and quantitative analysis of status updates over 2 years showed shifting patterns of code mixing, self-, and other-focused status updating and link sharing that indexed development of multiplex, dynamic, and sometimes conflicting multilingual identities. While one participant used social networking as a site of reflection and struggle over her sojourn abroad, sharing her experiences primarily with a home audience to which she would eventually return, the other used it deliberately as a means of investing in an imagined community and performing new identities as a global academic.

Work in Progress: Sociolinguistic Approaches and Language Socialization

In her 2009 study, Lam showed how a Chinese migrant adolescent used the hybridized textuality of instant messenger to "(re)define...relations to multiple localities and communities in the process of migration" (p. 380). Reflecting the

notion that multiliteracies are situated and distributed (as noted earlier), the participant made use of various vernaculars and orthographies to develop transnational affiliations and identities. In her literature review, Lam explained the utility of multiliteracies-informed perspectives for her research but added that multiliteracies “does not provide a basis for theorizing the new forms of ethnic and linguistic diversity and literacy practices in globalized communicative contexts” (p. 379). Indeed, although the framework attempted “to account for the context of our culturally and linguistically diverse and increasingly globalized societies” and “account for the burgeoning variety of text forms associated with information and multimedia technologies” (New London Group 1996, p. 61), its strengths lean toward pedagogical, as opposed to sociolinguistic, theorizing. When the group first met in New London, education was a premier context for technology use, while today formal schooling seems to be playing catch up to everyday uses of vernacular technologies, which arguably involve socialization processes more than ever. Moreover, school populations have become considerably more culturally and linguistically diverse. To theorize language use in new communicative ecologies like digital games and social networks, researchers like Lam have sought to enhance their LS research with tools from fields like sociolinguistics, where pedagogy is not necessarily a central concern.

Recent sociolinguistic research has focused on the wide range of new media practices that proliferate in distinct online contexts, employing the descriptive concept of “superdiversity” (e.g., Vertovec 2007) and preferring dynamic concepts like “translanguaging,” “bricolage,” and “recontextualization” over traditional concepts like “code-switching,” “appropriation,” and “acculturation” for fresh perspectives on digitally mediated sociolinguistic phenomena (Androutsopoulos and Juffermans 2014). The shift might be seen as ontological rather than paradigmatic, as its “impact resides in the redefining capacity of new work on language in superdiversity, where the traditional objects of analysis have to be re-imagined as an effect of empirical analysis” (Juffermans et al. 2014). Superdiversity is afforded by increasingly sophisticated global communication technologies, which have moved beyond the capacity to store cultural production and now more easily “facilitate deterritorialised interaction, individualised self-presentation, and large-scale participation in cultural and political discourses” (Androutsopoulos and Juffermans, p. 2).

New media-focused sociolinguistics work has drawn attention to the ways in which multiple languages and emergent discourse practices are used to construct relationships and establish social identities online, in a variety of digital contexts, using a variety of methods. To illustrate, Androutsopoulos and Juffermans’ (2014) special issue of *Discourse, Context, and Media* includes discussion of the online literacy practices of diaspora and multilingual communities as diverse as Nepalese, Senegalese, Taiwanese-German, Dutch-Chinese, and Spanish-Swedish. In the same issue, for example, Jonsson and Muhonen (2014) examine how Swedish youth “perform local, global, and glocal” (p. 87) identities using superdiverse, multilingual semiotic repertoires in Facebook, thus participating in transnational Japanese manga culture. They employ a “sociolinguistic online ethnography approach” that involves

both online and offline methods, thus offering triangulated perspectives into the voices, interpretations, and “complex indexicalities of young adolescents’ online practices in superdiverse conditions” (p. 98). It is interesting to compare Jonsson and Muhonen’s work with both Black (2008) and Pasfield-Neofitou (2011), who also work with adolescent learners of Japanese but take a more developmental perspective.

As this ontologically new sort of sociolinguistics research spreads, LS research will benefit greatly from interdisciplinary theoretical and methodological cross-pollination, especially considering the unique and sometimes challenging contexts of researching development and theorizing pedagogy in new digital environments, many of which form massive language contact zones. A focus on learning and the processes of development distinguishes LS research from scholarship in related fields like sociolinguistics, which may be ethnographic and longitudinal, but does not necessarily consider process or diachronic change; indeed, in the future, LS frameworks may inform sociolinguistics research by offering an approach that foregrounds the complex social ecologies of development.

Problems and Ongoing Challenges

Researchers continue to find great heuristic value in LS perspectives for understanding language use and learning in digital contexts, including those centered on new activities like fan fiction authoring, digital gaming, and social networking. However, each new context engenders new constellations of emergent socio-literacy practices and cultures of use that may test the methodological utility and ontological boundaries of concepts like literacy, language, identity, culture, and community. Enhanced by new technologies, new patterns of transnationalism and global migration have afforded emergent and hybrid linguistic activity for which traditional descriptors and research tools fall short. From a sociolinguistics of globalization perspective, Blommaert (2010) suggests that to accurately understand many late-modern contexts of communication, new theoretical frameworks are needed:

This theory construction cannot be just another *linguistic* theory. It needs to be a theory of language in society, or, more precisely, of changing language in a changing society . . . as the sociolinguistic side of a larger social system. (p. 1)

Additional challenges may arise as linguistic superdiversity and hybridity become the norm. The global dominance of English may lead to “glocal” dominance online, as digital domains are increasingly occupied by hybridized linguistic varieties with a base in languages of wider communication, primarily English. Moreover, each individual’s repertoire of practices, affiliations, and cultural familiarities is unique, and while this offers promise for customizable, learner-driven pedagogies, it adds to the already considerable methodological challenges facing researchers.

Issues of access and privacy present perhaps the most daunting challenges for online ethnographers (Gao and Tao 2015; Ortega and Zyzik 2008) – for example,

friending a participant on *Facebook* to collect his or her usage data might be considered intrusive, and the data may not even legally belong to the participant – and while technology may aid in data transcription and collection, some newer technologies like *Snapchat* are purposefully designed for communicative ephemerality. In response, researchers often take case study approaches and develop close relationships with their participants to gain emic perspectives, often relying on participants to document and share their own technology usage. Other LS research finds methodological inspiration from other fields. For example, borrowing from corpus linguistic frequency analytic techniques, Reinhardt and Chen (2013) used time markers on Facebook posts to plot longitudinal changes in usage trends such as choice of language, friending patterns, and status versus comment frequency. In his analysis of international graduate students' social networking literacies, Solmaz (2015) used the network analysis software *Gephi* to illustrate participants' networks and to identify the languages and genders to which their friends had set their interfaces. Both of these studies suggest that big data approaches may find greater purchase in LS research in digital contexts that enable longitudinal tracking of user actions, language use, and interface choices.

Future Directions

Language socialization is an approach to understanding learning and development that foregrounds the importance of participation in speech communities. Interactions with established members of a speech community, and the social relationships that are created, are critically important processes that help novices develop and expand identifiable semiotic repertoires. Despite the broad penetration of online tools, cultures, and literacies into many arenas of everyday life, L2 classrooms often remain separate contexts that provide few opportunities for committed, consequential, and longer-term communicative engagement afforded by new technologies. The relative isolation of many instructed L2 settings, while potentially quite productive for learning *about* language, can be seen as limited in view of recent language socialization research which suggests that informal social and linguistic environments affect L2 learners' language use and development and further the semiotic resources they have available for the construction of desired social identities (e.g., Duff 2007; Thorne et al. 2015).

As technology use becomes an everyday practice for an ever-increasing proportion of the global population, language socialization research in digitally mediated contexts becomes increasingly relevant to language education. *Facebook* alone has gone from five million to one billion users over the last decade, Statista (2014) reports that there were upward of 1.8 billion video game players in 2014, and there are at least a billion more mobile gadgets than there are humans. Capacities to communicate and access information made ubiquitous by mobile technology, combined with societal movements to deconstruct traditional educational structures and build customizable online learning “solutions,” are rendering static understandings of school-based literacy development and language socialization anachronistic and,

in some cases, obsolete. Beginning at ever younger ages, new generations are informally socialized into language and literacy through the processes of using and creating digital varieties and registers, even as increasing inequalities perpetuate and exacerbate digital divides. The review of research presented above reveals the potential of LS to examine language socialization into online communicative practices and demonstrates the importance, for language education professionals, of understanding digitally mediated creative expression and language use as tools for identity development and management.

Cross-References

► [Language Socialization and Multimodality in Multilingual Urban Homes](#)

Related Articles in the Encyclopedia of Language and Education

- Kevin Leander: [Literacy and Internet Technologies](#). In Volume: Literacies and Language Education
- Richard Kern, Paige Ware, and Matk Warschauer: [Networked-Based Language Teaching](#). In Volume: Second and Foreign Language Education
- K. Tusting: [Ecologies of Digital Literacies: Implications for Education](#). In Volume: Language, Education and Technology
- Randall Sadler: [Virtual Worlds and Language Education](#). In Volume: Language, Education and Technology
- Eva Lam: [Identity in Mediated Contexts of Transnationalism and Mobility](#). In Volume: Language, Education and Technology

References

- Androutsopoulos, J., & Juffermans, K. (2014). Digital language practices in superdiversity: Introduction. *Discourse Context and Media*, 4–5, 1–6.
- Black, R. (2008). *Adolescents and online fan fiction*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Blommaert, J. (2010). *The sociolinguistics of globalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Browell, D. (2007). *World of studentcraft: An ethnographic study on the engagement of traditional students within an online world*. Doctoral dissertation, Capella University. UMI Number: 3288705.
- Chen, H. (2013). Identity practices of multilingual writers in social networking spaces. *Language Learning and Technology*, 17(2), 143–170.
- Chik, A. (2014). Digital gaming and language learning: Autonomy and community. *Language Learning and Technology*, 18(2), 85–100.
- Crystal, D. (2001). *Language and the internet*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Duff, P. (2007). Second language socialization as sociocultural theory: Insights and issues. *Language Teaching*, 40, 309–318.

- Gao, X., & Tao, J. (2015). Ethical challenges in conducting text-based online applied linguistics research. In P. De Costa (Ed.), *Ethics in applied linguistics research* (pp. 181–194). New York: Routledge.
- Garrett, P., & Baquedano-López, P. (2002). Language socialization: Reproduction and continuity, transformation and change. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 31, 339–361.
- Hanna, B. E., & de Nooy, J. (2003). A funny thing happened on the way to the forum: Electronic discussion and foreign language learning. *Language Learning & Technology*, 7(1), 71–85.
- Herring, S. (1999). Interactional coherence in CMC. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 4, 0.
- Herring, S. (2004). Computer-mediated discourse analysis: An approach to researching online behavior. In S. A. Barab, R. Kling, & J. H. Gray (Eds.), *Designing for virtual communities in the service of learning* (pp. 338–376). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Herring, S. C. (2015). New frontiers in interactive multimodal communication. In A. Georgapoulou & T. Spilloti (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of language and digital communication* (pp. 398–402). London: Routledge.
- Jonsson, C., & Muhonen, A. (2014). Multilingual repertoires and the relocalization of manga in digital media. *Discourse, Context and Media*, 4–5, 87–100.
- Juffermans, K., Blommaert, J., Kroon, S., & Li, J. (2014). Dutch-Chinese repertoires and language Ausbau in superdiversity: A view from digital media. *Discourse, Context and Media*, 4–5, 48–61.
- Klimanova, L., & Dembovskaia, S. (2013). L2 identity, discourse, and social networking in Russian. *Language Learning & Technology*, 17(1), 69–88.
- Lam, W. (2004). Second language socialization in a bilingual chat room: Global and local considerations. *Language Learning & Technology*, 8(3), 44–65.
- Lam, W. (2008). Language socialization in online communities. In P. A. Duff & N. H. Hornberger (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of language and education, Language socialization* (Vol. 8, 2nd ed., pp. 301–311). New York: Springer.
- Lam, W. (2009). Multiliteracies on instant messaging in negotiating local, translocal, and transnational affiliations: A case of an adolescent immigrant. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 44(4), 377–397.
- Miller, D., & Slater, D. (2000). *The internet: An ethnographic approach*. Oxford: Berg.
- Mills, N. (2011). Situated learning through social networking communities: The development of joint enterprise, mutual engagement and shared repertoire. *CALICO Journal*, 28(2), 345–368.
- New London Group. (1996). A pedagogy of multiliteracies. *Harvard Educational Review*, 66(1), 60–92.
- Norton, B. (2000). *Identity and language learning: Gender, ethnicity and educational change*. Harlow: Longman/Pearson Education.
- Ortega, L., & Zyzik, E. (2008). Online interactions and L2 learning: Some ethical challenges for L2 researchers. In S. Magnan (Ed.), *Mediating discourse online* (pp. 331–355). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Pasfield-Neofitou, S. (2011). Second language learners' experiences of virtual community and foreignness. *Language Learning & Technology*, 15(2), 92–108.
- Piirainen-Marsh, A., & Tainio, L. (2009). Other-repetition as a resource for participation in the activity of playing a video game. *Modern Language Journal*, 93(2), 153–169.
- Prensky, M. (2009). H. sapiens digital: From digital immigrants to digital natives to digital wisdom. *Innovate: Journal of Online Education*, 5(3). Retrieved from <http://www.innovateonline.info/index.php?view=article&id=705>
- Rama, P., Black, R., van Es, E., & Warschauer, M. (2012). Affordances for second language learning in World of Warcraft. *ReCALL*, 24(3), 322–338.
- Reinhardt, J., & Chen, H. (2013). An ecological analysis of social networking site-mediated identity development. In M.-N. Lamy & K. Zourou (Eds.), *Social networking for language education* (pp. 11–30). Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan.

- Reinhardt, J., & Zander, V. (2011). Social networking in an intensive English program classroom: A language socialization perspective. *CALICO Journal*, 28(2), 326–344.
- Rheingold, H. (1993). *The virtual community: Homesteading on the electronic frontier*. Reading: Addison-Wesley.
- Solmaz, O. (2015). *Multilingual students' management of transnational identities in online participatory sites*. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation. University of Arizona.
- Statista (2014). Number of videogame players worldwide in 2014, by region (in millions). Downloaded 17 Nov 2016, from <https://www.statista.com/statistics/293304/number-video-gamers/>
- Steinkuehler, C. (2008). Massively multiplayer online games as an educational technology: An outline for research. *Educational Technology*, 48(1), 10–21.
- Thorne, S. L. (2008). Transcultural communication in open internet environments and massively multiplayer online games. In S. Magnan (Ed.), *Mediating discourse online* (pp. 305–327). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Thorne, S. L., Fischer, I., & Lu, X. (2012). The semiotic ecology and linguistic complexity of an online game world. *ReCALL Journal*, 24(3), 279–301.
- Thorne, S. L., Sauro, S., & Smith, B. (2015). Technologies, identities, and expressive activity. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 35, 215–233.
- Turkle, S. (1995). *Life on the screen: Identity in the age of the internet*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Vertovec, S. (2007). Super-diversity and its implications. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 30(6), 1024–1054.
- Warschauer, M. (1999). *Electronic literacies: Language, culture, and power in online education*. Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Wenger, E. (1998). *Communities of practice: Learning, meaning, and identity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Yi, Y. (2008). Relay writing in an adolescent online community. *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy*, 51(6), 670–680.

Language Socialization and Autism

Laura Sterponi

Abstract

In this chapter, I examine the contribution of language socialization to the study of the verbal communication of children with autism. A condition at once cognitive, social, and communicative, autism has been widely studied since the 1940s, when it was first described by Kanner (*Nervous Child*, 2, 217–250, 1943). However, no research prior to the contributions of language socialization scholars in the early 2000s had investigated autism from an anthropological perspective. In this chapter, I suggest that language socialization scholars' ethnographic and discourse analytic work has augmented traditional research on autism in two main ways: (1) by discerning dimensions of communicative competence in affected children that were previously undocumented and largely unrecognized and (2) by identifying interactional processes that have a bearing on the manifestation of autistic language. In this manner, language socialization scholars have challenged deficit perspectives, which assume that characteristic features of autistic language are inherently dysfunctional and pathological. Furthermore, they have questioned the assumption that those features are purely symptomatic of the autistic individual's condition. In the chapter, I also consider how the study of autism has generated theoretical insights that deepen our understanding of culture and human sociality.

Keywords

Autism • Autistic language • Ethnography • Discourse analysis • Echolalia • Neurodiversity • Pragmatic deficit • Pronoun reversal and avoidance • Language socialization

L. Sterponi (✉)

University of California, Berkeley, Berkeley, CA, USA

e-mail: sterponi@berkeley.edu

Contents

Introduction	412
Early Developments	413
An Overview of Main Trends of Research on Language in Autism	413
Major Contributions	414
Toward a Delineation of Communicative Competencies in Children with Autism	415
Toward an Understanding of the Influence of Context on the Communication of Children with Autism	417
Work in Progress: Implications for Education, Clinical Intervention, and Anthropological Theory	420
Problems and Difficulties	421
Future Directions	421
Cross-References	422
References	422

Introduction

Language socialization, as a theoretical perspective and field of study, has contributed remarkable insights to a wide range of research domains, from child language development to science and technology studies, from narratology to psychopathology (Duranti et al. 2012). This chapter examines how language socialization scholars have enriched our view of one of the most common and yet puzzling developmental disorders, autism.

Difficulties in verbal and nonverbal communication as well as in social interaction are among the core features of autism spectrum disorders. As such, autism represents a pertinent domain of inquiry for the language socialization scholar. Undoubtedly, an anthropologically informed perspective, such as language socialization, adds to the more prominent psychological accounts of the disorder. At the same time, deeper understanding of the social foundations of language is gained by looking at a condition in which those foundations are weaker or atypical.

In this chapter, I review the most significant contributions that language socialization scholars have offered to autism research. I suggest that their ethnographic and discourse analytic work has augmented traditional research on autism in two main ways: (1) by discerning dimensions of communicative competence in affected children that were previously undocumented and largely unrecognized and (2) by identifying interactional processes that have a bearing on the manifestation of autistic language. In this manner, language socialization scholars have challenged deficit perspectives, which assume that characteristic features of autistic language are inherently dysfunctional and pathological. Furthermore, they have questioned the assumption that those features are purely symptomatic of the autistic individual's condition.

In order to fully appreciate the contribution of ethnographic and discourse analytic work to the study of autism, in the next section I provide an overview of the main trends of research on communicative impairments in autism spectrum disorders, which, as we shall see, are rooted in psychology and overwhelmingly

employ experimental designs and quantitative analyses. Following the presentation of ethnographic and discourse analytic studies, I consider the insights that they have generated for anthropological theory and their implications for clinical intervention and education. I close the chapter with some suggestions for future investigation, in light of a brief discussion of lacunae and outstanding questions in autism research.

Early Developments

An Overview of Main Trends of Research on Language in Autism

A condition included in the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual (DSM) for Mental Disorders (American Psychiatric Association 2013), autism has been widely studied since the 1940s, when it was first described by Austrian psychiatrist Leo Kanner (1943). In his characterization of the disorder, Kanner considered language deficit as one of its core features. Kanner (1946) identified distinctive characteristics of autistic language, pointing to the prevalence of such phenomena as echolalia, pronominal reversal/avoidance, and literal language in the speech of those affected. For the most part, these linguistic features have been interpreted as epiphenomena, as manifestations of an underlying disorder located within the individual, generally characterized by social withdrawal, egocentrism, and an impairment of abstract thinking.

Building on Kanner's early observations, a large body of studies has aimed to identify the abnormal language features of autism. At first prevalently clinical and observational (e.g., Baltaxe 1977; Baltaxe and Simmons 1977; Rutter 1978; Simmons and Baltaxe 1975) and more recently cross-sectional and experimental in design, these studies have shown that the core and defining linguistic deficits in autism pertain to the domain of pragmatics (e.g., Frith 1989; Tager-Flusberg 1981).

In one of the first studies in autism that extended the scope of the linguistic analysis beyond the grammar of individual sentences to examine discourse, Baltaxe (1977) identified three aspects of autistic deficiencies in pragmatic competence. The first is impairment in the speaker-hearer role relationship, namely, a difficulty in role taking and shifting point of view in dialogue context. Baltaxe considered the prototypical autistic language features of pronoun reversal and avoidance, and formal speech, as indicators of these difficulties. A second aspect of pragmatics involved in autism is impairment in rules of conduct governing a dialogue, namely, a difficulty in understanding conventions that sanction utterances as socially appropriate, which Baltaxe argued sometimes results in autistic individuals being perceived as impolite or rude. The third aspect is impairment in foregrounding and backgrounding of information, that is, a difficulty in differentiating between new and old information in a conversational exchange, which results in the literalness and redundancy of autistic language.

Further delineation of the nature of pragmatic impairment in autism was provided by cross-sectional studies in the late 1980s and early 1990s. Notably, Landry and Loveland (1988) compared children with autism with two other groups: children with developmental language delay and typically developing children, matched for

nonverbal mental age and mean length of utterance. They found that autistic children were equally responsive to other initiations as the other two groups but mobilized attention-directing devices (i.e., pointing and showing) less frequently than typically developing children and those with developmental language delays. Tager-Flusberg and Anderson (1991) compared the discourse abilities of six children with autism and six children with Down's syndrome matched on age and language level and found that children with autism produced fewer adjacent, contingent, and relevant utterances. Surian et al. (1996) examined the ability to detect utterances that violate key conversational maxims (be informative but not redundant, be truthful, relevant, and polite) in high-functioning children with autism, children with specific language impairment, and normally developing children, matched on linguistic development. They found that children with autism were significantly more impaired in detecting pragmatic violations than the other two groups.

The contribution of studies that have discerned the abnormal language features of autism is of significant value. (Other noteworthy works include Happé 1995; Lee et al. 1994; Prizant and Duchan 1981; and Prizant and Rydell 1984.) While acknowledging their import, language socialization scholars have challenged some of the assumptions that underpinned those studies and have provided additional perspectives, leading to insights that nuance our understanding of language in autism.

Major Contributions

Language socialization scholars have brought to autism research both methodological and theoretical novelty. Although clinical studies were often based on extended observations of children with autism, and some psychological studies have been conducted outside of the laboratory, in natural contexts, language socialization scholars have offered an ethnographic perspective on autism. This methodological approach is closely related to language socialization's theoretical emphasis on the cultural domain (Ochs 2002). The assumption of the cultural organization of children's social and communicative practices and the interest in documenting it empirically across contexts and communities compel language socialization researchers to complement the psychological understanding of the social as interpersonal with the anthropological understanding of the social as cultural.

Examining the verbal communication of children with autism in the natural contexts of their everyday lives, language socialization scholars delineate with finer granularity the pragmatic difficulties of children with autism. In doing so, previously unrecognized resourcefulness on the part of affected children is revealed. In addition, in focusing on spontaneously occurring activities in their natural settings, language socialization scholars have contended that those contexts are multi-layered and consequential, that is, they can be structured in many different ways, which may differentially affect the child's participation and communicative performance. In what follows I present exemplary studies to illustrate the twofold scope of language socialization research on communication in autism.

Toward a Delineation of Communicative Competencies in Children with Autism

Many of the pragmatic deficits related to autism have been considered as resulting from difficulties in perspective taking. An impairment of the capacity to place oneself in another's shoes – or more technically put, to grasp another's mental states – can explain phenomena such as irrelevant utterances, pronoun atypicality, and unintelligible speech. While not denying the importance of perspective taking for social functioning and felicitous communication, Ochs and associates contended that the psychological interpretation of such capacity needed further articulation (Ochs et al. 2004). More specifically, they argued that perspective taking is more fruitfully conceived of as comprising two distinct components, the interpersonal and the sociocultural. In privileging the cognitive dimension of social functioning, psychological studies have offered insight on the interpersonal component. However, perspective taking not only requires an understanding of the other's intentions, beliefs, and feelings but also the ability to take into account culturally organized expectations regarding roles, stances, and behaviors.

As an illustration, Ochs et al. (2004) consider speech acts and argue:

The ability to recognize, interpret, and respond to speech acts involves sociocultural perspective-taking, minimally including an awareness of (1) the sociocultural conventions for performing such acts; (2) the social roles being enacted by the performers; (3) the social activities in which the acts are both embedded and which they help to constitute; (4) the default knowledge states, beliefs, emotions, and intentions conventionally associated with performers of such acts; and (5) the possible, anticipated, and preferred next interactional moves conventionally projected by the performance and performers of these acts. (p. 156)

The twofold articulation of perspective taking allowed Ochs et al. (2004) to delineate a *cline of competence* with respect to social functioning in 16 children with high-functioning autism or Asperger syndrome who were part of their ethnographic and discourse analytic study. The authors observed that the children in their study were more successful in achieving sociocultural perspective taking and encountered greater difficulty with interpersonal perspective taking, namely, “with the task of trying to interpret an individual's particular, sometimes idiosyncratic intentions, beliefs, knowledge and feelings” (p. 158). Within the domain of sociocultural perspective taking, the authors further discerned gradations of ability: The children were observed to master conversational turn-taking and sequences in ways that demonstrated fine coordination with the interlocutors and the capacity for sustained attention and attunement to a conversational sequence.¹ In this respect, the communicative abilities of children with autism appeared at the same level as neurotypical individuals. However, only moderate success was attained in recognizing and constructing situational scenarios; and the children were least successful in

¹For a detailed study of autistic children's mastery of question-answer sequences, see Kremer-Sadlik (2004).

grasping sociocultural indexes that engaged social roles, identities, institutions, and dispositions (p. 159).

By giving attention to the everyday interactions of children with autism as experienced by those children, Ochs and associates elucidated distinctive patterns of autistic children's practical reasoning and conversational participation (Ochs et al. 2004; Sirota 2004; Solomon 2004; Sterponi 2004). Of special interest is the phenomenon that Ochs and Solomon (2005) defined as *proximal relevance*: when experiencing and participating in a conversation on unfamiliar topics or requiring moment-by-moment recalibrations, the children in their study routinely remained engaged in the interaction by expressing ideas that were "not quite in synch with the focal concern" (p. 158) but were nevertheless connected to the unfolding conversation. Whereas a traditional deficit-oriented perspective would have dismissed those utterances as incoherent, Ochs and Solomon (2005) showed that they achieve proximal coherence in two alternative ways: either they "make the interactional contribution locally relevant to what was just said or what just transpired" (p. 158) (failing, however, to attune to the overarching concern or topic under consideration), or they "shift the focus away from personal states and situations to topically relevant impersonal, objective cultural knowledge" (p. 158). While confirming the children's social and communicative difficulties, Ochs and Solomon's notion of proximal relevance also recognizes intelligibility in the autistic modus operandi.

Other ethnographic and discourse analytic studies have focused on specific areas of language use or prototypical features of autistic language. Through detailed analyses of these language characteristics in spontaneous social interaction, these studies have qualified widespread ideas of generalized impairment in communication and interpersonal relatedness and have complicated the common depiction of autistic language's features as dysfunctional phenomena.

Solomon (2004), for instance, examined the production of narrative discourse in high-functioning children with autism in their everyday life to test the generalizability and ecological validity of laboratory studies, which evidenced severe difficulties with this speech genre and mode of thought in affected individuals (e.g., Loveland et al. 1990; Tager-Flusberg 1995). In contrast to these laboratory-based findings, Solomon observed that children with autism were able to spontaneously launch narratives in conversational interaction and that those sequence opening turns, which Solomon refers to as *narrative introductions*, displayed an orientation to the thematic content of ongoing talk. Her analysis revealed, however, that the affected children's capacity to secure thematic continuity could only extend to immediately prior talk. In addition, the author found that participation in jointly constructed narratives over the course of several propositions and turns was challenging for children with autism, who had difficulties grasping the overarching scope of narrative productions. Thus, while not denying the difficulties that children with autism encounter in everyday narrative discourse, Solomon discerned strength and competence that had remained unidentified within traditional psychological studies.

In similar fashion, Sirota (2010) examined "the lived contexts in which children with autism spectrum disorders actively engage with family members in co-constructed narrative recountings of personal life events and, as such, are

apprenticed into culturally consonant genres of life narrative” (p. 95). Drawing from Foucault’s notion of *technologies of the self* (Foucault 1988), the author demonstrates how in narratives of personal experience, the individual, and the sociohistorical domains coalesce, each articulating the other in ways that situate human subjectivity within a culturally and historically configured social matrix. In this study, Sirota focuses particularly on how issues of normativity, disability, and difference are shaped, understood, and refashioned through joint narratives. These recountings offer children with autism a venue and form of scaffolding for experiencing, apprehending, and expressing themselves and the intricacies of their lifeworlds.

Sterponi and Shankey (2014a) critically reexamined echolalia, one of the defining and most distinctive features of autism spectrum disorders. Broadly described as the repetition of the speech of others, echolalia was traditionally conceived of as an automatic behavior with dubious communicative function. Through the case study of a 6-year-old child with autism, the authors offered a contextually situated look at echoic utterances, elucidating how social interaction organizes autism echolalia and how repetitive speech responds to discernible interactional trajectories. Complementing discourse and acoustic analyses with ethnographic observations, the authors demonstrated that the child was able to mobilize echolalia to mark different stances, through the segmental and suprasegmental modulation of echoes. They thus argued that autism echolalia “cannot be characterized solely in terms of the traditional parameters of accuracy and temporal relationship with respect to the model utterances, but is best captured in its complexity in terms of voicing” (Sterponi and Shankey 2014a, p. 299). In echoing stretches of talk, the child did not simply repeat utterances but also animated voices; and in exploiting the subtleties of voice, the child deployed echoes as a powerful and flexible resource to mark his stances, affiliative or disaffiliative, vis-à-vis his interlocutors. In summary, Sterponi and Shankey’s work debunked the presumed automaticity and randomness of autism echolalia and contributed a novel conceptual framework that illuminates the nuanced interactional work that children with autism can accomplish through echo usage.

Toward an Understanding of the Influence of Context on the Communication of Children with Autism

Electing the laboratory setting as the most favorable environment for conducting research is often motivated by the awareness that contextual features may influence the phenomena under investigation. In contrast, rather than trying to control and restrict the influence of naturalistic contextual factors on the practices and behaviors being studied, language socialization researchers opt to include those factors within the scope of their investigation.

Ochs et al. (2005) reflected on the influence of the cultural context on children’s language development, taking as a case in point children with severe autism. The authors challenged the view that culture solely supports and amplifies the social and

communicative potential of these children and showed how the culturally organized communicative dispositions of Euro-American caregivers, which result in specific language socialization practices, may be unsuccessful with children with severe autism and, indeed, may limit these children's opportunities for social interaction and language development.

Drawing upon Bourdieu's practice theory (Bourdieu 1977), the authors conceived of child-directed communication as *habitus*, that is, as a set of historically rooted, socially organized dispositions that inform beliefs, structure practices, and guide actions. Thus, child-directed communication as *habitus* consists of temporally contingent, socioculturally shaped communicative arrangements, conducts, and beliefs mobilized in interacting with children.

Ochs et al. (2005) discerned features of Euro-American child-directed communicative *habitus* that exacerbated the communicative difficulties of children with severe autism: Face-to-face bodily arrangement, insistence on speech as primary expressive medium for the child, and caregivers' slowed speech articulation and profuse praise proved to hinder the communicative exchanges of the six autistic children who were the subjects of this study. That is, language socialization dispositions and behaviors common among caregivers in mainstream, middle-class Euro-American culture, as well as among clinical workers, proved ineffective, or counter-productive, in interactions with these children.

In addition to demonstrating the impact of *habitus* and its perdurance, Ochs et al. (2005) were also able to document its transformation. Albeit small in scale, a noteworthy modification of the child-directed communicative *habitus* occurred when an Indian woman, Soma Mukhopadhyay, mother of a severely autistic boy, disputed commonly held assumptions about her child's condition and initiated an alternative set of communicative practices attuned to severe autism. Ochs et al. offered a glimpse of how Soma Mukhopadhyay's method² positively transformed the communicative experiences of the children and family members with whom she worked.

The influence of contextual characteristics on the communicative behavior of children with autism has also been investigated at a more micro-level, that of conversational sequences. In a study of therapist-child interactions in a center for the treatment of social deficits associated with autism spectrum disorders, Fasulo and Fiore (2007) showed how, in engaging affected children in conversation with the goal of strengthening their communicative skills, the therapists often disregarded fundamental characteristics of everyday conversational exchanges, notably tellability, granularity, and sequential orientation. Furthermore, the therapists often

²In the early 2000s, Soma Mukhopadhyay moved to the USA and formalized her approach into a trademarked method, Rapid Prompting Method (RPM), which elicits responses from children with autism through intensive verbal, auditory, visual and/or tactile prompts. She also founded a nonprofit organization, Helping Autism through Learning and Outreach (HALO), to disseminate her approach (<http://www.halo-soma.org/>).

restricted the topic of conversation to already known matters, set the level of detail in the dialogue to a simplified level, and ignored courses of actions launched by the young patients. As the authors pointed out, what is at stake here is not simply a restraint in deployment of conversational technicalities but rather an underestimation of the child's communicative capacities and a withholding of trust in the interlocutor. Fasulo and Fiore's analysis revealed the children in their study to be highly sensitive to the way the therapists positioned them, displaying frustration, resistance, and withdrawal when they were given limited conversational space to express their agency and capacity.

Based on language socialization theoretical underpinnings and employing discourse analytic methods, Sterponi and Shankey (2014b) delineated the interactional matrix of two distinctive features of autistic speech, pronominal reversal/avoidance, and echolalia, in the communication of the same 6-year-old child with autism described earlier in this section. The authors demonstrated that those two linguistic phenomena were not only frequent but also orderly, that is, they occurred in specific interactional circumstances.

The use of proper names in third person constructions, for referring to self or the interlocutor – which traditional autism research labels as pronoun avoidance and interprets as atypical – often occurred in sequential contexts in which the adult interlocutor had him/herself been using such personal reference forms and constructions, as part of the baby talk register. Thus, the child's atypical reference forms were often contextually sensitive in that they aligned to corresponding forms found in the talk of his parents. In simplifying their speech addressed to autistic children, well-meaning interlocutors can unwittingly constrain the children to use simplified forms themselves.

Echolalia as well was shown to respond to discernible interactional trajectories. More specifically, different kinds of repetition were systematically produced within different interactional contexts. Sterponi and Shankey (2014b) highlighted that within these contexts, the repetitive speech was not simply context shaped but also context-transformative as echolalia was mobilized to divert, redirect, and negotiate courses of action set up by the adult interlocutor.

In summary, studies informed by language socialization have complicated traditional perspectives on the verbal communication of children with autism by discerning contextual factors that have an impact on these children's speech production and participation in interaction. Encoded in cultural dispositions and shaping turn design, these factors can exert a facilitating influence³ on the child's communication but can also restrict his contribution to form and content that do not reflect the child's communicative potential. At the same time, language socialization scholars have shown that cultural dispositions are not static but open to modifications, and

³Description of facilitating factors can be found in Solomon (2004), who identified adaptive conversational strategies, devised by the parents to foster autistic children's participation in everyday narrative discourse (see also Kremer-Sadlik 2004; Ochs et al. 2004; Sterponi and Fasulo 2010).

conversational turns and trajectories can be diverted or redirected. In this way, the structuring impact of linguistic habitus and the transformative role of individual agency are illuminated in equal measure.

Work in Progress: Implications for Education, Clinical Intervention, and Anthropological Theory

In documenting capacity and resourcefulness in individuals with autism, and in identifying complex influences of cultural dispositions and interactional circumstances, language socialization researchers' understanding of autism has an affinity with claims and aspirations of neurodiversity scholars and advocates. Paralleling terms like *biodiversity* and *cultural diversity*, which are considered as valuable societal pursuits, neurodiversity promotes the recognition of different forms of brain wiring, which manifest in different ways of perceiving the world and others, none necessarily defective or inferior (Brownlow and O'Dell 2013; Siberman 2015; Walker 2012).

Already in a 2001 publication, Ochs and associates petitioned to regard the autistic ways of "thinking, feeling, and acting in the world outside the parameters of ordinary expectations" as enriching human sensibility (Ochs et al. 2001, p. 416. See also Ochs and Solomon 2010). In the same article, the authors endorsed inclusion as educational practice, arguing that "giving autism greater dialogic space in the school curriculum may enhance the perspective-taking skills and nurture the creative potentialities of all children" (p. 416). Current efforts of language socialization scholars are also oriented toward crediting the value of alternative therapeutic approaches, which are more expansive in their appreciation of sensory modalities as means of communication and self-expression (Solomon 2015; Sterponi and de Kirby 2016; Yu 2016).

For language socialization scholars, investigating autism does not represent a diversion from the fundamentally anthropological scope of their research program. As Ochs et al. (2004) have contended and compellingly demonstrated, the study of autism enhances "theories of society and culture, in that both the struggles and the successes of those diagnosed with autism make evident what is most essential to participation in human society" (p. 172).

Autistic individuals' predilection for predictable environments and unvarying courses of action, and their propensity to organize information into categorical structures, and activities into systems of rules and procedures, corroborate social and anthropological theories that anchor societies and cultures to stable orders of norms and scripts. The difficulties of people with autism in navigating social situations that are not univocally and exhaustively codified, conversely, substantiate theoretical perspectives that place a premium on individuals' capacity to respond to indeterminacy and to improvise, affirming that individual agency plays a constitutive role in societal order as well as societal change.

Theoretical insight of great significance has also resulted from the study of how children with autism engage with language. In the perseverative speech of a child with autism, filled with repetitions of precise time references and onomatopoeic

words, Ochs (2012) highlighted the transportative power of language, that is, the capacity of language to become “an experience in itself” (p. 149). In so doing, Ochs (2012) brought the phenomenological potential of language to the forefront. The traditional focus on the symbolic capacity of language – i.e., of language as arbitrary sign system, standing apart from reality and experience, and functioning as representational apparatus – has engendered obliteration of the fact that “utterances, are themselves *modes of experiencing the world*” (p. 142). The way children with autism sometimes relate to and mobilize speech makes the phenomenological potential of language particularly conspicuous, which has afforded Ochs the basis and inspiration for layering the anthropological theorization of language (see also Sterponi et al. 2015).

Problems and Difficulties

The longitudinal scope of language socialization research – which has deepened our understanding of processes of cultural transmission and transformation, reproduction and change (Garrett and Baquedano-López 2002) – has still to enrich the autism research program. In their review essay on language socialization, Kulick and Schieffelin (2004) remind us that reproduction can’t be assumed and that the task of the language socialization scholar is to “document not only how and when practices are acquired, but also how and when they are acquired differently than what was intended, or not acquired at all” (p. 352). The authors contend that an investment in long-term ethnography is key to this assignment.

Intense emotions often pervade the vicissitudes that result from obtaining an autism diagnosis. An autism diagnosis also sets in motion a complex bureaucratic process related to eligibility for services and accommodations (Angell and Solomon 2014). Unarguably, autism refashions habits, beliefs, and life trajectories not only of those who are given an autism diagnosis but also their family members. These aspects may render the task of close and long-term ethnographic inquiry particularly difficult. Yet these very aspects make the ethnographic inquiry all the more important.

Precisely because it is a domain of uncertain intelligibility, autism can further illuminate how culturally specific forms of subjectivity come into being. Language socialization, as a theoretical and methodological approach, has the capacity to provide sensitive understanding of the complex interrelationship between the subjective and the social.

Future Directions

In endeavoring to make a phenomenon previously strictly confined within the biomedical paradigm the object of their investigation, language socialization scholars have promoted a view of autism that is germane to anthropology, human development, and social theory. In other words, in moving away from autism as

developmental psychopathology toward seeing it as a “human, social, and cultural phenomenon” (Grinker 2010, p. 172), language socialization scholars have delineated a program for interdisciplinary autism research. However, such a program has yet to be developed to a significant extent. For instance, it would be fruitful to illuminate the complexity of topics such as subjectivity and intersubjectivity in autism by merging the understandings of developmental psychologists with those of social theorists and anthropologists. This interdisciplinary enterprise would likely necessitate devising mixed-method studies, where the ethnographic and in-depth qualitative approach of the language socialization scholar is combined with the quantitative breadth of the psychologist and the historical and epistemological scope of the social theorist.

As a human, social, and cultural phenomenon, autism is also rapidly changing. In the past two decades, no other mental disorder has received as much attention, in the popular media and scientific domain, as autism. The Internet and emerging practices of electronic communication have both propelled and witnessed profound transformations of discourses around autism (e.g., Grinker 2010) as well as the development of self-advocacy movements (e.g., Bagatell 2010). Documenting the birth and life span of autism and neurodiversity communities represents an important enterprise for the language socialization scholar, arguably one with significant theoretical and methodological potential.

In their article “Autism and the Social World,” Ochs et al. (2004) suggested that “autism is the last frontier of anthropology” (p. 172). The anthropological commitment to apprehend the other is under pressure when the other is an individual with autism; as Ochs et al. ask, “how can we begin to understand the social logics of persons with autism from an emic perspective if a disruption in ‘social logic’ is positioned precisely at the heart of this condition, as it has been conceptualized from the etic perspective?” (p. 172). The challenge of autism for anthropology is perhaps insurmountable. However, by illuminating the lifeworlds of individual with autism, their ways of being, thinking, and relating with themselves and others, language socialization scholars have undoubtedly expanded the horizon of autism research and deepened our understanding of human sociality.

Cross-References

- ▶ [Language Socialization: An Historical Overview](#)
- ▶ [Pragmatic Socialization](#)
- ▶ [Signed Language Socialization in Deaf Communities](#)

References

- American Psychiatric Association. (2013). *Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders* (5th ed.). Arlington: APA.

- Angell, A. M., & Solomon, O. (2014). The social life of health records: Understanding families' experiences of autism. *Social Science & Medicine*, *117*, 50–57.
- Bagatell, N. (2010). From cure to community: Transforming notions of autism. *Ethos*, *38*(1), 33–55.
- Baltaxe, C. (1977). Pragmatic deficits in the language of autistic adolescents. *Journal of Pediatric Psychology*, *2*, 176–180.
- Baltaxe, C., & Simmons, J. (1977). Bedtime soliloquies and linguistic competence in autism. *Journal of Speech and Hearing Disorders*, *42*, 376–393.
- Bourdieu, P. (1977). *Outline of a theory of practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Brownlow, C., & O'Dell, L. (2013). Autism as a form of biological citizenship. In J. Davidson & M. Orsini (Eds.), *Worlds of autism* (pp. 97–114). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Duranti, A., Ochs, E., & Schieffelin, B. B. (Eds.). (2012). *The handbook of language socialization*. Malden: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Fasulo, A., & Fiore, F. (2007). A valid person: Non-competence as a conversational outcome. In A. Hepburn & S. Wiggins (Eds.), *Discursive research in practice* (pp. 224–246). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Foucault, M. (1988). Technologies of the self. In L. H. Martin, H. Gutman, & P. H. Hutton (Eds.), *Technologies of the self* (pp. 16–49). Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press.
- Frith, U. (1989). A new look at language and communication in autism. *British Journal of Disorders of Communication*, *24*, 123–150.
- Garrett, P., & Baquedano-López, P. (2002). Language socialization: Reproduction and continuity, transformation and change. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, *31*, 339–361.
- Grinker, R. R. (2010). Commentary: On being autistic, and social. *Ethos*, *38*(1), 172–178.
- Happé, F. (1995). Understanding minds and metaphors: Insights from the study of figurative language in autism. *Metaphor and Symbolic Activity*, *10*(4), 275–295.
- Kanner, L. (1943). Autistic disturbances of affective contact. *Nervous Child*, *2*, 217–250.
- Kanner, L. (1946). Irrelevant and metaphorical language in early infantile autism. *American Journal of Psychiatry*, *103*, 242–246.
- Kremer-Sadlik, T. (2004). How children with autism and Asperger syndrome respond to questions: A “naturalistic” theory of mind task. *Discourse Studies*, *6*(2), 185–206.
- Kulick, D., & Schieffelin, B. B. (2004). Language socialization. In A. Duranti (Ed.), *A companion to linguistic anthropology* (pp. 349–368). Malden: Blackwell.
- Landry, S. H., & Loveland, K. A. (1988). Communication behaviors in autism and developmental language delay. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry and Allied Disciplines*, *29*(5), 621–634.
- Lee, A., Hobson, P. R., & Chiat, S. (1994). I, you, me, and autism: An experimental study. *Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders*, *24*, 155–176.
- Loveland, K. A., McEvoy, R. E., Tunali, B., & Kelley, M. (1990). Narrative story-telling in autism and Down syndrome. *British Journal of Developmental Psychology*, *8*, 9–23.
- Ochs, E. (2002). Becoming a speaker of culture. In C. Kramsch (Ed.), *Language acquisition and language socialization: Ecological perspectives* (pp. 99–119). New York: Continuum.
- Ochs, E. (2012). Experiencing language. *Anthropological Theory*, *12*(2), 142–160.
- Ochs, E., & Solomon, O. (2005). Practical logic and autism. In R. Edgerton & C. Casey (Eds.), *A companion to psychological anthropology: Modernity and psychocultural change* (pp. 140–167). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Ochs, E., & Solomon, O. (2010). Autistic sociality. *Ethos*, *38*(1), 69–92.
- Ochs, E., Kremer-Sadlik, T., Solomon, O., & Sirota, K. G. (2001). Inclusion as social practice: Views of children with autism. *Social Development*, *10*(3), 399–419.
- Ochs, E., Kremer-Sadlik, T., Sirota, K. G., & Solomon, O. (2004). Autism and the social world: An anthropological perspective. *Discourse Studies*, *6*(2), 147–183.
- Ochs, E., Solomon, O., & Sterponi, L. (2005). Limitations and transformations of habitus in child-directed communication. *Discourse Studies*, *7*(4–5), 547–584.
- Prizant, B., & Duchan, J. (1981). The functions of immediate echolalia in autistic children. *Journal of Speech and Hearing Disorders*, *46*, 241–249.

- Prizant, B., & Rydell, P. (1984). Analysis of functions of delayed echolalia in autistic children. *Journal of Speech and Hearing Research*, 27, 183–192.
- Rutter, M. (1978). Diagnosis and definition of childhood autism. *Journal of Autism and Childhood Schizophrenia*, 8, 139–161.
- Siberman, S. (2015). *NeuroTribes: The legacy of autism and the future of neurodiversity*. New York: Avery.
- Simmons, J., & Baltaxe, C. (1975). Language patterns of autistic children who have reached adolescence. *Journal of Autism and Childhood Schizophrenia*, 5, 333–351.
- Sirota, K. G. (2004). Positive politeness as discourse process: Politeness practices of high-functioning children with autism and Asperger syndrome. *Discourse Studies*, 6(2), 229–251.
- Sirota, K. G. (2010). Narratives of distinction: Personal life narrative as a technology of the self in the everyday lives and relational worlds of children with autism. *Ethos*, 38(1), 93–115.
- Solomon, O. (2004). Narrative introductions: Discourse competence of children with autism spectrum disorders. *Discourse Studies*, 6(2), 253–276.
- Solomon, O. (2015). “But- he’ll fall!”: Children with autism, interspecies intersubjectivity, and the problem of ‘being social’. *Culture, Medicine, and Psychiatry*, 39, 323–344.
- Sterponi, L. (2004). Construction of rules, accountability and moral identity by high-functioning children with autism. *Discourse Studies*, 6(2), 207–228.
- Sterponi, L., & de Kirby, K. (2016). A multidimensional reappraisal of language in autism: Insights from a discourse analytic study. *Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders*, 46, 394–405.
- Sterponi, L., & Fasulo, A. (2010). How to go on: Intersubjectivity and progressivity in the communication of a child with autism. *Ethos*, 38(1), 116–142.
- Sterponi, L., & Shankey, J. (2014a). Rethinking echolalia: Repetition as interactional resource in the communication of a child with autism. *Journal of Child Language*, 41(2), 275–304.
- Sterponi, L., & Shankey, J. (2014b). Situating communicative (in)competence in (performative) context: Insights from autism. In S. Bornand & C. Leguy (Eds.), *De compétences en performances* (pp. 205–236). Paris: Éditions Karthala.
- Sterponi, L., de Kirby, K., & Shankey, J. (2015). Rethinking language in autism. *Autism*, 19(5), 517–526.
- Surian, L., Baron-Cohen, S., & Van der Lely, H. (1996). Are children with autism deaf to Gricean maxims? *Cognitive Neuropsychiatry*, 1(1), 55–71.
- Tager-Flusberg, H. (1981). On the nature of linguistic functioning in early infantile autism. *Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders*, 11, 45–56.
- Tager-Flusberg, H. (1995). ‘Once upon a ribbit’: Stories narrated by autistic children. *British Journal of Developmental Psychology*, 13, 45–59.
- Tager-Flusberg, H., & Anderson, M. (1991). The development of contingent discourse ability in autistic children. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 32, 1123–1134.
- Walker, N. (2012). Throw away the master’s tools: Liberating ourselves from the pathology paradigm. In J. Bascom (Ed.), *Loud hands: Autistic people, speaking* (pp. 225–237). Washington, DC: The Autistic Press.
- Yu, B. (2016). Bilingualism as conceptualized and bilingualism as lived: A critical examination of the monolingual socialization of a child with autism in a bilingual family. *Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders*, 46, 424–435.

Language Socialization Through Hip-hop Culture

‘Real’ knowledge and counterlanguage ideology

Marcyliena Morgan

Abstract

This chapter explores research on informal language socialization in hip-hop as secondary socialization and in more formal socialization settings known as hip-hop ciphers. These ciphers are commonly groups of youth, performers, and listeners that convene in communities and schools where their peers socialize them into hip-hop culture as they develop confidence and learn to analyze and critique their social world through an understanding of language, discourse, power, and identity. In this chapter, I review early developments in hip-hop culture and socialization in relation to language ideology and race and then discuss more recent developments as a form of underground counterlanguage socialization.

Keywords

Language ideology • Counterlanguage • Racism • Identity • Dialect discrimination • Hip-hop cipher • Language socialization

Contents

Introduction	426
Early Developments: Ideology and Race in Language Socialization	427
Major Contributions: Underground Counterlanguage Socialization	430
Work in Progress: The Social World of the Cipher: Decoding Intentionality	433
Problems and Difficulties: Hip-hop Therapy – Trauma and (Common) Sense and Reference	434
Future Directions: Language Socialization of Courage Over Fatalism “When They Come for You”	435
Cross-References	436
Related Articles in the Encyclopedia of Language and Education	436
References	436

M. Morgan (✉)
Harvard University, Cambridge, MA, USA
e-mail: mmorgan@fas.harvard.edu

Introduction

Research on communication styles among young African-Americans in the United States generally focuses on language structure and difference in relation to middle class varieties and notions of standards and norms. This emphasis is largely the result of both scholarly interests in social dialects and a commitment to improving educational outcomes that may be the result of dialect discrimination. While some studies have explored language and literacy socialization of social dialect speakers, especially of communities regarding race and social class (e.g., Heath 1983), there remains a need for more analysis and discussion about socializing practices that occur in US nonwhite communities whose language use is often stigmatized and for whom competent language use includes management and knowledge of racism, language bias, and other forms of discrimination. In many respects, the focus of hip-hop socialization is to make sense of what youth consider hypocrisy regarding their life chances in a country that prides itself on fairness, justice, and freedom, and that discriminates and abuses young people of color while insisting that it is not discriminating. Some young people “manage” these contradictory messages and treatment by undergoing socialization into “how to *really* mean” in communication (Halliday 1975, 1976) and how to interpret and recognize truth and reality in meaning and intentionality across cultural and social contexts (cf. Duranti 2011, 2015; Heidegger 1962; Husserl 1983).

While educators and legal scholars attempt to address institutional bias and linguistic stereotyping and discrimination (e.g., Baugh 2003; Labov 1972, 2012; Smitherman 1999; Adger et al. 2007; Hudley et al. 2010; Alim and Baugh 2006), hip-hop culture provides language socialization that directly processes and addresses racism and forms of repression and bias. Though artists often rap about the range of adolescent confusion, desire, and angst, generation after generation embrace hip-hop’s core commitment and vision of youth who are compelled to “tell it as they see it” and confront complex and powerful institutions and practices in the process. The words and rhymes of hip-hop identify what has arguably become the one cultural institution that urban youth rely on for honesty and “keeping it real.” With the introduction of the salutation “Word!” and “Word Up!,” hip-hop emerged in the late 1970 as a cultural, social, and political force constituted and instantiated through language style, philosophy, and theory.

Whether in reference to educational institutions or society in general, the social reality of linguistic discrimination (cf., Banks 2005, 2011; Baugh 2003; Morgan 2002) is of concern in African-American speech communities. Linguistic discrimination is also addressed in formal hip-hop cultural environments known as ciphers/cyphers. These ciphers are groups of youth, performers, and listeners that convene in communities and schools where they are socialized into hip-hop culture as they develop confidence and learn to analyze and critique society regarding language, discourse, power, and identity. Generally, early childhood socialization occurs through caregivers and significant others (cf., Ochs and Schieffelin 1984, 1995; Schieffelin and Ochs 1986). In contrast, language socialization into hip-hop culture usually begins as a form of secondary socialization (Berger and Luckman 1966) or a

resocialization provided by what I call the *outlier other* (cf., Gladwell 2011). Secondary speech communities often introduce counter definitions, realities, and ideologies (Berger and Luckman 1966). They can also result in what some consider unsuccessful socialization since the ideology may suggest a competing and contradictory analysis of primary socialization. For example, African-American parents may prepare their children to recognize racism, prejudice, and police brutality in a socialization ritual known in the black community as *the talk* (cf., Gandbhir and Foster 2015). In contrast, while hip-hop socialization acknowledges that families have talked about injustice, it also considers continued discrimination in society to be a failure of the parents' generation. Consequently, hip-hop socialization is obsessed with discovering, critiquing, and challenging the "truth" and the "real," and it encourages some level of activism as a critique of the failure of parents to end injustice. This critique, while harsh, is not a callous attack on previous generations. Rather, it is based on the belief that the courage and honesty of the hip-hop generation is necessary in order to further expose injustice and to implicate people and institutions that discriminate based on race, gender, class, and sexuality. As a result, hip-hop socialization can be considered a threat to the social order. These outliers invite young people to join the counter speech community (Morgan 2002) of hip-hop culture. It is through and to language that youth are socialized into the power of analysis, critique, and representation.

Early Developments: Ideology and Race in Language Socialization

As Smitherman (1998, 2000), Alim (2006), and Morgan (2009, 2014) have shown, hip-hop language ideology shares the "linguistic culture" (Schiffman 1996) and language ideology (Kroskrity 2004) of African-American speech communities. The African-American speech community refers to those of African descent whose ancestors lived through US plantation slavery. The resulting variety of English spoken during plantation slavery represented the grammatical and lexical development from the merging of African languages and the varieties of English spoken at the time (Green 2002; Baugh and Labov 1999; Baugh 2002; Alim et al. 2016). It also represented the merging of deep-rooted African discourse strategies, philosophies, and language ideologies necessary to survive in a complex social world that continued to discriminate based on race. This world included enforced "rules of communication" in the form of subservient interactions with whites that did not allow black speakers to show their agency and that implied acceptance of discriminatory practices. In turn, these language and interaction "rules" generated a contrasting "underground" counterlanguage within the African-American speech community (c.f., Morgan 2002) that, to paraphrase Gwaltney (1993), *knew when it was lying*.

Hip-hop language ideology assumes that the language and discourse of repression is unmarked to the dominant society, which in turn does not recognize that its everyday discourse creates discriminatory practices. Bobo and Smith (1998) refer to this unmarked form of racial discrimination, as *laissez-faire racism*. It occurs

where there are claims to supporting equality while simultaneously maintaining negative, stereotypical beliefs about minorities. According to Tarca (2010) and Bonilla-Silva (2013), it is the belief, stated or implied through actions, that one can end racial inequality and discrimination by refusing to acknowledge that race and racial discrimination exists. Laissez-faire racism also encompasses the ideology of how individual deficits explain the problems of entire social groups. Thus the so-called “problems” of black and Latino youth in particular are the result of their own deficiencies.

The language socialization that addresses this ideology is one that focuses on exposing the underlying assumptions of laissez-faire racism discourse. The focus is not just the existence of everyday discourse that may be racist but also the assumptions that everyday discourse is acceptable because it is common. It is not only becoming aware of what speakers habitually do (Hanks 1996) but also addressing what people actually do and what it might mean. Duranti (2011, p. 164) explains that the result is, “. . .speakers are made accountable for something that they may claim to be an unconscious, unquestioned and unquestionable way of communicating.” There have been analyses of covert racist discourse that expose the ideological side of what appear to be “natural” ways of speaking (e.g., J. Hill 2008; Kulick 2003; Hall 1997). With increased access to mobile devices that record interactions, sound, and visual recordings, there are more publicized cases that actually suggest that speakers are, in fact, accountable. In fact, further theories and analyses of speaker agency and intentionality may be the most effective weapon in exposing laissez-faire racism.

Intentionality refers to the recognition that while there may be common sense or conventional sounds, notions, expressions, etc., that are part of the language ideology of speech communities, these norms exist within a complex system of social, cultural, and political relationships. The main indication that intentionality is in play in hiphop language socialization is the use of indirectness. Indirectness occurs when cultural actors recognize talk as symbolic of ideas, values, and occurrences that are not directly related to the present context (Morgan 2002). For adults, indirectness includes an analysis of discourses of power, since these adults know that their cultural practices, beliefs, and values are generally not shared by the wider society, who may not be aware that they exist at all. Consequently, interactions among speech community members embody and highlight an exacting sense of speaker agency (Morgan 1993). This intense focus on speaker agency was co-constructed with a black audience for whom language forms and styles signal that content or speaker intent is purposefully camouflaged. In other words, within the system of repression, the counterlanguage provided a vehicle for facework (Goffman 1967) and protected and confirmed the existence of the antisociety. Its function in instantiating speaker agency was so great that the “act” of talking was potentially political and highly symbolic. Although legal forms of segregation and punishments were removed with the civil rights movement, the importance of indirectness remains a central aspect of African-American ideologies of language (cf. Morgan 2002), especially those that assume the larger society views blacks as deficient because of their race.

The writer John Edgar Wideman illustrates the multilayered and deep rootedness of the African-American language ideology that is the foundation of hip-hop (cited in Alim 2006).

What's fascinating to me about African American speech is its spontaneity, the requirement that you not only have a repertoire of vocabulary or syntactic devices/constructions, but you come prepared to do something in an attempt to meet the person on a level that both uses the language, mocks the language, and recreates the language. (Wideman 1976, p. 34)

Because of their access to this language ideology, youth who are socialized into hip-hop culture have an arsenal of linguistic and discourse weapons from which to choose. They then use their linguistic arsenal to exploit, develop, and play competitive games of representation and social defense. Bennett (2012) describes the philosophy behind hip-hop's language ideology as one where attention is paid to the more skilled speaker who excels in language and symbolic play and critique as cultural norm that creates an "imagination community." It is this imagination community, where equality and citizenship are attainable and "where members of the hip-hop speech community draw from a shared set of creative linguistic skills and values in order to communicate with each other in ways that those outside of that community may fail to appreciate or understand" (Bennett 2012).

This language socialization, which generally begins before adolescence and both instantiates and introduces the hip-hop speech community and its language ideology, then serves as both a critique and companion to their primary socialization (Chang and Herc 2005; Dyson 2008; Kelley 1998; Keyes 2004; Morgan 2009; Peterson 2015; Watkins 2006). Socialization teaches how power and dominance operate in all aspects of society. It also critiques secondary socialization associated with the teenage years that produces gang culture and reproduces social inequality like jocks and cliques (cf., Eckert 1989, 2000). Young girls and boys who adopt hip-hop culture do so as part of families and communities (Cohen 2010; Dimitriadis 2007, 2009) and may identify as Hip-hop Heads(z) since, from their perspective, they *grew up* in hip-hop culture.

Most hip-hop language use begins before the teenage years and as a form of play as youth practice skills like deejaying, dancing, writing (graffiti), performing, and writing lyrics (MCs) (Morgan 2009). For emcees (MCs), ciphers usually consist of onlookers who form a circle and evaluate the overall lyrical skill of participants (Keyes 2004; Peterson 2015; Alim 2006; Richardson 2006). MCs demanding an audience, competition, and critical evaluation can occupy the center of the cipher. If the MC cannot hold the center in terms of lyrical and linguistic skills, the MC will be forced out with stinging critiques and insulting chants from onlookers. The skill necessary to participate as an MC and audience incorporates a broad understanding and reverence for multiple levels of knowledge and cultures. The levels of knowledge include popular and public culture, history, politics, art, music, language, philosophy, literature, religion, health, food ways, and cultural insight into immigrant home countries, languages, and values of those in the local hip-hop community as well as other societies that the artist and community might consider a subject of

focus. All of these items are displayed through language manipulation and play under the following tenets: (1) sounds, objects, and concepts embody and index memory, community, and social world; (2) choices of language and dialect can signify status, beliefs, values, and specific speakers; and (3) all meaning is co-constructed and coauthored (Duranti 1986).

The cipher serves as a collective of social, linguistic, and cultural critics that assess every aspect of the performer, including one's body movements and adornment, and language, and message. The audience critiques the social face (Goffman 1961, 1967) and persona of an artist and audience members who support him and her as well. Friendly yet fierce battles concerning criteria of evaluation and facts are often waged between critics and, in the presence of hearers, willing audiences and passersby, who acknowledge the victor at every turn. At the height of the cipher, everything is at stake: the nation, the future, the truth, the neighborhood, family, beliefs, and, most importantly, getting closer to the truth – The Real Hiphop. It is not surprising that all over the world, Hiphop Heads frequently proclaim: "I AM Hiphop!" In fact, understanding the complex interplay of language and other symbols is so important that at times the artist is also the critic, evaluating his or her performance and philosophy in order to work at the highest possible level while keeping it real.

Major Contributions: Underground Counterlanguage Socialization

As discussed above, the purpose of the cipher is to build critical skills and cultivate a language ideology in an environment that is unwaveringly supportive as well as critical. Contemporary research and descriptions of hiphop language socialization within and outside of ciphers occur in linguistics, education, psychology, science, technology, math, cultural analysis, philosophy, music, and health as well as in biographies of artists. For example, the autobiography *Decoded*, which chronicles the life of hiphop artist and business mogul Jay Z (Jay-Z 2010), begins with a description of his first experience at a hiphop cipher as a 9-year-old boy exploring his neighborhood. His description of Slate, who he describes as a "regular" but slightly older kid from the neighborhood commanding the hiphop cipher, included a critical portrayal of someone standing in the middle of the circle for hours as he played with, toyed with, and slayed his language while rhyming about nothing and about everything as well as rhyming about rhyming and the structure, layers, meaning, intentionality, ideology, and everything else that is language and discourse. "He was rhyming, throwing out couplet after couplet like he was in a trance. . . It was like watching some kind of combat. . .but he was alone in the center. All he had were his eyes, taking in everything, and the words inside him. I was dazzled" (Jay-Z 2010, pp. 4–5).

This particular analysis of the practice and ideology of hiphop as framed by Jay Z reflects the perspectives of many artists and Hiphop Heads(z) interviewed about their understanding of hiphop culture. The intensity of the language play is often

described as a trance and spell. The MC and listeners participate in the cipher and decipher the language flow of the MC as words and language are used to transform and intensify reality not as poetry – though that may be an outcome – but as a passionate, direct, unforgiving, yet thoughtful form of language play delivered by someone from everyday life that shares everyday experiences through rhyme. The MC does not exist without the people, the audience, and the onlookers who are active collaborators. Symbolically the cipher represents ordinary people demonstrating the power of art and language to critique and represent the social world and to mask that representation when necessary. It is seeing someone just like you, who speaks the same language(s) – secret and otherwise – who has the courage to both expose the game and to play it hard. It assumes that speaker intentionality is context specific and that MCs must also deal with the realities imposed by society's often-hostile speech communities. In fact Jay Z considers *misunderstandings* between speech communities to be a badge of righteous honor:

Growing up as a black kid from the projects, you can spend your whole life being misunderstood. . . . accused of motivations you don't know you have, dehumanized – until you realize, one day, it's not about you. . . . The joke's on them because they're really fighting phantoms of their own creation. Sometimes the mask is to hide and sometimes it's to play at being something you're not so you can watch the reactions of people who believe the mask is real. . . . (Jay-Z 2010, pp. 55–56)

To participate, one must be able to creatively *play* with all the knowledge sets in a competitive manner. MCs then freestyle – produce imaginative rhymes instantaneously or deliver prepared rhymes in inventive ways. It is also in the cipher that MCs develop their battling skills and the ability to provide and accept critique and find their place and voice. Some MCs adapt a variety of personas and flow with many verbal styles within and across ciphers to demonstrate their knowledge and proof that they control the mic (Krimms 2000). In earlier works, Smitherman (1977) described call and response as “spontaneous verbal and nonverbal interaction between speaker and listener in which all of the speaker's statements (‘calls’) are punctuated by expressions (‘responses’) from the listener” (1977, p. 104). Hip-hop incorporates a somewhat distinctive spin on call and response in that it considers affirmation to be a process of critique. These critics describe, broadcast, and evaluate the background, predict what the future has in store, and challenge anyone to prove them wrong. Those in hip-hop consider this language to be visible yet unattainable unless one respects hip-hop's language ideology. It is the barely perceptible anti-language (Halliday 1978) and counterlanguage (Morgan 2002) that produce potentially dangerous discourses with power. That is, hip-hop youth respond to society's attempt to stigmatize and marginalize their language use by their continued innovations within the norms of both dialects (Morgan 2002, 2009).

There have been several ethnographies that have also focused on language ideology as part of the hip-hop socialization process. Morgan (2009) conducted an ethnographic study of an underground hip-hop Project Blowed “workshop” in the Leimert Park neighborhood of Los Angeles, California, that was designed to socialize participants into hip-hop language and cultural practices. She describes cipher

activities and the criteria for audience's coauthored assessment of language skill and respect of hip-hop culture. Morgan argued that evaluations of skill and successful socialization by the audience/coauthors were based on their assessment of the MCs ability to reflect concerns and values of the community, representation of the people (s) and neighborhood, linguistic representations of the community and surrounding area, and discourse styles. Several years later, Lee (2016) returned to Leimert Park and the underground hip-hop workshop. He focused on the daily lives of participants within and outside of Project Blowed and their dreams to become successful. He also revealed the different levels of existentialism experienced by the artists and the intricacies within the types of support and enlightenment developed through ciphers. Lee, in turn, contrasted this support with the relentless intrusion of violence, absence of opportunity, and repressive law enforcement visited upon the artist with regularity. In Peterson's (2015) exploration into the hip-hop underground, he discovered that philosophical, artistic, and ideological socialization was fundamental to hip-hop culture. He argues that it functions to reimagine western philosophy in that it focuses on the critical difference between vernacular and standard language and contexts. He concludes, "A standard requires nostalgia whereas a vernacular thrives on critical memory" (p. 142).

As mentioned earlier, socialization through ciphers includes cultural, historical, and social critiques, analyses of educational and teaching practices and school-based social networks, as well as critiques of other forms of status, hierarchy, and advantage and discrimination in society in general. Dimitriadis (2007, 2009) was among the first to describe the importance of hip-hop lyrics in educational literacy practices in the classroom through his examination of the political and social lyrics of the artist Tupac Shakur. He introduced cipher activities into his language arts curriculum and was able to demonstrate an overall improvement in literacy levels in the classroom. In his study of hip-hop language and culture practices, Alim (2006) captured the socialization process through interviews and observations of performances. In particular, he identified the multilayered adaptation of call and response, linguistic creativity, and philosophy both locally and globally. Alim (2006) referred to the global spread of hip-hop language ideology as Hip-hop Nation Language (HHNL) and argued that when one looks beyond linguistic structure and also captures a community's understanding of language as culture, "what is globalized is not an abstract language, but specific speech forms, genres, styles, and forms of literacy practices" (p. 6). Richardson (2006) also provides a critical overview of the language and literacy practices of hip-hop and the tremendous impact it continues to have on language in the United States and around the globe. She cautions about the growth of global and US programs that claim to be hip-hop inspired but are actually cultural appropriations. She finds that many are without the cultural grounding and recognition of the social context from which hip-hop culture emerged.

The language education implications of hip-hop language ideology cannot be overstated. Gloria Ladson-Billing (1995, 2013) argues that in order to educate children, cultural practices should become part of pedagogical practices. Her study of a hip-hop and spoken-word program at the University of Wisconsin found that a culturally sustaining pedagogy allows for a fluid understanding of culture and a

teaching practice that explicitly engages questions of equity and justice. Her findings inspired research on the importance of hiphop language and cultural socialization from ciphers. Hill (2008) and Hill et al. (2013) described the culture of hiphop literacy and the importance of socialization into the culture. In science and technology courses, Emdin (2010, 2016) incorporated cipher strategies that also occurred informally in schools and in communities. He focused on students who supported and critiqued each other in ciphers but whose STEM performance in the classroom did not reflect shared values and interests. He then developed what he calls “reality pedagogy” based on his observations, and STEM learning began to appear in ciphers and verbal competitions. Love (2012) found that the inclusion of hiphop ciphers provided an outlet for girls to discuss personal issues and develop confidence in their schoolwork. Paris (2011, 2012), and Ladson-Billings continue to argue that cultural practices that may not be common in educational settings are the greatest resource from which to teach and inspire students. They focus on the importance of dynamic scholarship and suggest that it is time for a “remix” of the original theory of culturally sustaining pedagogy to include the kind of collaboration that occurs in ciphers.

Work in Progress: The Social World of the Cipher: Decoding Intentionality

The language of African-American youth residing in urban areas has been a subject of interest to linguists and sociologists since the 1970s when work by William Labov (1972) focused on urban youth as dialect innovators. The persistence of African-American English (AAE) as a social dialect also suggests that youth operate with a highly structured language ideology and antilanguage and counterlanguage (Halliday 1978; Morgan 2002). Hiphop’s language ideology has revealed the enduring importance of counterlanguages in situations of inequality, where one group has power over another and where speaking one’s mind may result in punishment of some sort. The group that has little power, and whose behavior is controlled, may develop a secret and often embedded system of communication that is not perceptible to those in power. In contrast, hiphop discourse is not concerned with sustaining a system hidden from dominant culture as such. Rather, hiphop constantly uses the tools of counterlanguage through local references and the creation of new words and meanings that may be unknown within dominant culture. But its purpose is to produce an in-your-face antilanguage. Hiphop wants you to know that they use a counterlanguage and that dominant culture can never really know what they mean.

Hiphop relies on the African-American ideology of the WORD by focusing on the tenets mentioned above (see Early Developments). The first tenet regarding sounds and objects refers to the importance of signifiers or indices and emblems of black urban life as well as society in general. These may include use of and references to language and dialect varieties, expressions, proverbs, music, movies, neighborhoods, streets, public transportation systems, prisons, and the things people must deal with. However, these items’ value may change quickly. Thus it is not only

the popular items that have exchange value for youth culture but also how they function within a system of markedness where the notion of normal, expected, and stable are disrupted by forms, references, expressions, and so on that question what is considered normal and accepted. Moreover, a system of markedness functions within popular and local trademarks and brands (cf. Coombe 1998; Bucholtz and Hall 2004; Bucholtz 2011) and youth may use the system to mark the same symbol as both positive and negative in any given moment.

The second tenet or position regarding language is concerned with identity, ideology, power, and knowledge of and attitudes toward language use. It refers directly to the possibility of altering symbols and trademarks as a means to exploit and subvert them. As Stuart Hall (1996) says, “Identities are. . . constituted within, not outside of representation. . . within, not outside, discourse, and constructed through, not outside, difference” (p. 4) (Hall and Du Gay 1996).

The third and final point about audiences makes obvious that neither youth nor the artist stands alone as an independent individual. Rather, the ties to the audience/generation, speech community, and peers bring him or her into existence. In this sense, an artist is a composite of his or her audience – representing experiences that are shared – and the audience determines whether the artist can assume that role. Thus in this respect, any person anywhere in the world who claims to be hiphop reinforces these ties and the shared values of the Hiphop Nation. Whether the lyrics of the MC are playful, insulting, or political, this ideology is ever-present and may appear in any context. The discourse itself is proof of hiphop’s existence and its ability to infiltrate and interfere with dominant culture. Thus references to public individuals, events, objects, etc., are indexical and can stand for, point to, connect, and target particular groups and contexts (Peirce 1960; Silverstein 1979, 2003). As a consequence, hiphop is always concerned with context and reifies local and in-group knowledge as it points and “shouts out” to its members. It relies on the secret handshake, knowing look, and coded message. It signals the existence of an alter-entity – ordinary youth as thinkers, critics, and creators of language, culture, art, ideas, and political movements. All of these attempts to incorporate socialization done in communities of hiphop enthusiasts raise serious questions about the nature of socialization. Philosophers like Darby and Shelby (2005) and Thomas (2007) argue that because youth are socialized into analyzing issues and seeking “the truth” and explanations for poverty, racism, and urban decay, they are engaging and challenging radical philosophical movements.

Problems and Difficulties: Hiphop Therapy – Trauma and (Common) Sense and Reference

Because ciphers require practice and critiques of “the way things are,” they offer both direct language about prejudice, critiques of problems, and criticism from others and scenarios that might resolve the conflict. Travis (2015) provides an extensive review of early efforts to incorporate hiphop socialization practices into therapy for youth, especially those experiencing trauma. In 2004, Tomas Alvarez III

developed one of the country's first "Hip Hop Therapy" programs that used the process of creating rap music as a tool for promoting mental health and healing among urban youth uninterested in traditional talk therapy. Some therapists had already noticed that hip-hop culture and the cipher activities, in particular, were one of the few contexts that urban adolescents considered conducive to sharing emotions and mental health issues (e.g., Winfrey 2009; Elligan 2004; Hadley and Yancy 2011). In 2011, the Hip Hop Therapy program, which changed its name to *Beats, Rhymes and Life (BRL)*, began serving youth throughout the San Francisco Bay area of California.

Alvarez (2011) explains that although the juvenile justice system is a negative outcome in the lives of youth, it is also often their first opportunity to get help for trauma. In the United States, there remain serious issues regarding race and how African-Americans and Latina/os should behave when speaking to authority, especially the police. BRL incorporates ciphers, journals, and other modes of expression that not only teach the dangers and intricacies of racial interactions but also explicitly teach the ideology and ways of representing and communicating in the face of repression. Yet the superficial use of hip-hop socialization techniques is a danger to the success of mental health programs for urban youth. What is needed is the acknowledgement that society is not fair and that success is often not due to merit but to the opportunity that whiteness can guarantee.

Future Directions: Language Socialization of Courage Over Fatalism "When They Come for You"

The tension between recognizing hip-hop as art and not as "a diary" of real life, as Jay Z scolds, is also a critique of the larger conceit associated with dominant cultural valuations of what is "real" art and what is the "real" language. The tension between living in the social world and artistic portrayals of life is not new. Language is a powerful semiotic tool for evoking social and moral sentiments, collective and personal identities tied to place and situation, and bodies of knowledge and belief (Duranti 1997, 2011, 2015; Hymes 1964; Sapir 1921). Heath's (2010) description of the difficulty of conducting research on teenagers is relevant when considering how to support the development and diversity of those in that age group on an ongoing basis. However for hip-hop, language socialization that addresses prejudice is hard-wired in the culture. Hip-hop's philosophy and ideology remain a constant that cycles its socialization within and through youth life cycles.

The requirement that hip-hop artists have expansive vocabularies, grammatical knowledge, ideologies, and philosophies about language is fundamental to hip-hop culture. It is also the opposite image often associated with urban teenage youth as disinterested in knowledge building and generally at risk (e.g., McWhorter 2008). Since language socialization occurs through and into language (Ochs and Schieffelin 1984, 1995; Schieffelin and Ochs 1986), it is predictable that speculation about language use would occur among groups where dominant society stigmatizes their speech because of regional and social differences.

Hiphop cultural activity through cipher socialization has been in existence for over 40 years. Future research on this kind of language socialization is promising for long-term work. Youth in hiphop culture who continue socialization with each recurring generation are determined yet bewildered that their efforts remain a necessity. They look both backward and forward and see that their life chances are still determined by their skin color, neighborhood, gender, sexual choices, and social class – just like their ancestors. If we consider the major linguistic philosophy and language ideology arguments that have emerged through hiphop language socialization, it is clear that the need for a sense of belonging and meaning so poignantly articulated by Heath (2010) has ushered in new challenges. It requires philosophical analyses that pay more attention to cases of language and language socialization and that address and understand that the power of the Word in hiphop is also the age-old question of sense and reference, truth and reality, and even being and time. After all, hiphop youth have a theory of what it means to intend and pretend to misunderstand and to be misunderstood.

Cross-References

- ▶ [Language Socialization: An Historical Overview](#)
- ▶ [Language Socialization and Multimodality in Multilingual Urban Homes](#)
- ▶ [Language Socialization in the Learning Communities of Adolescents](#)

Related Articles in the Encyclopedia of Language and Education

- Brian Street: [New Literacies, New Times: Developments in Literacy Studies](#). In Volume: Literacies and Language Education
- E. Richardson: [African American Literacies](#). In Volume: Literacies and Language Education
- J. Mahiri: [Literacies in the Lives of Global Youth](#). In Volume: Literacies and Language Education
- Sandra Lee McKay: [Sociolinguistics and Language Education](#). In Volume: Second and Foreign Language Education
- Alastair Pennycook: [Critical Applied Linguistics and Education](#). In Volume: Language Policy and Political Issues in Education
- Awad Ibrahim: [Immigration/Flow, Hybridity and Language Awareness](#). In Volume: Language Awareness and Multilingualism

References

- Adger, C. T., Wolfram, W., & Christian, D. (2007). *Dialects in schools and communities*. Mahwah: Routledge.
- Alim, H. S. (2006). *Roc the mic right: The language of hip hop culture*. New York: Routledge.

- Alim, H. S., & Baugh, J. (Eds.). (2006). *Talkin black talk: Language, education, and social change*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Alim, H. S., Rickford, J. R., & Ball, A. F. (Eds.). (2016). *Raciolinguistics: How language shapes our ideas about race*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Alvarez, T. (2011). Beats, rhymes and life: Rap therapy in an urban setting. In S. Hadley & G. Yancy (Eds.), *Therapeutic uses of rap and hip-hop* (pp. 117–128). New York: Routledge.
- Banks, A. J. (2005). *Race, rhetoric, and technology: Searching for higher ground (NCTE- literacy and composition research)*. Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Banks, A. J. (2011). *Digital griots: African American rhetoric in a multimedia age*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Baugh, J. (2002). *Beyond Ebonics: Linguistic pride and racial prejudice*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Baugh, J. (2003). Linguistic profiling. In S. Makoni, G. Smitherman, A. F. Ball, & A. K. Spears (Eds.), *Black linguistics: Language, society and politics in Africa and the Americas* (pp. 15–169). London/New York: Routledge.
- Baugh, J., & Labov, W. (1999). *Out of the mouths of slaves: African American language and educational malpractice*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Bennett, D. (2012). *Imagination communities: Hip-hop's creative labor* (pp. 1–15). Presented at the hip-hop and globalization conference, Harvard University: Hip-hop Archive.
- Berger, P. L., & Luckmann, T. (1966). *The social construction of reality: A treatise in the sociology of knowledge*. Middlesex: Penguin Books.
- Bobo, L., & Smith, R. (1998). From Jim Crow racism to Laissez-Faire racism: The transformation of racial attitudes in America. In W. Katkin, N. Landsman, & A. Tyree (Eds.), *Beyond pluralism: Essays on the conception of groups and group identities in America* (pp. 182–220). Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- Bonilla-Silva, E. (2013). *Racism without racists: Color-blind racism and the persistence of racial inequality in America*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.
- Bucholtz, M., & Hall, K. (2004). Language and identity. In A. Duranti (Ed.), *A companion to linguistic anthropology* (pp. 369–394). Hoboken: Wiley Blackwell.
- Chang, J., & Herc, D. J. K. (2005). *Can't stop won't stop: A history of the hip-hop generation* (Reprinted.). New York: Picador.
- Cohen, C. J. (2010). *Democracy remixed: Black youth and the future of American politics*. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press.
- Coombe, R. J. (1998). *The cultural life of intellectual properties: Authorship, appropriation, and the law*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Darby, D., & Shelby, T. (Eds.). (2005). *Hip-hop and philosophy: Rhyme 2 reason*. Chicago: Open Court.
- Dimitriadis, G. (2007). *Studying urban youth culture primer*. New York: Peter Lang Publishing Inc.
- Dimitriadis, G. (2009). *Performing identity/performing culture: Hip hop as text, pedagogy, and lived practice* (4th ed.). New York: Peter Lang Publishing Inc.
- Duranti, A. (1986). The audience as co-author: An introduction. *Text – Interdisciplinary Journal for the Study of Discourse*, 6(3). <http://doi.org/10.1515/text.1.1986.6.3.239>.
- Duranti, A. (1997). *Linguistic anthropology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Duranti, A. (2011). Ethnopragmatics and beyond: Intentionality and agency across languages and cultures. In C. Baraldi, A. Borsari, & A. Carli (Eds.), *Hybrids, differences, visions: On the study of culture* (pp. 151–168). Aurora: The Davies Group, Publishers.
- Duranti, A. (2015). *The anthropology of intentions: Language in a world of others*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dyson, M. E. (2008). *Know what I mean?: Reflections on hip-hop*. New York: Basic Civitas Books.
- Eckert, P. (1989). *Jocks and burnouts: Social categories and identity in the high school*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Eckert, P. (2000). *Linguistic variation as social practice: The linguistic construction of identity in Belten High*. Hoboken: Wiley-Blackwell.

- Elligan, D. (2004). *Rap therapy: A practical guide for communicating with youth and young adults through rap music*. New York: Kensington.
- Emdin, C. (2010). *Urban science education for the hip-hop generation*. Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.
- Emdin, C. (2016). *For white folks who teach in the hood... and the rest of y'all too: Reality pedagogy and urban education*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Gandhir, G., & Foster, B. (2015, March 17). A conversation with my black son. *The New York times*. Retrieved from <http://www.nytimes.com/2015/03/17/opinion/a-conversation-with-my-black-son.html>
- Gladwell, M. (2011). *Outliers: The story of success* (Reprint ed.). New York: Back Bay Books.
- Goffman, E. (1961). *Asylums: Essays on the social situation of mental patients and other inmates*. New York: Anchor Books/Doubleday.
- Goffman, E. (1967). *Interaction ritual – Essays on face-to-face behavior*. New York: Pantheon.
- Green, L. J. (2002). *African American English: A linguistic introduction* (9.3.2002 ed.). Cambridge/New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Gwaltney, J. L. (1993). *Drylongso: A self-portrait of black America*. New York: The New Press.
- Hadley, S., & Yancy, G. (2011). *Therapeutic uses of rap and hip-hop*. New York: Routledge.
- Hall, S. (1996). Who needs “identity”? In S. Hall & P. du Gay (Eds.), *Questions of cultural identity* (pp. 1–17). London: Sage.
- Hall, S. (Ed.). (1997). *Representation: Cultural representations and signifying practices* (1st ed.). London/Thousand Oaks: Sage/Open University.
- Hall, S., & du Gay, P. (Eds.). (1996). *Questions of cultural identity*. London: Sage.
- Halliday, M. A. K. (1975). *Learning how to mean: Explorations in the development of language*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Halliday, M. A. K. (1976). Anti-languages. *American Anthropologist*, 78(3), 570–584.
- Halliday, M. A. K. (1978). *Language as social semiotic: The social interpretation of language and meaning*. London: University Park Press.
- Hanks, W. F. (1996). Language form and communicative practices. In J. J. Gumperz & S. C. Levinson (Eds.), *Rethinking linguistic relativity* (pp. 232–270). Cambridge/New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Heath, S. B. (1983). *Ways with words: Language, life and work in communities and classrooms*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Heath, S. B. (2010). Language socialization in the learning communities of adolescents. In P. A. Duff & N. Hornberger (Eds.), *Language socialization: Encyclopedia of language and education* (Vol. 8, 2010th ed., pp. 217–230). Dordrecht: Springer.
- Heidegger, M. (1962). *Being and time* (Reprint ed.). New York: Harper Perennial Modern Classics.
- Hill, J. H. (2008). *The everyday language of white racism*. Chichester/Malden: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Hill, M. L., Petchauer, E., & Chang, J. (2013). *Schooling hip-hop: Expanding hip-hop based education across the curriculum*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Hudley, A. H. C., Mallinson, C., Banks, J. A., Wolfram, W., & Labov, W. (2010). *Understanding English language variation in U.S. schools*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Husserl, E. (1983). *Ideas pertaining to a pure phenomenology and to a phenomenological philosophy: First book: General introduction to a pure phenomenology* (trans: Kersten, F.) ([1913] 1982). The Hague/Boston/Hingham: Springer.
- Hymes, D. H. (1964). *Language in culture and society: A reader in linguistics and anthropology*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Jay-Z. (2010). *Decoded*. New York: Spiegel & Grau.
- Kelley, R. D. G. (1998). *Yo' mama's disfunkcional!: Fighting the culture wars in urban America*. Beacon Press.
- Keyes, C. L. (2004). *Rap music and street consciousness*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- Krims, A. (2000). *Rap music and the poetics of identity*. Cambridge/New York: Cambridge University Press.

- Kroskrity, P. (2004). Language ideologies. In A. Duranti (Ed.), *A companion to linguistic anthropology* (pp. 496–517). Hoboken: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Kulick, D. (2003). Language and desire. In J. Holmes & M. Meyerhoff (Eds.), *The handbook of language and gender* (pp. 119–141). Malden: Blackwell Pub.
- Labov, W. (1972). *Language in the inner city: Studies in the black English vernacular*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Labov, W. (2012). *Dialect diversity in America: The politics of language change*. Charlottesville/London: University of Virginia Press.
- Ladson-Billings, G. (1995). Toward a theory of culturally relevant pedagogy. *American Educational Research Journal*, 32(3), 465–491.
- Ladson-Billings, G. (2013). “Stakes is high”: Educating new century students. *The Journal of Negro Education*, 82(2), 105–110.
- Lee, J. (2016). *Blowin’ up: Rap dreams in South central*. Chicago/London: University of Chicago Press.
- Love, B. L. (2012). *Hip hop’s Li’l Sistas speak: Negotiating hip hop identities and politics in the new South*. New York: Peter Lang Publishing Inc.
- McWhorter, J. (2008). *All about the beat: Why hip-hop can’t save black America*. New York: Gotham.
- Morgan, M. (1993). The Africanness of counterlanguage among Afro-Americans. In S. S. Mufwene (Ed.), *Africanisms in Afro-American language varieties* (pp. 423–435). Athens: University of Georgia Press.
- Morgan, M. (2002). *Language, discourse and power in African American culture*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Morgan, M. (2009). *The real hip-hop: Battling for knowledge, power, and respect in the LA underground*. Durham: Duke University Press Books.
- Morgan, M. (2014). *Speech communities: Key topics in linguistic anthropology*. Cambridge/New York: Cambridge University Press.
- 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). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ochs, E., & Schieffelin, B. (1995). The impact of language socialization on grammatical development. In P. Fletcher & B. MacWhinney (Eds.), *The handbook of child language* (pp. 73–94). Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.
- Paris, D. (2011). *Language across difference: Ethnicity, communication, and youth identities in changing urban schools* (1st ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Paris, D. (2012). Culturally sustaining pedagogy: A needed change in stance, terminology, and practice. *Educational Researcher*, 41(3), 93–97.
- Peirce, C. S. (1960). *Collected papers of Charles Sanders Peirce* (Vol. 2, trans: Charles H & Weiss P). Second Printing. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Peterson, J. (2015). *The hip-hop underground and African American culture: Beneath the surface*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Richardson, E. (2006). *Hip-hop literacies*. London/New York: Routledge.
- Sapir, E. (1921). *Language: An introduction to the study of speech*. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World.
- Schiffman, H. (1996). *Linguistic culture and language policy*. London/New York: Routledge.
- Schieffelin, B. B., & Ochs, E. (Eds.). (1986). *Language socialization across cultures*. Cambridge/New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Silverstein, M. (1979). Language structure and linguistic ideology. In P. R. Clyne, W. F. Hanks, & C. L. Hofbauer (Eds.), *The elements: A parasession on linguistic units and levels including papers from the conference on non Slavic languages of the USSR* (pp. 193–247). Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society.
- Silverstein, M. (2003). Indexical order and the dialectics of sociolinguistic life. *Language and Communication*, 23(3–4), 193–229.

- Smitherman, G. (1977). *Talkin and testifyin: The language of black America*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Smitherman, G. (1998). Word from the hood: The lexicon of African American English. In S. S. Mufwene, J. Rickford, G. Bailey, & J. Baugh (Eds.), *African-American English: Structure, history, and use* (pp. 203–225). London/New York: Routledge.
- Smitherman, G. (1999). *Talkin that talk: Language, culture and education in African America*. New York: Routledge.
- Smitherman, G. (2000). *Black talk: Words and phrases from the hood to the amen corner*. Boston: Mariner Books.
- Tarca, K. (2010). Colorblind in control: The risks of resisting difference amid demographic change. *Educational Studies*, 38(2), 99–120.
- Thomas, A. (2007, September 12). *The spirit and philosophy of hip hop*. Retrieved September 5, 2016, from <http://www.newstatesman.com/blogs/the-faith-column/2007/09/hip-hop-movements-thought>
- Travis Jr., R. (2015). *The healing power of hip hop*. Santa Barbara: Praeger.
- Watkins, S. C. (2006). *Hip hop matters: Politics, pop culture, and the struggle for the soul of a movement*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Wideman, J. (1976). Frame and dialect: The evolution of black voice in American literature. *American Poetry Review*, 5(5), 34–37.
- Winfrey, A. M. (2009). *H.Y.P.E.: Healing young people thru empowerment*. Chicago: African American Images.

Language Socialization and Immigration in Europe

Inmaculada García-Sánchez and Kristina Nazimova

Abstract

Language socialization-inspired linguistic ethnography, by focusing on the complex relationship between multilingual practices and larger sociocultural dynamics to illuminate the experience of immigrant communities in Europe, has enriched current understandings of new sociopolitical European realities – characterized by mobility, multilingualism, and diversity. This review emphasizes children’s and youth’s everyday and institutionalized language practices, as they intersect with hegemonic language ideologies, and cultural politics of recognition and belonging that immigrants must negotiate on a daily basis. This chapter first traces early developments by describing how language socialization theory was used to explore the complex dialectic among language use, identity development, and group belonging in the socialization trajectories of immigrant children and youth. The main section concentrates on the most productive analytic foci in this body of literature, more specifically immigrant children’s and youth’s linguistic and interactional practices as they negotiate identities in relation to difference and belonging; school interactions as key sites for the socialization of newcomers amid crisscrossing tensions and debates about integration, education, and inclusion; and intergenerational dynamics and religious socialization in the development of heritage identities. The final section outlines several lines of inquiry for future language socialization studies in European immigrant communities, namely, paying closer attention to how structural inequalities and power relationships shape processes of language socialization in contexts of sociopolitical marginalization, attending to adult language socialization processes as they

For the purposes of this chapter, Europe refers to the historical, cultural, and geographical area that comprises the westernmost part of Eurasia, not to the more recent political unit known as the European Union.

I. García-Sánchez (✉) • K. Nazimova
Department of Anthropology, Temple University, Philadelphia, PA, USA
e-mail: igarcias@temple.edu; knazimova@temple.edu

impact professional and bureaucratic trajectories, and investigating the kinds of socialization trajectories of multilingual development that are encouraged in European transnational spaces and institutions.

Keywords

Language socialization • Immigrants and immigration • Diaspora populations • Multilingualism and multiculturalism • Integration and belonging • Marginalization and exclusion • Language and identities • Europe • School and education • Immigrant children and youth

Contents

Introduction	442
Early Developments	443
Major Contributions	444
Language Socialization Practices in Multilingual Classrooms	445
Language Socialization Beyond the Classroom	450
Future Directions	452
Cross-References	453
Related Articles in the Encyclopedia of Language and Education	454
References	454

Introduction

From the postwar flow of immigrant workers from former colonial territories in the 1960s and 1970s to the present-day refugee crisis, transnational migration has been one of the most defining phenomena of the contemporary European experience. These unprecedented levels of immigration have had a deep impact on the demographic, racial, religious, cultural, and linguistic composition of both urban and rural European centers and have challenged taken-for-granted notions of belonging based on Herderian ethnolinguistic homogeneity.¹ This new sociopolitical reality, characterized by mobility and superdiversity (Vertovec 2007), has provided fertile ground for language scholars working in Europe to explore the challenges and opportunities brought about by increasing levels of multilingualism and multiculturalism on the continent.

Language socialization-inspired linguistic ethnography, in particular, has played an important role in illuminating the intricate relationship among multilingual language practices, immigrant children and youth, and larger sociocultural dynamics, with particular emphasis on how these domains intersect with the hegemonic language ideologies and cultural politics of recognition and belonging that immigrants must negotiate on a daily basis. This chapter traces the major contributions of

¹For an exhaustive historical examination of how notions of belonging to European national collectivities became tied to ideas of ethnolinguistic purity, see Bauman and Briggs' (2003) *Voices of Modernity*, particularly Chaps. 5 and 6.

this research paradigm to current understandings of how processes of language and sociocultural development unfold in politically contested contexts of immigration and, in turn, how they impact immigrant children's and youth's sense of belonging and processes of identification. Following major trends in language socialization scholarship, this review emphasizes specifically children and youth's everyday and institutionalized language practices in European contexts, as they intersect with discourses of education, integration, and socialization. This chapter also considers how future developments can expand the horizons of this paradigm by addressing new ways of analyzing and theorizing competence in contexts of marginalization by attending to immigrant experiences across the life span.

Early Developments

We start this section by addressing why a chapter devoted to language socialization scholarship in Europe focuses exclusively on research conducted in immigrant communities, rather than taking a more general approach that would embrace the different trends and directions that language socialization work has taken in European contexts more generally. Our emphasis is due to the fact that the vast majority of studies conducted in Europe under the rubric of language socialization have aimed to understand the sociolinguistic and sociocultural worlds of the increasing number of immigrant children and youth across the continent. There are, of course, a few exceptions to this, most notably the work conducted in Italy by Pontecorvo and her collaborators (see, e.g., Pontecorvo et al. 2001) and in Sweden by Aronsson and her collaborators (see, e.g., Aronsson and Gottzén 2011) since the late 1990s. Both of these projects were based on longitudinal linguistic video ethnographies of everyday negotiations of family life among middle-class Italian and Swedish families, respectively, and they were crucial in the dissemination of the language socialization paradigm among European scholars of child and youth studies, as well as among ethnographically oriented language scholars.

We think there are several reasons why so much of the language socialization research conducted in Europe has concentrated on immigrant children and youth growing up in multilingual and multicultural communities. As we discussed in the introduction, the impact of contemporary migratory flows into different nation states across the continent has steadily become the focus of much European scholarship in the human and social sciences. In trying to understand the experience of transnational children and youth whose lives are characterized by mobility, language scholars began to recognize the importance of attending to not only how these children and youth navigate the liminality of linguistic boundaries but also of national, sociocultural, and ideological borders. The new multilingual and multicultural realities brought a growing recognition of the importance of understanding immigrant children's and youth's socialization trajectories as intimately tied to how they were able to negotiate multiple languages and identities in different arenas of social life, as well as to how they were able to develop a sense of belonging to multiple communities in politically fraught contexts of marginalization. For

example, in his work on *crossing* among British adolescents, Rampton (1995) argued for the need for European language scholars to move away from understanding socialization as acculturation in favor of more dynamic models to examine the complex dialectic among language use, identity development, and group belonging in the socialization trajectories of these youth. Because of its attention to how identities are socially situated and locally produced in interactions, as well as how these interactions are shaped by larger ideologies and structures, language socialization offers the theoretical and methodological sophistication to respond to this challenge in multilingual, socioculturally contested contexts.

Indeed, themes of how immigrant children develop and deploy the appropriate linguistic resources to negotiate participation and belonging in interethnic interactions in their most immediate local context were present from the earliest language socialization studies. Palloti (2001), for example, used a language socialization approach in his longitudinal case study of a Moroccan girl in an Italian nursery school. Focusing on issues of developmental pragmatics, he analyzed how Fatma was able to use her immediate discourse context to participate successfully in everyday interactions with her teachers and peers. Evaldsson (2005) focused on how immigrant and working-class boys in an elementary school in Sweden negotiated their local social order, displaying an astute orientation to dominant language ideologies and to the politics of ethnic difference in the ways they insulted and categorized one another. Finally, among these early examples of European language socialization scholarship in immigrant communities, Trimaille's (2003) study involving immigrant youth of North African descent in a neighborhood youth center (*centre social*) in Grenoble, France, is also worth mentioning. She examined how these youth organize their multilingual practices in French, Arabic, and English in relation to French ideologies of speech and behavior. While the links between microexamples of language use and macroideological and political structures are not fully explicated in this work, Trimaille insightfully demonstrates how these youth encountered multiple exclusions and, relatedly, notes the importance of peer group inclusion for social recognition.

Major Contributions

In attempting to understand the linguistic and sociocultural matrix of immigrant children's and youth's lives in Europe, language socialization researchers have focused on the fine-grained analysis of their multilingual repertoires and interactional practices as they negotiate identities in relation to difference and belonging. On the one hand, this overarching analytic concern has been examined in the context of school interactions and classroom discourse processes as key sites for the socialization of newcomers amid crisscrossing tensions and debates about integration, education, and inclusion. On the other hand, it has also been studied with regard to intergenerational dynamics and religious socialization in the development of heritage identities. Indeed, a characteristic of many of these studies is their ethnographic focus on a single social context of immigrant children's lives, whether educational,

familial, neighborhood, or religious. A recent important exception is García-Sánchez's (2014) monograph on the lives of Moroccan immigrant children in Spain. It attempts to offer an integrated, holistic perspective by highlighting the emergent, and sometimes paradoxical, qualities of immigrant children's everyday social engagements at public schools, in medical clinics, in families, during neighborhood play, and in religious education settings. Across all these contexts and against a backdrop of increased problematization of Muslim and North African immigrants, García-Sánchez investigated how children attempted to position themselves and were differentially positioned by others as they negotiated membership and forms of participation in their multiple communities. In this sense, it is one of the most comprehensive language socialization studies conducted to date among immigrant communities in Europe.

Language Socialization Practices in Multilingual Classrooms

Schools have long been noted as key sites for socialization into sociolinguistic norms and for the reproduction of national ideologies, as well as being among the first institutions involved in the settlement processes of immigrant families. Consequently, a major focus of language socialization research in Europe has been on immigrant children's and youth's integration into education systems and the institutional responses to increasing ethnolinguistic diversity in schools. As illustrated in the next sections, researchers have taken ethnomethodological and discourse analytic approaches to understanding how microlevel interactions and local dynamics in multiethnic classrooms are in dialectic relationship with larger sociohistorical and political concerns about immigration and inclusion. They have closely examined the processes through which children from immigrant backgrounds make sense of their emerging social identities in relation to both immediate practices in the classroom and to broader sociocultural ideologies in European societies. Simultaneously, scholars have attended to the way teachers and students from ethnolinguistically dominant backgrounds respond to the presence and participation of immigrant children, to the use of nonstandard language varieties, and to multilingual/polylinguistic interactions in settings that have traditionally privileged standard monolingual language ideologies or limited forms of bilingualism involving other European language varieties. Of critical importance has been documenting how communicative practices in diverse multilingual classrooms reproduce but also contest the institutional discourses, ideologies, and structural constraints of interactional norms. Thus, in what follows, we highlight primarily language socialization research conducted in educational settings – with a special focus on classroom interactions – and then turn our attention to those scholarly contributions that are ethnographically based in familial and other institutional contexts.

Newcomers' Development of Cultural and Linguistic Competence

Building on the sociohistorical, sociocultural, and interactional approach to learning that has traditionally characterized the language socialization paradigm

(Duranti et al. 2012), a central concern has been to document newly arrived immigrant children's development of cultural and linguistic competence. Thus, language socialization-inspired linguistic ethnographies have detailed the process of children's acquisition of communicative skills through everyday interactions with others and the ways in which this process intersects with other sociocultural dynamics. Cekaite (2007), for example, studied the development of interactional competence of a Kurdish girl in a Swedish primary school. By tracing the systematic changes in the child's verbal contributions to multiparty classroom talk, particularly her increasing expertise in turn-taking rules, Cekaite captured the student's shifting social identity and positioning in the classroom from a silent to a noisy to a skillful child. Hence, Cekaite argued against the notion that a newcomer's L2 learning follows a "unilinear development toward a single learner identity" (p. 45). Her data suggest that an L2 novice can occupy different social positions within the classroom depending on their level of interactional skill and the affordances they have for participation.

In another study, Cekaite (2012) addressed the notion of multiple trajectories toward communicative competence more centrally. Examining a Somali student's non-compliant affective stance toward the teacher's directives, Cekaite argued that the girl's process of becoming a competent participant in the classroom community did not follow a "normative" trajectory. Indeed, her embodied "opposition" to the class activities led her to occupy an unfavorable social position. The interplay between the student's stances and the teacher's socializing responses generated a social identity for the student as a problematic subject who opposes the values, norms, and ideologies of educational settings. Both of Cekaite's studies speak to the multifaceted and contested nature of immigrant children's socialization into, and deployment of, linguistically mediated social practices in the classroom.

Other scholars who focus on immigrant children's development of bi-/multilingual competencies and identities have attended to the linguistic and literacy strategies that facilitate this development. Al-Azami et al. (2010) have written about how the transliteration of Bengali into Roman script facilitated the bilingual learning identities of second- and third-generation British Bangladeshi children who were attending a community-run after-school program. Transliteration provided a communicative bridge for students, parents, and teachers to engage in discussions about word meanings and grammatical distinctions between English and Bengali. These discussions facilitated metalinguistic awareness about linguistic difference without creating an ideological rift between the two language varieties that so often accompanies the educational goals of mainstream classrooms in Europe.

Negotiating Multilingual Repertoires in Traditionally Monolingual Spaces

Given the multilingual skills of the growing number of immigrant children entering European schools, language socialization studies have also examined the tensions between children's multilingual repertoires and resources, on the one hand, and monolingual ideologies and practices in the classroom, on the other. To understand

how such tensions bear on children's socialization in increasingly diverse schools, scholars have analyzed the ways children exploit a range of communicative resources during peer interactions to construct situated identities and negotiate local forms of social organization in a linguistically diverse environment. Karrebæk (2013) has explored how multilingual repertoires of Turkish-speaking children are curtailed in the Danish education system, where speaking in a language other than standard Danish marks the speaker as undesirably different. In this study involving Turkish immigrants, Karrebæk highlighted the school system's privileging of monolingualism despite growing linguistic diversity, but also noted the way children themselves reproduced and socialized each other into the hegemonic monolingual model during group play. The students valorized the use of Danish while distancing themselves from Turkish, rendering it less valuable and stigmatizing. Similarly, Cekaite and Evaldsson (2008) focused on language alternation practices in multiethnic Swedish primary schools where teachers enforced Swedish monolingualism. Within this context, the standard of monolingualism was an integral component of children's negotiations of identity. "Monolingual" emerged as a relational category against which they constructed and displayed their locally meaningful identities as "good students" who followed that standard or as bi-/multilingual "troublemakers" who broke it. In so doing, students exploited the monolingual-multilingual binary in classroom interactions to their own situational advantage.

Mökkönen (2013) has also shown children's situationally advantageous use of multilingualism. Using the Bakhtinian notion of "voice" (Bakhtin 1981), she analyzed how two newcomers to Finland negotiated their participation in an English-only classroom community. Initially the two students displayed alignment with the teacher's English-only rule because it helped to signal their shared identity as foreign newcomers. Yet, for one of the students, accessing peer talk became a crucial means of avoiding social exclusion so she began to draw on her emerging Finnish-English bilingualism to engage in illicit side conversations with her Finnish peers. For Mökkönen, these data suggest that immigrant children's ability to negotiate a successful social identity for themselves "is not located in the literal production of utterances in a new language but in the midst of the dual expectations of teacher and peer talk" (p. 138).

A related line of inquiry has investigated how children use these multilingual repertoires specifically to challenge or subvert monolingual norms. For example, Mökkönen (2012) analyzed students' use of subteaching or students' uptake of teacher-like discourses and practices (Tholander and Aronsson 2003). On the one hand, subteaching emerged as a key interactional tool by which students deployed the authoritative institutional discourses of the English-only classroom to co-enforce monolingualism. On the other hand, subteaching also allowed children to appropriate teacher-like discourses to contest and at times to subvert these enforcements, by mockingly re-voicing the subteacher's directives to speak English. In so doing, children effectively challenged the institutional constraints on communicative practices. Mökkönen's study underscores children's linguistic agency to resist the social structure of institutional settings that call for monolingual practices. Furthermore,

her study demonstrates that children do not passively follow the normative expectations but “contingently draw upon these norms adapting them to their own social purposes, even reinterpreting and subverting them to perform social actions” (p. 320).

Children’s Political Agency to Police, Exclude, and Discriminate

Indeed, the language socialization studies reviewed here have taken seriously children’s agency as social actors who manipulate in sophisticated ways the social orders they encounter. A productive focus of inquiry has been children’s practices of systematic inclusion and exclusion of others. As mentioned in the Early Developments section, Evaldsson (2005) examined the insult routines of boys from immigrant, working-class backgrounds in a Swedish elementary school. In particular, she brought to light the political character of children’s talk by attending to how they use the negatively valued social, economic, and linguistic characteristics of their peers as the driving force of insults. Evaldsson’s data demonstrate children’s active exploitation of ethnic, gender, and class categories as resources for framing verbal offenses, practices that are generally suggestive of the way preadolescent youth are already able to strategically deploy macrolevel categories and ideologies in everyday talk to negotiate group belonging.

Using Goffman’s (1981) conceptualization of *participation framework*, Karrebæk (2011) analyzed peer group play among preschool children in a multiethnic kindergarten in Denmark. In this study, she focused on the way young children establish social order and hierarchies by negotiating who has access to play activities and to particular roles within the play frames. As previous peer language socialization studies had shown, Karrebæk’s research demonstrated that children’s games are serious arenas for both children’s “learning and socialization” as well as for “failures and socialization into marginalization” (p. 2929). Her analysis underscored how children’s participation in games is an interactional accomplishment that is embedded in local power dynamics, which children must learn to manipulate in order to negotiate – to varying degrees of success – their entry into and social position within the peer group.

Children’s political agency to (re-)produce inequalities in their local contexts has also been underscored in García-Sánchez’s (2014) analysis of everyday school interactions between Moroccan immigrant children and their Spanish peers. García-Sánchez documented how the behavior of Moroccan immigrant children was routinely policed and constructed as deviant by their Spanish peers through a set of linguistically mediated technologies of surveillance and exclusion. These quotidian exclusionary practices consisted of everyday discursive practices, such as tattling, blaming, accusing, and *fueling the fire* sequences that were overwhelmingly directed at Moroccan students. Through these practices, racialized and exclusionary boundaries were instantiated through aggravated peer directives and other linguistic structures that encode unmitigated, negative types of agency, making Moroccan immigrant children either not ratified as full participants or negatively ratified.

(Re)producing and Learning Hegemonic Ideologies of Difference and Belonging Through Teacher-Peer Interactions

How children come to learn and (re)produce sociolinguistic hegemonies and discriminatory practices has been a key question for researchers working with immigrant populations, who face exclusionary discourses, policies, and ideologies on a daily basis. Language socialization scholars have looked to schools as spaces where children not only acquire the communicative competence necessary to participate in the classroom community or within their peer groups, but where they develop as certain kinds of citizens and/or members of multiple communities. Through interactions with teachers and peers, students acquire national and group subjectivities that allow them to see themselves and others in terms of sociopolitical identities, belonging, difference, and marginality. By analyzing focus group interviews with immigrant youth in Spain who have encountered racism and xenophobia in and outside the school, Relaño Pastor (2010) described how immigrant youth experience some of these processes. In her analysis of their narratives of “fitting in,” she discovered that ethnic categorization was a key interactional device in how youths made sense of their experiences and identities. These youths persistently relied on ethnic categorization as a way of establishing boundaries between “us” and “them,” as well as marking their resistance to discrimination.

In her study of Moroccan immigrant children’s lives in Spain, García-Sánchez (2013) critically examined how mundane teacher-student interactions (re)produce notions of cultural citizenship in a fourth grade classroom. Through interactional practices of distinction, authentication, and authorization (Bucholtz and Hall 2004), García-Sánchez showed how the teacher systematically excluded immigrant children from a sense of belonging to a Spanish national collectivity. Instead of accomplishing the school’s intended goal of fostering an intercultural ethos in the classroom, the instructor’s interactional moves revealed a persistent pattern of marginalizing children from immigrant backgrounds by essentializing their identities as quintessential Others. García-Sánchez’s work captured ethnographically precisely the kinds of exclusionary discourses children are exposed to and how teachers can mobilize these discourses into fairly undetectable and institutionally sanctioned practices that students can then reproduce in socially expert ways. As she argued, these practices of exclusion did not rise to the level of the teacher’s consciousness, even as Moroccan immigrant children resisted the teacher’s essentialist formulations by asserting multiple, hybrid forms of membership and belonging. Perhaps it is precisely this quality of being unacknowledged that gives exclusionary discourses their potency and stability, as they prevail even in institutional settings that strive to be explicitly “intercultural.” The tension between the ethos of conviviality and the pedagogical imperatives that rely on defining cultural, ethnic, and national boundaries has been explored in other studies as well (e.g., Zembylas et al. 2016).

Youths’ Transnational Multilingual Practices and Identities

A number of language socialization studies have also been conducted at the post-primary educational levels, articulating points of continuity and contrast between

language socialization practices of children and youth. Karrebæk (2011), whose work with Turkish children in Denmark was described earlier, asserted that in primary school settings children from immigrant backgrounds tend to use minority languages significantly less and usually as learning aids or in *byplay* (Goffman 1981) interactions. Furthermore, she argued that older youth deploy their multilingual repertoires in increasingly more playful and politically sophisticated ways to contest authorities or negotiate group membership. Indeed, scholars documenting language practices among high school students have highlighted the youths' multilingual repertoires, with a particular attention to how such forms of multilingualism are youth's creative responses to larger processes of globalization. Corona et al. (2013) analyzed the way high school students of Latin American descent used hybrid registers to construct diasporic identities in Barcelona. Drawing on peninsular varieties of Spanish, Catalan, and Spanish varieties from Latin America, they indexed being a "Latino in Barcelona" rather than a particular place of origin. The authors illustrate how such multilingual repertoires break down the conflation of language and territory, fostering "deterritorialized" forms of self-identification. Furthermore, immigrant youth socialized their non-Latino peers into using linguistic varieties that were not local to Barcelona, thereby calling into question traditional notions of a "speech community."

Other studies have focused on how institutional policies and learning opportunities in high schools influence students' cultural and linguistic identities and socialize youth into particular life trajectories. Machowska-Kosciak (2013) has explored the way minority language education in Ireland influences identity construction among immigrant students from Poland. Comparing two different educational settings, one which promotes further engagement with Polish language and culture and one which focuses on English acquisition, Machowska-Kosciak revealed how Polish students develop different patterns of English-Polish bilingualism and different forms of self-identification. Relatedly, Codó and Patiño-Santos (2014) studied the relationship between language, social categorization, and ideologies of social class at a high school in Barcelona. The study demonstrated how teachers' categorization of the school as "different" and the students as "non-academic" guided the class' failure to observe the institutional norm of using and enforcing Catalan as preferred language of instruction in the classroom. As Codó and Patiño-Santos pointed out, Catalan is associated with symbolic capital that gives access to higher socioeconomic spheres. Teachers' construction of the students, who were mostly from immigrant backgrounds, as "vocational students" encouraged the students' systematic use of Spanish, preparing them to access low-skilled jobs.

Language Socialization Beyond the Classroom

While educational contexts have been a prime locus of ethnographic inquiry into processes of language socialization for immigrant children and youth in Europe, scholars have also gone beyond this institutional setting to explore other aspects of the immigrant experience. Of particular interest to researchers have been

intergenerational language socialization dynamics between adult caregivers and children, as well as between siblings and peers, in the diaspora. Studying family practices in the immigrant diasporas of Europe has allowed scholars to trace processes of reproduction, change, and development of heritage identities across generations. For example, Gregory et al. (2010) investigated intergenerational learning between grandparents and third-generation British Bangladeshi children in London. A central issue they addressed was the fact that most studies of child development focus on differences in socialization practices across cultures. Inadvertently, however, this research dichotomizes socialization in terms of key oppositions such as the value of individualism in Western societies versus interdependence in “traditional” societies. This approach has been productive, nonetheless, for understanding development as a culturally and socially mediated process and for refocusing our empirical lenses on the culturally diverse sets of resources that immigrant families draw on for socializing their children.

Diasporic contexts offer opportunities to examine how multiple cultural repertoires may clash or reinforce one another as different generations teach and learn from each other. In Gregory et al.’s (2010) study, the interactions between British Bangladeshi children and their grandmother evidence that intergenerational teaching/learning takes a syncretic form in the diaspora, both culturally and linguistically. The grandmother codeswitched between English and Bangla while synthesizing Western, child-centered strategies with heritage forms of learning. Similarly, Zhu (2010) studied conversations in Chinese diasporic families in the UK, focusing on the use of address terms and “talk about social, cultural and linguistic practices” to demonstrate how parents and children negotiate their shifting identities, cultural values, and norms when they strategically use or avoid particular address terms (p. 193). Her analysis takes an emergent approach to “interculturality” as something that is accomplished interactionally between the older and younger generations as they draw on traditional and local norms, generating new expectations regarding appropriate behavior. As Zhu also emphasized, children take agentive roles in co-constructing new value systems by challenging traditional forms of address.

García-Sánchez (2014) studied language socialization and literacy practices in after-school Arabic heritage language classes in Spain. Through Arabic language education, the older generation socialized Moroccan children into locally appropriate ethnoreligious identities, thus establishing cultural and linguistic continuity across the generations, as well as providing a means for articulating notions of cultural authenticity within the Moroccan immigrant community. These alternative educational settings afforded children a discursive space to negotiate their identities in ways that may not be sanctioned in official European classrooms. Within this more recent scholarship, religious and auxiliary learning contexts have emerged as powerful sites of cultural and linguistic reproduction in immigrant communities (e.g., Lytra 2010).

A smaller set of studies has also attended to language socialization practices within the same generation by focusing on interactions between siblings and peers in neighborhoods and out-of-school contexts. In particular, they have paid close analytical attention to children’s play activities as loci of socialization and as a window

into children's agency as they learn from each other and play with alternative forms of identification. In her ethnography, García-Sánchez (2014) documented how a group of young Moroccan girls constructed gendered identities through pretend play. By animating their dolls and codeswitching between Spanish and Arabic the girls played with idealizations of Spanish femininity that would be considered transgressive among some segments of the Moroccan diasporic community. Through pretend play, the girls could embody different identities that contest their subaltern socio-economic positions, as well as traditional expectations of femininity.

Finally, Gregory et al. (2015) focused on sibling interactions between children from a Tamil Hindu community in London to examine their "faith play," during which siblings imaginatively took on religious roles, constructed a Hindu Temple out of blocks, and recreated ritual practices. In so doing, the authors illustrated how children transmit symbolic knowledge and forms of religious practice in the diasporic faith community.

Future Directions

Language and interactional processes that are at the core of immigrants' identity negotiations will be a major focus of elaboration in language socialization studies in Europe (and in other regions). Such focus brings to light how immigrant groups are able to negotiate simultaneously different identities while negotiating commonality of belonging, particularly in relation to the marginal and, in many cases, degraded positionalities that immigrant communities come to occupy in local and national indexical orders. Following more general trends in language socialization research, future work along these lines will incorporate more critical perspectives to document how local relations of power are shaped by the sociohistorical and macropolitical dynamics regulating belonging (Duff 2008). García-Sánchez (2016), for example, has argued that language socialization is a powerful paradigm to reveal how processes of marginalization emerge from the dialectic intersection between individuals' developmental trajectories of socialization and the unequal structural and ideological arrangements that shape and constrain those trajectories. In this regard, since the marginalization of individuals and communities always involves diverse sources and mechanisms of exclusion, García-Sánchez (2016) has called for documenting the dynamic interplay between these sources and mechanisms across contexts of people's everyday lives to find how mechanisms contradict and reinforce each other and, in turn, how these paradoxes impact how trajectories of marginalization emerge and become more or less enduring. A related aspect in exploring exclusion and marginalization from a language socialization perspective will be to revisit the notion of competence, not as a property of individuals, or exclusively as a matter of linguistic ability and sociocultural knowledge, but as a product of everyday practice and as embedded in local and macrorelations of power and ideologies. Looking at differential competence as situated and interactionally produced is

important in order to understand how opportunities for acquiring or displaying competence can be unequally afforded.

Another productive line of inquiry for future language socialization studies in European immigrant communities is to go beyond children's and youth's communicative practices to attend to language socialization processes across the life span. While there was some promising early research on adult immigrant language socialization into professional communities of practice, such as Sarangi and Roberts' (2002) account of adult socialization in professional gatekeeping encounters in the UK, the focus has continued to be heavily tilted toward children and youth. In spite of this, such early studies show immigrant adults' socialization trajectories into professional discourses and practices in the workplace, as well as how they navigate access to institutional services and bureaucratic structures. The ethnographic perspective and fine-grained analysis of language use in interaction that characterizes language socialization can provide a powerful lens to explore consequential issues in the lives of adult migrants and their families, such as how perceived language competence and ideologies of integration can shape their professional trajectories, including their successful access to skilled labor markets (Garrido and Codó 2014), or how effectively adult immigrants can negotiate bureaucratic paths to legal residency and forms of citizenship (Codó 2008).

Finally, beyond language socialization in immigrant communities, an important focus of future work will be to trace how, in progressively interconnected and transnational European spaces and institutions, social actors, whether of immigrant descent or not, become deterritorialized multilingual speakers, particularly in relation to language ideologies that position certain forms of bi-/multilingualism as more valuable than others. Current work has shown how language programs and policies often contribute to unequal orders of linguistic indexicality in multilingual contexts, by promoting certain bi-/multilingual competencies as worthy of being cultivated (usually involving what are considered other European languages with a global status, such as English, French, or Spanish) at the expense of other bi-/multilingual competences that are subject to subtractive schooling and to eventual loss of one of the languages (usually involving what are considered non-European, *immigrant* languages, such as Arabic, Turkish, or Somali) (see, e.g., Martín-Rojo et al. 2017; Mijares and Relaño Pastor 2011). Language socialization is well positioned to help illuminate how these new multilingual speakers are being allowed to develop (or are thwarted from developing) multiple linguistic repertoires and trajectories, as well as these speakers' agency to resist, challenge, or subvert the kinds of multilingualism being hegemonically sanctioned through their hybrid language practices.

Cross-References

- ▶ [Bi- and Multilingual Family Language Socialization](#)
- ▶ [Language Socialization and Schooling](#)
- ▶ [Language Socialization: An Historical Overview](#)

Related Articles in the Encyclopedia of Language and Education

- Massimiliani Spotti: [Multilingual classrooms at times of superdiversity](#). In Volume: Discourse and Education
- Ofelia García and A.M.Y. Lin: [Extending Understandings of Bilingual and Multilingual Education](#). In Volume: Bilingual and Multilingual Education
- Sven Sierens and Piet Van Avermaet: [Bilingual Education in Migrant Languages in Western Europe](#). In Volume: Bilingual and Multilingual Education
- Kutlay Yağmur: [Multilingualism in Immigrant Communities](#). In Volume: Language Awareness and Multilingualism
- H. Janks, Rebecca Rogers, and Katherine O’Daniels: [Language and Power in the Classroom](#). In Volume: Language Policy and Political Issues in Education
- Ariana Mangual Figueroa: [Ethnography and Language Education](#). In Volume: Research Methods in Language and Education

References

- Al-Azami, S., Kenner, C., Ruby, M., & Gregory, E. (2010). Transliteration as a bridge to learning for bilingual children. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 13(6), 683–700.
- Aronsson, K., & Gottzén, L. (2011). Generational positions at a family dinner: Food morality and social order. *Language in Society*, 40(4), 405–426.
- Bakhtin, M. M. (1981). In M. Holquist (Ed.), *The dialogic imagination: Four essays* (trans: C. Emerson & M. Holquist). Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Bauman, B., & Briggs, C. L. (2003). *Voices of modernity: Language ideologies and the politics of inequality*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Bucholtz, M., & Hall, K. (2004). Language and identity. In A. Duranti (Ed.), *A companion to linguistic anthropology* (pp. 369–394). Malden: Blackwell.
- Cekaite, A. (2007). A child’s development of interactional competence in a Swedish L2 classroom. *The Modern Language Journal*, 91(1), 45–62.
- Cekaite, A. (2012). Affective stances in teacher-novice student interactions: Language, embodiment, and willingness to learn in a Swedish primary classroom. *Language in Society*, 41(5), 641–670.
- Cekaite, A., & Evaldsson, A.-C. (2008). Staging linguistic identities and negotiating monolingual norms in multiethnic school settings. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 5(3), 177–196.
- Codó, E. (2008). *Immigration and bureaucratic control: Language practices in public administration*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Codó, E., & Patiño-Santos, A. (2014). Beyond language: Class, social categorisation and academic achievement in a Catalan high school. *Linguistics and Education*, 25, 51–63.
- Corona, V., Nussbaum, L., & Unamuno, V. (2013). The emergence of new linguistic repertoires among Barcelona’s youth of Latin American origin. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 16(2), 182–194.
- Duff, P. A. (2008). Language socialization, participation and identity: Ethnographic approaches. In M. Martin-Jones, A. M. de Mejía, & N. H. Hornberger (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of language and education* (Discourse and education 2nd ed., pp. 107–118). New York: Springer.
- Duranti, A., Ochs, E., & Schieffelin, B. B. (Eds.). (2012). *The handbook of language socialization*. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.

- Evaldsson, A.-C. (2005). Staging insults and mobilizing categorizations in a multiethnic peer group. *Discourse & Society*, 16(6), 763–786.
- García-Sánchez, I. M. (2013). The everyday politics of ‘cultural citizenship’ among North African immigrant school children in Spain. *Language and Communication*, 33, 481–499.
- García-Sánchez, I. M. (2014). *Language and Muslim immigrant childhoods: The politics of belonging*. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.
- García-Sánchez, I. M. (2016). Language socialization and marginalization. In N. Bonvillain (Ed.), *The Routledge handbook of linguistic anthropology* (pp. 159–174). New York: Routledge.
- Garrido, M. R., & Codó, E. (2014). Deskillling and delanguaging African migrants in Barcelona: Pathways of labour market incorporation and the value of ‘global’ English. *Globalisation, Societies and Education*. doi:10.1080/14767724.2014.944757.
- Goffman, E. (1981). Footing. In *Forms of talk* (pp. 124–159). Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania.
- Gregory, E., Ruby, M., & Kenner, C. (2010). Modelling and close observation: Ways of teaching and learning between third-generation Bangladeshi British children and their grandparents in London. *Early Years*, 30(2), 161–173.
- Gregory, E., Lytra, V., & Ilankuberan, A. (2015). Divine games and rituals: How Tamil Saiva/Hindu siblings learn faith practices through play. *International Journal of Play*, 4(1), 69–83.
- Karrebæk, M. S. (2011). It farts: The situated management of social organization in a kindergarten peer group. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 43, 2911–2931.
- Karrebæk, M. S. (2013). “Don’t speak like that to her!”: Linguistic minority children’s socialization into an ideology of monolingualism. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 17(3), 355–375.
- Lytra, V. (2010). Negotiating language, culture and pupil agency in complementary school classrooms. *Linguistics and Education*, 22, 23–36.
- Machowska-Kosciak, M. (2013). A language socialization perspective on knowledge and identity construction in Irish post-primary education. In F. Farr & M. Moriarty (Eds.), *Language, learning, and teaching: Irish research perspectives* (pp. 87–110). Bern: Peter Lang.
- Martín-Rojo, L., Anthonissen, C., García-Sánchez, I. M., & Unamuno, V. (2017). Recasting diversity in language education in post-colonial, late-capitalist societies. In A. A. De Fina, D. Ikizoglu, & J. Wegner (Eds.), *Diversity and super-diversity: Sociocultural linguistic perspectives* (pp. 171–190). Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.
- Mijares, L., & Relaña Pastor, A. M. (2011). Language programs at Villababel High: Rethinking ideologies of social inclusion. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 14(4), 427–442.
- Mökkönen, A. C. (2012). Social organization through teacher-talk: Subteaching, socialization and normative use of language in a multilingual primary class. *Linguistics and Education*, 23, 310–322.
- Mökkönen, A. C. (2013). Newcomers navigating language choice and seeking voice: Peer talk in a multilingual primary school classroom in Finland. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly*, 44(2), 124–141.
- Palloti, G. (2001). External appropriation as a strategy for participation in intercultural multiparty conversations. In A. di Luzio, S. Günthner, & F. Orletti (Eds.), *Culture and communication* (pp. 295–334). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Pontecorvo, C., Fasulo, A., & Sterponi, L. (2001). Mutual apprentices: The making of parenthood and childhood in family dinner conversation. *Human Development*, 44, 340–361.
- Rampton, B. (1995). Language crossing and the problematisation of ethnicity and socialisation. *Pragmatics*, 5(4), 485–513.
- Relaña Pastor, A. M. (2010). Ethnic categorization and moral agency in ‘fitting in’ narratives among Madrid immigrant students. *Narrative Inquiry*, 20(1), 82–105.
- Sarangi, S., & Roberts, C. (2002). Discoursal (mis)alignments in professional gatekeeping encounters. In C. Kramsch (Ed.), *Language acquisition and language socialization: Ecological perspectives* (pp. 196–227). New York: Continuum Press.

- Tholander, M., & Aronsson, K. (2003). Doing subteaching in school group work: Positionings, resistance, and participation frameworks. *Language and Education, 17*(3), 208–234.
- Trimaille, C. (2003). *Approche sociolinguistique de la socialisation langagière d'adolescents* [Sociolinguistic approaches to language socialization of adolescents] (Thèse de doctorat). Université Stendhal – Grenoble 3, Grenoble.
- Vertovec, S. (2007). Super-diversity and its implications. *Ethnic and Racial Studies, 30*(6), 1024–1054.
- Zembylas, M., Charalambous, C., & Charalambous, P. (2016). Talking about peace and conflict in a (super)diverse classroom. In *Peace education in a conflict-affected society: An ethnographic journey* (pp. 151–170). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Zhu, H. (2010). Language socialization and interculturality: Address terms in intergenerational talk in Chinese diasporic families. *Language and Intercultural Communication, 10*(3), 189–205.

Index

A

Academic discourse, 260
Academic discourse socialization
 entextualized humor, 247–248
 future research, 250–251
 intertextuality, 246
 negotiation and co-construction of
 identities, 243–244
 oral interactions, 241
 problems in, 249
 semiotic resources, 248–249
 social agents, 245–246
Access to signed languages. *See* Deaf
 communities, signed language
 socialization
Accommodation, 175
Adolescent language socialization
 community organizations, 219–221
 future research, 222–223
 home and school studies, 218–219
 peer-centered identity groupings, 219
 problems in, 221–222
Adult authority, 172
Adult control, 172
Adult education, 157
Affect, 310, 312
 and embodiment, 127
Affordance, 21, 23, 28
Africa, 157
African American, 357
Agency, 241, 246, 249
Alzheimer's disease, 278, 281
Anthropological approach, 66
Antiwar feminist, 259
Arabic, 160
Arts-based community organizations, 220
Asia, 157

Autism, 412, 418, 422
 abnormal language features of, 414
 Bourdieu's practice theory, 418
 delineation of communicative
 competencies, 415
 diagnosis, 421
 discourse abilities, 414
 ethnographic perspective on, 414
 implications for education, clinical
 intervention and anthropological
 theory, 420–421
 linguistic analysis, 413
 linguistic deficits in, 413
 therapist-child interactions, 418
 verbal communication of children, 414
Autistic language, 413, 416
Auto-ethnography, 301, 303

B

Baby talk register, 6
Ban Khor Sign Language, 175
Belonging, 443, 449
Bilingual and multilingual communities, 300
Bilingualism, 83, 85, 91, 178, 372
Bilingual socialization, 353

C

California, 354, 355
Cameroon, 158, 160, 174
Caribbean, 157, 160
Catholic, 357
Central Americans, 357
Chicago, 354, 356, 358
Chicanoization, 357

Children

- academics, 99
- American families, 101–102
- bed time routines, 104
- disputes, 129
- engagement in works, 106
- food time interaction, 103–104
- gossip stories, 128
- homework, 102
- Italian families, 102
- moral and social orders, 133
- social interactions, 100, 101
- Children's peer language socialization
 - child discourse and children's interactions, 125
 - children's assessments and evaluative commentary, 128–129
 - conversation analysis, 125
 - directives, 126
 - pretend play, 129
 - sociologists and linguistic anthropologists, 125
 - transnational and postcolonial settings, 130–131
- Choral response, 175
- Classroom discourse, 294
- Classroom interactions, 174, 175
- Code-mixing, 159, 176
- Codes, 37
- Code-switching, 176, 364, 370, 371, 373
- Colonialism, 157
- Communication, 274, 276, 278, 279, 281, 283
 - repertoires, 257, 265–266
- Communicative competence, 5, 6, 10, 368, 370
- Competence, 158
- Cooperation, 133
- Cosmopolitan identity, 345, 346
- Counterlanguage, 427, 428, 430
- Cree Way Project, 295
- Creoles, 369, 373, 376
- Critical discourse analysis, 199, 206
- Cultural contact, 143, 145
- Cultural production, 207
- Culture, 113, 116, 117, 198, 202, 204

D

- Deaf children, 384, 388, 390, 392
- Deaf communities, signed language socialization
 - American Sign Language, 386, 389
 - bilingual classrooms, 388
 - bilingual education movement, 391

- educational policy, 390
- ethnographic study, 386, 388
- identity factors, 393
- Kenyan Sign Language, 392
- linguistic and cultural minorities, 386
- medical-scientific establishment, 391
- microanalysis, 386
- Nicaragua Sign Language, 390
- residential schools, 385, 387
- sociocultural view of, 385
- speech only approaches vs. visually-based pedagogies, 391
- Swedish Sign Language, 388
- techno-medical eradication, 392
- theoretical and descriptive studies, 385
- transnational emphasis, 389
- visual orientation, 389
- World Federation of the Deaf, 392
- Deafhood, 390, 391
- Deaf identity, 390, 391
- Deaf Latinos, 360
- Deaf parents, 388, 389
- Deaf teachers, 387, 388, 390
- Dementia
 - communication-related problems, 276
 - conversation analysis, 280
 - Dementia Care Mapping, 277
 - diagnosis, 274
 - early stages of, 279
 - early symptom of, 274
 - ethnographic study, 278
 - language and conversational discourses, 277
 - sociolinguistic rules, 275
 - validation therapy, 282
- Dialect discrimination, 426
- Diaspora, 142, 144, 146–148
 - population, 451
- Diasporic communities, 11
- Digital literacies, 115
 - challenges, 405–406
 - computer-mediated communication, 398
 - computer mediated discourse analysis, 399
 - electronic literacy development, 399
 - multiplayer online games, 401
 - social networking, 402
 - sociolinguistic approaches, 403–405
- Dinnertime talk, 161
- Directives, 126–128
- Discourse analysis, 412, 415, 417, 419
- Displacement, 324
- Dominica, 160, 176
- Dominicans, 357

E

Easter Island, 176
 East Harlem, 354
 Echolalia, 413, 417, 419
 Ecological linguistics, 18
 Edmonton, 354
 Educational ethnographies, 294
 Emergentism, 25, 28
 Empathy, 310, 313
 Enana, 174, 176
 English, 160, 161, 176, 258
 English for academic purposes, 241
 Entextualization, 247
 Ethics, 150
 Ethnographically informed training programs, 258
 Ethnography, 354, 356, 413, 417, 421
 Europe, 443. *See also* Language socialization
 Exclusionary discourses, 449
 Explicit modeling, 174

F

Fader, A., 176
 Family dinner discourse, 66
 bilingualism, 73
 cross-cultural differences, language socialization, 68
 cultural ways of speaking, 70
 extended discourse, 73
 future research, 74
 genres, 72
 home-school study of language and literacy development, 67
 Italian vs. American families, socialization for taste, 68
 language acquisition of communicative competence, 67
 micro-discourse-analytical approach, 68
 minority language maintenance, 73
 moral behavior, 72
 participation and social roles, 69
 problems and difficulties in, 74
 social construction of knowledge, 71
 Family language policies, 173, 176
 Fan fiction, 400, 405
 First Nations, 292, 296, 303
 Folk beliefs, 161
 Foreign brides, 162
 Formulaic language, 161
 Formulaic talk, 175

Francophone, 163
 Francophone communities, language socialization
 code-switching, 370
 ethnographic studies, 366, 370, 374
 ideologies of monolingualism, 369
 language laws, 371
 linguistic competence, 368
 socialization of oral skills, 371
 social minoritisation, 368
 sociolinguistic investigations, 365
 UCLA Sloan Center's CELF program, 366
 Franqueza, 356
 French, 160, 161, 174, 176
 communicative competence, American students, 368
 education, 369
 French immersion program, 372
 French-structured educational settings, 365
 language and schooling policies, 369
 language ideologies, 370
 linguistic competence in, 368
 pedagogical interactions in, 370
 post-colonial contexts, 370
 French Polynesia, 176
 Friendship groups, 219, 222
 Fulbe, 174
 community, 160
 Fulfulde, 174

G

Gangs, 216, 219, 221
 Gender
 ideologies, 162
 role, 313
 Generation, 177
 Gestures, 160
 Globalization, 142, 143, 149, 150, 162
 Gossip, 72
 Grammatical metaphor, 44
 Guided repetition, 163, 174

H

Habitus, 99–101, 365
 Hang'ombe community, 164
 Hebrew, 325, 331, 332
 non-Israeli pronunciations, 329
 research on, 334
 textual, 329

- Heritage language, 184, 327, 330, 331, 334
 Chinese learners, 185–186
 Korean learners, 186
 major contribution, 188–190
 multi-competence practises, 187
- Heritage language socialization (HLS), 189, 190
- Hiphop
 cipher, 426, 430, 433
 core commitment, 426
 counterlanguage socialization, 430
 Hip Hop Therapy program, 435
 ideology and race in language socialization, 427
 philosophy, 435
- Hispanic, 355
- Historicity, 28
- Homes, 112
 knowledge, 115
 language, 112, 177
 literacy practices, 113
 multilingual, 117
 script systems, 112
- Homestay, 228, 229, 231, 233, 234
- Honorific particles, 159
- Honorifics, 229, 232, 310, 312, 315
- Humor, 247
- Humorous phrases, 71
- Hybridity, 328, 329
- Hybrid language, 175
- Hybrid varieties, 174
- I**
- Identity, 86, 89, 91, 92, 215, 219, 241, 243, 247, 260, 261, 265–266, 324, 328, 330, 398–400, 402, 404, 406, 426, 434, 435
 social, 52
- Ideology, 143, 147–149, 199, 204, 206
- Immigration, 144, 146, 150
 and immigrants, 443
- Indexicality, 10
- Indigenous peoples in Canada, 300
 family language policies, 301
- Indigenous signed languages, 385, 387
- Informal learning, 401
- Integration, 445, 453
- Interactional routine, 315, 316
- Interactional sociolinguistic research, 258
- Intercultural communication, 57
- Internet sociolinguistics, 398, 399
- Intertextuality, 113, 239, 246–247
- Inuit, 293, 295, 297, 300
- Islamic, 160
- J**
- Jewish communities, 324
 contributions to literature, 327–332
 desires and identifications, 326
 distinguishing features of language socialization, 324–325
 future research, 333–334
 multi-sited ethnography, 332
- Jewish culture, 325
- Jewish English, 324, 332
- Jokes, 177
- Judaism, 325, 327
- K**
- Kam Muang, 175, 176
- Koranic school, 174
- Korean-English bilingual children, 344
- Korean language, 341
 acquisition and development, 341
 and culture, 346
 and identity, 345
 and Korean ethnolinguistic identities, 346
 social and psychological orientation, 341
- Korean transnational communities
 cosmopolitan belonging, class and language ideologies, 345–347
 Korean social relationships and morality, 342–345
 language acquisition and development, 341
 linguistic characteristics, 341
 social and psychological orientation, 341
 social structure, 341
 transnational migration, 340
 women's gender-related socialization, 348
- Kreol, 161
- Kwara'ae family, 157
- Kweyol, 172
- L**
- Language, 275, 276, 278, 281, 283
 change, 170
 and culture, 185
 endangerment, 327, 331, 332
 and identities, 187, 190, 449–450

- ideologies, 5, 7, 10, 158, 171, 172, 178, 327, 329, 330, 334, 366, 369, 370, 375, 427, 433, 436
- maintenance and revitalization, 300
- policy, 84, 88, 327, 331, 333, 334
- shift, 10, 170, 177, 372, 373
- and socialization, 190 (*see also* Heritage language socialization (HLS))
- transgression, 72
- Language ecology, 22, 26, 29
- cognitive ecology, 19
- definition, 18
- natural ecology, 19
- second language acquisition and socialization (*see* Second language acquisition and socialization)
- sociocultural ecology, 19
- Language learning
- study abroad, 56
- telecollaboration, 57
- Language of instruction, 175
- Language maintenance, 170
- Language socialization (LS), 53, 66, 113, 118, 177, 242, 246, 274, 443
- adult-child relationship, 98
- and autism (*see* Autism)
- and caregivers, 280–282
- children's practices of systematic inclusion and exclusion, 448
- component of, 275
- cross-sectional studies, 85
- definition, 80
- and dementia, 278–280
- in digital contexts (*see* Digital literacies)
- early developments, 80–82
- ethnoarchaeological method analysis, 105
- and family language policy, 88
- first generation LS research, 340
- food time interactions, 103–104
- francophone communities *see* (Francophone communities, language socialization)
- hiphop culture (*see* Hiphop)
- in Jewish communities (*see* Jewish communities)
- in Korean transnational communities (*see* Korean transnational communities)
- language shift in Papua New Guinea, 83
- linguistic and cultural knowledge, 98–99
- multilingual repertoires and monolingual norms, 446–448
- newcomers' development of cultural and linguistic competence, 445–446
- Norwegian-English bilingual families, 83
- (re)producing and learning hegemonic ideologies, 449
- Puerto Rican community in New York City, 83
- recent works, 58
- research criteria, pragmatic socialization, 58–59
- social interactions, 101
- socioeconomic class, 99
- through textbooks (*see* Textbooks)
- transnationalism, 88
- work family research, 105–106
- youths' transnational multilingual practices and identities, 449–450
- Latino, 355
- Language Maintenance, 170
- Learner agency, 58, 246, 318
- Learning, 113, 114
- communities, 214–217, 221, 249
- hegemonic ideologies, 449
- heritage language, 183–191
- Linguistic anthropology, 5, 8
- language socialization and, 8–11
- Linguistic minorities, 162
- Linguistic repertoire, 172
- Literacy, 9, 161, 196–197, 200
- Logical grammatical metaphor, 44
- Los Angeles, 357
- M**
- Mandarin, 174
- Mandarin language, 162
- Marginalization, 452
- Marquesas, 174
- Mauritian preschool, 161
- Mediation, 20
- Medical-scientific establishment, 391
- Membership categorization analysis, 126
- Meta-communicative markers, 71
- Metalinguistic community, 330, 332, 333
- Metapragmatic, 54
- Metapragmatic comments, 70
- Mexicanization, 357
- MexiRicans, 358
- Michaocán, 356
- Micro-discourse-analytical approach, 68
- Microfunctions, 36
- Middle Ages, 214, 217
- Migration, 324, 333
- Modernity, 171
- Modes of self, 171
- Muang community, 159

- Multiculturalism, 442, 443
 Multilingual communities, 170
 Multilingualism, 55, 85, 90, 114, 115, 118, 372, 447, 453
 Multilingual socialization, 157, 158
 Multiliteracies, 399, 402, 404
 Multimodality, 114, 116
 Multiparty talk, 69
 Multiplayer online gaming, 399, 401–402
 Multi-site studies, 178
 Muslim, 163, 178, 445
- N**
- Narratives, 298–299
 Neoliberalism, 269
 Neurodevelopmental disorders, 7
 Neurodiversity, 420, 422
 New Guinea, 171
 Nominalization, 44
 Non-standard variety, 173
 Non-Western, 157, 162
 Northern Thai, 173, 175, 176
- O**
- Oceania, 157
 One parent one language, 87
 Online discussion forums, 243
- P**
- Participant framework, 163
 Participation structure, 314, 315
 Patwa, 160, 172
 Peer code, 176
 Peer groups, 164, 175, 176
 Peer interaction, 176
 Peer/sibling groups, 170
 Pentecostal, 357
 Personhood, 171
 Person reference, 177
 Pijin, 158
 Politeness, 310, 311, 313
 Postcolonial contexts, 157
 Pragmatic deficit, 415
 Pragmatic particle, 310, 315
 Pragmatics, 228, 231
 Pragmatic socialization, 50–59
 Pretend play, 129–130
 Primary school classrooms, 157
 Professions, 257, 258
 Pronoun reversal and avoidance, 413
- Proposition 227, 355
 Protolanguage, 36–37
 Purist language ideologies, 173, 174
- Q**
- Qualitative research methodology, 56
 Qur'an, 160
- R**
- Racism, 426, 428, 434
Rancheros, 356
 Rapa Nui, 176
 Registers, 170
 Register variation, 42
Relajo, 356
 Religious life, 326, 329
 Residential schools, 385, 387
 Respect, 175
Respeto, 356
 Responsibility, 173
 Revival movements, 174
 Riddles, 177
 Rote repetition, 175
- S**
- Safe-talk, 175
 San Antonio, 355
 Schooling, 157
 Second/foreign language education, 156
 Second language acquisition, 165
 Second language acquisition and socialization, 21
 - agent-environment systems, 23–24
 - cognitive ecology, 22
 - communicative competence in, 20
 - identity-based approaches, 25
 - materiality-based and virtuality-based approaches, 24–25
 - social aspects of, 20
 - value-based approaches, 25–26
 Semantic variation, 35, 42
 Service encounters, 230, 233, 234
 Sibling, 176
 Signed language socialization,
 - deaf communities. *See* Deaf communities, signed language socialization
 Social class, 163
 Social construction, 71–72, 282, 284
 Social constructionism, 278
 Social domains, 172

- Social hierarchy, 175
 Social interactions, 98, 99, 101, 102, 105
 Socialization
 communication repertoires and identities, 265–266
 early developments, 257–259
 family, 259–260
 future research, 267–269
 and humor, 266
 postsecondary academic and vocational discourse, 260–261
 problems in, 266–267
 trajectories of, 264
 in workplace, 261–264
 Social media, 402
 Social networking, 399, 400, 402–403, 406
 Social networks, 246
 Social relationships, 177
 Socioeconomic class, 99
 Sociolinguistics, 55
 Solomon Islands, 157, 174
 Songs, 177
 Spain, 178
 Spanglish, 84
 Spanish, 176, 355
 Spanish-English bilingualism, 83
 Speech community, 364
 Stance, 244
 Standard language, 172
 Standard Thai genres, 177
 Standard varieties, 374
 Study abroad, 228, 229, 233, 235
 Subjectivities, 158
 Symbolic capital, 365
 Syncretic, hybrid varieties, 174
 Syncretic Spanish/Rapa Nui, 176
 Syncretic variety of language, 176
 Syncretism, 328, 329
 Systemic functional linguistics (SFL), 34
 early developments, 36–38
 language socialization, 40
 problems and future developments, 44–45
 register variation, 42–44
 semantic variation, 42
 social instruction, 40
 system, 38
- T**
 Taiap, 171
 Tai-gi, 174
 Taiwan, 162
 Taiwanese, 174
 Teasing, 353
 Texas, 354, 355
 Textbooks, 196
 culture, 198–199
 English foreign-language, 201–203
 first-language and heritage-language, 200–201
 knowledge, 197
 literacy, 196
 problems in language socialisation, 205–207
 selective tradition, 199
 Thailand, 159
 Thai sign language, 175
 Theories of child development, 172
 Traditional folk tales, 174
 Translanguaging, 114, 115
 Tok Pisin, 171
 Translocal Islamic discourses, 160
 Transnational community,
 Korean. *See* Korean transnational communities
 Transnational emphasis, 389
 Transnationalism, 88, 405
 Transnational migration, 162
- U**
 Urbanisation, 115
 Urban youth, 177
- V**
 Vancouver, 354
 Verbal conflict, 72
 Vernacular language, 172
 Vernacular varieties, 364, 373, 374
 Visually-based culture, 384
 Visually-based language, 384
 Vocabulary, 161
 Voluntary learning, 213
- W**
 Wandala, 163
 Work and family, 98, 104–106
 Working families
 CELF methodology, 101
 dual earner environment, 98
 Italian families, 102
 language socialization, 100
 Workplace, 261–264

Y

Yiddish, 324, 329, 330

language programming, 326

language socialization, 330, 331

metalinguistic community, 330

speakers in South Philadelphia, 328

Youth culture, 215, 222

Youth language, 215

Z

Zambia, 164

Zapotec, 173