1 The Theory of Language Socialization

ELINOR OCHS AND
BAMBI B. SCHIEFFELIN

Scope of Language Socialization

Language socialization arose out of an anthropological conviction that language is a fundamental medium in children's development of social and cultural knowledge and sensibilities, a domain that the field of language acquisition does not capture. While the study of child language encompasses developmental pragmatics (Ochs and Schieffelin 1979), the scope of pragmatics tends to be limited to what Malinowski (1935) called 'the context of situation,' with an interest in verbal acts, activities, turns, sequences, stances, style, intentionality, agency, and the flow of information. Instead, the study of language socialization examines how children and other novices apprehend and enact the 'context of situation' in relation to the 'context of culture.' In so doing, language socialization research integrates discourse and ethnographic methods to capture the social structurings and cultural interpretations of semiotic forms, practices, and ideologies that inform novices' practical engagements with others. While language acquisition research privileges mother–child conversation as a site of observation, language socialization research extends the object of inquiry to the range of adult and child communicative partners with whom a child or other novice routinely engages in some capacity across socioculturally configured settings.

Language socialization also recognized a lacuna in anthropological studies of children across communities (Mead 1928; Whiting and Whiting 1975; Whiting and Edwards 1988), namely the paucity of attention to the role of language as integral to how children grow up to become members of families and communities. Mead concentrated on the psychocultural patterning of caregiving, weighing the effects of local culture on universal psychological and developmental forces in the transition from infancy to adulthood. The Harvard-based Six Cultures Project

The Handbook of Language Socialization, First Edition. Edited by Alessandro Duranti, Elinor Ochs, Bambi B. Schieffelin.

systematically documented the sociocultural ecology of children's lives and children's behavior, inspiring research on how local theories and environments influence parenting and child development (e.g. Harkness and Super 1996; Rogoff 2003; Shweder, Mahapatra, and Miller 1987; Weisner 2002), but language practices were minimally addressed.

Drawing upon Gumperz and Hymes' (1964) paradigm of the ethnography of communication and the University of California at Berkeley's *A Field Manual for Cross-Cultural Study of the Acquisition of Communicative Competence* (Slobin 1967), language socialization research emerged in the 1980s to consider aspects of the sociocultural environment of children's communicative practices that were left out of linguistic, psychological, and anthropological studies. Suddenly, what children were told, by whom, and in what language variety or register became as important as the order by which particular sounds or syntactic constructions were being acquired. Adopting a cross-cultural and ethnographic perspective, language socialization scholars went to different societies around the world to document how, in the course of acquiring language, children become particular types of speakers and members of communities (Ochs and Schieffelin 2008; Schieffelin and Ochs 1986a, 1986b, 1996). Decades later, these scholars are teaching language socialization courses in anthropology, applied linguistics, education, psychology, and human development. The field has now expanded to include second language and heritage language socialization, literacy, and media socialization, as well as socialization across community settings.

The multidisciplinarity of language socialization research has allowed the field to understand how children and other novices come to create multiple, fluid, sometimes conflicting 'webs of meaning' (Geertz 1973) and the 'unconscious patterning of behavior' (Sapir 1929) that underpin social connectivity. To document the generation of cultural intuitions and common sense across social encounters is a very ambitious project that necessitates looking at micro-interactional and macro-societal and developmental processes. Attention to these dynamics and others draws from different kinds of linguistics, anthropology, sociology, psychology, education, and philosophy.

Contemporary scholarship considers language socialization to be a lifespan process that transpires across households, schools, scientific laboratories, religious institutions, sports, play, media use, artistic endeavors, medical encounters, legal training, political efforts, and workplaces, among other environments (Baquedano-López 2001; Baquedano-López and Mangual Figueroa, this volume; Duff and Hornberger 2008; Duranti and Black, this volume; Fader 2009, this volume; Garrett and Baquedano-López 2002; He 2003; Heath 2008, this volume; Kulick and Schieffelin 2004; Mertz 2007; Moore 2006, this volume; Philips 1982; Riley 2008; Stivers, this volume; Wortham 2005). Adults as well as children constantly encounter novel situations and challenges that summon the semiotically mediated involvement of more knowledgeable persons. In some cases, involvement is elicited, as when adults seek healers to illuminate a health-related or existential concern. In other cases, language socialization may be initiated by others, as when a supervisor at work or sports coach trains or corrects nonexperts.

Language socialization begins at the developmental point at which members of a community recognize that a person enters into existence and continues throughout the life course until a person is viewed as no longer a living social being. In the twenty-first-century United States, for example, some parents sing, speak, and read to their unborn baby. English language websites catering to expectant parents even advertise products that enhance this engagement. One site, for example, advises parents-to-be that 'your baby's senses are active by your fifth month. This is the time to start using your *Bébé Sounds Prenatal Talker.*' The mother is instructed to strap on a belt with a battery-operated microphone and 'speak into the microphone […] in a normal voice […] if you speak too loud it will disturb your baby.'[1] The site advises the mother and the father to alternate speaking in 'a loving tone' in five-minute intervals and to 'read a story […] that you will also read to him/her after birth.' This practice is reported to help the baby to recognize family voices and enhance bonds between the unborn baby and the family. Lasky and Williams (2005), however, report that the fetus does not reliably respond to speech sounds until after 27 weeks and only then when given high levels of auditory stimulation, given the background noises in the womb and the fact that the cochlea matures at 31 weeks.[2] While fetuses eventually become familiar with the uterine version of their mother's speech, there is no evidence that they respond to their father's 'loving' voice or benefit from being read books across the abdominal wall. Alternatively, in other communities, infants are not routinely considered primary addressees until they produce recognizable utterances (Ochs 1988; Schieffelin 1990).

Language Socialization and Agency

Over the years the term 'socialization' (Parsons and Bales 1956) has been critically viewed as overly deterministic, unidirectional, and goal-oriented toward adulthood by many cultural psychologists, anthropologists, and sociologists (cf. Cole 1996; Prout and James 1997; Rogoff 2003; Vygotsky 1986; Zentella 2005). The same criticisms apply to the notion of 'enculturation,' which takes the view that children are passive recipients of the generation transmission of a localized culture (Boas 1911; Herskovits 1952). Boas (2004 [1932]: 144–5) set the stage for this perspective in his insistence that children's conformity to habits of speaking, acting, and thinking is instinctive and automatic:

> In childhood we acquire certain ways of handling our bodies. If these moves have become automatic, it is almost impossible to change to another style, because all the muscles are attuned to act in a fixed way . . . What is true of the handling of the body is equally true of mental processes. When we have learned to think in definite ways it is exceedingly difficult to break away and to follow new paths.

In this conceptual framework, cultural knowledge is reproduced in infancy through imitation and internalization without modification. More recently,

Bourdieu and Passeron (1990 [1977]) similarly assume that educators 'inculcate' and learners (drawing upon their developmental capacities) internalize implicit and explicit principles of practices, habitus, and cultural capitalism. The difference is that Bourdieu and Passeron (1990: 5) saw pedagogy as 'symbolic violence' and 'the imposition of a cultural arbitrary by an arbitrary power,' while Boas saw cultural transmission as predominantly seamless, necessary, and fruitful.

Our use of the term 'socialization' in 'language socialization' diverges from these usages and instead draws inspiration from Sapir's classic 1933 article 'Language,' which insisted that 'Language is a great force of socialization, probably the greatest that exists' (Mandelbaum 1958: 15), and his 1924 article 'Culture, Genuine and Spurious,' which argued for the conceptual and behavioral independence of the 'individual' and 'culture' (Sapir 1924: 411):

> [A] genuine culture refuses to consider the individual as a mere cog, as an entity whose sole raison d'etre lies in his subservience to a collective purpose that he is not conscious of or that has only a remote relevancy to his interests and strivings. The major activities of the individual must directly satisfy his own creative and emotional impulses, must always be something more than means to an end.

Reacting in part to the dispiriting effects of mechanization in modern life, Sapir proposes a view of 'genuine culture' as nurtured by society but ultimately arising internally from within the individual (1924: 421):

> The individual self, then, in aspiring to culture, fastens upon the accumulated cultural goods of its society, not so much for the sake of the passive pleasure of their acquirement, as for the sake of the stimulus given to the unfolding personality and of the orientation derived in the world (or better, a world) of cultural values.

A central tenet of language socialization research is that novices' participation in communicative practices is promoted but not determined by a legacy of socially and culturally informed persons, artifacts, and features of the built environment. Moreover, while many socializing situations involve older persons as experts and younger persons as novices, the reverse is also commonplace, especially as rapidly changing technologies and fresh perspectives render older modus operandi and ways of thinking inadequate (Goodwin 1996; Heath, this volume). Indeed, Margaret Mead (2001 [1950]) was one of the first to point out that older generations are often at a loss in raising their children to handle modern innovations and that children may guide their elders through the thickets of a brave new world. She depicted teachers who feel that each year they know less about children as if they were on 'an escalator going backwards' (2001 [1950]: 60). The antidote that Mead prescribed for teachers is to grow and learn with and from the children.

The agency of children and other novices has implications for the fixity and fluidity of habitus (Sterponi, this volume). As emphasized by Mead, predictability and plasticity coexist as polar societal necessities, thereby provoking an inherent tension in socializing encounters. It is tempting to stereotype 'traditional' com-

munities as pulling novices in the direction of continuity, while postindustrial societies are pushing novices to break glass ceilings. Yet, these trajectories are desired endpoints in all communities, given that novelty and creativity are part of the human condition. As revealed by Schegloff (1986), even the seemingly simplest interactional routine (e.g. the beginning of a phone call) is far from automatic but instead a skillful interactional achievement. In Duranti and Black (this volume), the authors elaborate ways in which 'creativity is made possible by routinization . . . even though the degree of freedom of execution varies across situations and speech genres.' Analyzing spontaneous play, joking, formal instruction, and musical genres such as jazz and Indian classical music, where creativity is a key aesthetic value, they provide a framework in which repetition, daily routines, and imitation are necessary and sometimes arduous steps in the socialization of different kinds of 'patterned' improvisation and evaluated performance. In this spirit, Moore (this volume) indicates how repetition practices in Qur'anic and French schools in a Fulbe community in Cameroon demand far more cognitive agency than verbatim parroting of their mentors. Indeed, as Moore notes, repetition is always something more – creative and transformative. As they go about their lives, the Fulbe children's Qur'anic Arabic and French language practices resemble but are not replicas of those of their teachers. Indeed, Moore notes that Fulbe mothers even allow children to play with the sounds of Qur'anic verses. Similarly, Heath (this volume) reports that, while Pitjantjatjara youths in Australia imitate culturally rooted storytelling and sand-drawing practices, their stories are revised – that is, improvised – to relate to present-day events.

In line with the notion that individuals comprise multiple selves as they move through life experiences (Wittgenstein 1958), language socialization research holds that habitus is infused with fluidity across the life cycle as well as across generations. It has been widely noted that institutional experiences, most notably those transpiring in schools, draw children into transformative dispositions and practices (Bourdieu 1979). What is less noticed is that children and youths actively assume informal, age-appropriate, situated practical communicative competences and subjectivities that they then shed and that may 'atrophy' from disuse later in life. These habitus and their practical competencies may be integral to life stages, as when childhoods are nurtured through peer-constructed practices of play (Aronsson, this volume; Goodwin and Kyratzis, this volume). A life course may also be marked by shifting language socialization experiences that encourage the shedding of certain language forms in favor of the adoption of others, thereby having an impact on the historical vitality of a communicative habitus (Duranti 2009; Friedman, this volume; Nonaka, this volume). The contributors to this handbook bring to the fore how persons across the life cycle and across different generations are alike yet different, recognizable yet transformed, lending on-the-ground insight into how habitus and practice become durable, transposable, and restructured over time (Bourdieu 1979).

Regardless of when it transpires across the life course, language socialization is best viewed as an *interactional* rather than unidirectional process (Pontecorvo, Fasulo, and Sterponi 2001). That is, all parties to socializing practices are agents

in the formation of competence. Valued knowledge, talent, virtue, action, and emotion are lodged in and nurtured through socially organized, fluid collaborative exchanges wherein displays of relative adeptness may shift among participants. This perspective resonates with Rogoff's (1990, 2003) idea that learning is collaborative and development is a dynamic outcome of children's active involvement in activities with others who guide their participation. Language socialization studies document the social and communicative positionings of children and other novices in different activity settings and the affordances of such positionings for situational and cultural competence.

Having laid down an argument for the agency of novices and for the interactional grounding of language socialization, we hasten to emphasize the social inequality in most expert–novice engagements (Lo and Fung, this volume; Miller, Koven, and Lin, this volume; Riley, this volume; Sterponi, this volume). Common to all socializing interactions is an asymmetry of knowledge and power. This asymmetry may last for the duration of an interactional turn or a lifetime. Whatever its tenure, experts and novices are distinguished precisely through an asymmetry of ratified knowledge, which is linked to the exercise of power over persons. The link between knowledge and power is exemplified by the well-known case of the panopticon, who exercises power by assuming a position that allows him to perceive everyone and everything (Bentham 1791; Foucault 1979). Think of the power implications of knowledge of religious and other texts, specialized lexicon, laws, rules, formulas, scientific findings, and eyewitness testimonials. In contrast to ratified knowledge, unratified knowledge does not yield a social advantage. Thus, Garfinkel (1967) bemoaned the attitude of psychology scholars who considered themselves as more knowledgeable about their research subjects than the subjects were about themselves, casting them as 'cultural dopes.' Similarly, Mehan's (1996) account of how a mother's experiential knowledge of her child is discounted in light of school psychologists' test results and expertise reveals the consequences of the distinction between ratified and unratified knowledge for the labeling of children as learning disabled. A similar phenomenon transpires when children's knowledge is viewed as less legitimate than that of an adult, as when adults speak for children (Stivers, this volume) or gloss their cries and unintelligible utterances in ways that match adult expectations. In these cases, power trumps knowledge.

The exercise of power over novices' communicative practices is ubiquitous. Schools in the US, for example, specify how children should tell stories for the class (Heath 1983; Michaels 1981; Miller, Koven, and Lin, this volume) and how they should read books – that is, alone and silently (Sterponi, this volume). During book-reading, children resort to counter-practices wherein they surreptitiously share the contents of their books, creating what Sterponi calls 'multi-vocal texts' with classmates in 'liminal spaces' out of the panoptical gaze of their teachers. This endeavor of school children resonates with Fader's insight (this volume) that '[c]hildren's autonomy is constrained in unique and temporary ways by adults. Their agency includes their capacity to reject or subvert the dominant moral discourse critical to the reproduction of their moral communities.' Even when adults

and children engage in the seemingly neutral sphere of play, 'the child may challenge adult authority within the frames of the play. Yet, ultimately, adults tend to come out as winners as it were, in that they are stronger or more in the know' (see also Aronsson, this volume; Garrett, this volume; Paugh, this volume). Asymmetries in power are not limited to adult–child interaction; they also pervade socializing interactions among peers (Aronsson, this volume; García-Sánchez, this volume; Goodwin 2006; Goodwin and Kyratzis, this volume). Rather than benign means of enhancing skills, peer assessments and corrections can have the effect of degrading certain children who do not meet their standards as inadequate and marginal.

Becoming Speakers of Cultures

A further tenet of language socialization research is that, as children and other novices become fluent communicators, they also become increasingly adept members of communities. Their communicative efficacy in particular situations depends upon their grasp of shifting and enduring perspectives that give meaning and order to an array of relationships, institutions, moral worlds, and knowledge domains. The process of becoming a recognized member entails an accommodation to members' ideologies about communicative resources, including how they can be used to acquire and display knowledge, express emotions, perform actions, constitute persons, and establish and maintain relationships. That is, each of the speech communities relevant to the novice socioculturally organizes the situational parameters of the communication that surrounds him/her – who communicates what with whom in which style, genre, and code. Novices come to understand the social and cultural underpinnings of these parameters through their own and others' socially structured engagement in such situations. Stivers' study of pediatric visits in the United States, for example, indicates that children are primarily talked about and infrequently addressed during these visits, with most questions about the child's condition directed to parents (this volume). Yet, when a question is directed to them, children as young as two and a half years old can answer certain questions competently, indicating that they have some sense of the point of the medical visit. Stivers argues that doctors' questions indirectly socialize child patients into what constitutes medically relevant information (e.g. presence, severity, and duration of symptoms; general health condition) and what kind of response they or their parent are expected to provide.

Human beings are differentially apprenticed into and through linguistic codes and other semiotic systems, which parse environments, instantiate social actions, organize relationships, and evoke psychological states. Some of the ways in which semiotic forms accomplish these ends are universal and likely rooted in species-wide modes of thinking, feeling, and (inter)acting with the social and physical world. It is hard to imagine a community in which language socialization does not cultivate social competence in and through requesting, questioning, asserting, planning, storytelling, correcting, evaluating, confirming, and disputing, for example (Ochs 1996). Socialization into these common communicative activities

facilitates social engagement not only within but also across linguistic communities, underpinning the globalization of institutions and perspectives. In this sense, language socialization into a community is language socialization into the human condition.

On the opposite side of the coin, language socialization is distinctly local and situated. Thrown into social situations from birth, human beings become attuned to socioculturally saturated linguistic cues that afford their sensibility to a fluidity of contexts. Infants not only become speakers of languages; they also become speakers of cultures. While anthropologists no longer view culture as homogeneous, bounded, and static, adults and children nonetheless 'are always trying to make sense out of their lives, always weaving fabrics of meaning, however fragile and fragmentary' (Ortner 1997: 9). Indeed, researchers immersed in the daily worlds of novices and experts, be they children and their caregivers or amateurs and professionals, can testify to the continued centrality of learning to interpret the situated social meanings of collective representations and to perform as expected in certain circumstances.

In a variety of participant roles (e.g. speaker, addressee, audience, overhearer), developing children and other novices are typically required to recognize how and when to produce kinds of requests, questions, assertions, plans, stories, corrections, evaluations, confirmations, and disputes. They learn how to express their emotions and constitute themselves as moral persons in public places to a greater or lesser extent. Moreover, while, universally, language socialization orients novices to the world around them, members of social groups use language and other semiotic resources to orient novices to notice and value certain salient and relevant activities, persons, artifacts, and features of the natural ecology. In making this point, we are not embracing linguistic determinism; rather, we simply note that the intertwining of language, society, and culture may begin in the womb and that language acquisition and socialization are interdependent developmental processes.

Transcending the Nature–Nurture Divide

Language socialization mediates the dualisms of nature and nurture, development and learning, individual and society, and mind and culture. The relation between neurobiology and culture has been a point of departure for cross-disciplinary dialogue, with considerable interest in the developmental transition into socially informed, protean selves capable of cooperating with others (Enfield and Levinson 2006; Richerson and Boyd 2004; Tomasello et al. 2005). This volume evidences the role of semiotic forms and practices as essential resources in this transition.

Going beyond the oppositionally framed debates of nature versus nurture surrounding the basis of acquisition, language socialization researchers have formulated a paradigm that assumes both nature and nurture as implicated. Language socialization assumes the biological immaturity of children, the social urgency for children to be nurtured by caregivers, and the universal cultivation of children's

awareness of self and other. At the same time, it assumes that children's and other novices' social awakening is inextricably tied to their entry into social order and the cultural significance of their own and others' actions, demeanors, and signs (Heath 1983; Schieffelin and Ochs 1986a, 1986b; Schieffelin 1990). In this regard, language socialization research shares with cultural psychology the notion that each child's conception, birth, and growth is informed by the social and cultural histories of the communities with which their progenitors affiliate (Cole 1996).

As evidenced in the example of the *Bébé Sounds Prenatal Talker* depicted earlier, even before a child is born, he or she enters a social world, one that is culturally organized and shaped by ideas about personhood, sociality, and the complicated relationships between nature and nurture, however they are locally defined. While the lives of infants may seem relatively circumscribed, people and things, theories and practices – all embedded in time and place – explicitly and/or tacitly contribute to the emerging social and communicative competencies of the infant, as well as to the interactive moves of caregivers. While there are many universal practices observed in the first two years due to the obvious requirements of biological circumstances of infancy and caregiving, there is also significant variation in activities relevant to language socialization, both individually and collectively in any given community.

A case for this phenomenon is made in Takada's study of San mother–infant nursing interactions in Botswana (this volume). Takada finds evidence of the universal primacy of mutual involvement between nursing San infants and caregivers in Botswana, but, unlike nursing interactions observed elsewhere, San caregivers avoid gazing at the infant and do not pause while nursing to attend to a fussing infant, bowing to a San preference for continuous flow of rhythmic engagement, supplemented by songs and sounds. Similarly, Brown confirmed the establishment of caregiver–child joint attention to external entities in Tzeltal Mayan and Rossel Island (Papua New Guinea) communities. The study draws upon Tomasello et al.'s (2005) observation that the establishment of joint attention to entities with infants is ontogenetically and phylogenetically critical to the development of intersubjectivity as a platform for culture and that pointing is instrumental in achieving mutual gaze towards an object or event. Brown found that both Tzeltal and Rossel Islanders use pointing with infants to this end around the same developmental period, but that Rossel Islanders do so more frequently, for longer, and more affectively. Caregivers in both of these communities did not follow the preference for labeling objects that has been observed in studies of joint attention in other societies.

Language socialization research shares with cultural psychology a strong interest in the social 'niches' of human development, particularly how more knowledgeable members of social groups organize novices' transition into social and cultural competence (de León 1998; Lave and Wenger 1991; Rogoff et al. 2003). In the case of language socialization, preferred corporeal habitats of infants (e.g. carried on back, nested in front, or facing caregiver; swaddled; placed in cradle) organize communication between infants and others (de León, this volume; Ochs, Solomon, and Sterponi 2005; Solomon, this volume; Takada, this volume).

In addition, the built environment and household arrangements surrounding novices at all stages of life create certain communicative affordances and inhibitions for communication. For example, the open architecture of dwellings and the spatial plan of extended family compounds and villages in many places in the world promote multiparty engagements between very young children and others, while walled-off houses containing smaller nuclear families in other communities may afford dyadic exchanges.

This ecological distinction is a key cross-cultural distinction that organizes the extent to which infants and young children are positioned as addressees, overhearers/observers, or messengers for others (de León, this volume; Schieffelin 1990; Solomon, this volume). De León's study of Zinacatecan Tzotzil families, for example, indicates a preference for involving infants in triadic exchanges and a dispreference for engaging them in dyadic proto-conversations, as observed in other communities (Bates, Camaioni, and Volterra 1979). The prevalence of multiparty versus dyadic communicative environments may also contribute to cross-cultural differences in the extent to which children are oriented to pay close attention to the social world around them, monitoring, learning, accommodating, and responding to situational contingencies (Garrett, this volume; Heath, this volume; Ochs and Schieffelin 1984, 1995; Paugh, this volume; Rogoff et al. 2003). It should be noted, however, that the distinction between multiparty and dyadic language socialization ecologies is by no means absolute or necessarily conducive to promoting keen attention to other people. Moreover, regardless of whether their home interactional environments are predominantly dyadic or multiparty, many young children across societies spend time outside their households in multiparty environments such as preschools and are brought to medical visits where they and their caregiver are differentially positioned in triadic interactions to inform and respond to the doctor (Stivers, this volume).

Language socialization research apprehends the role of nurture in children's emergent communication through systematic analysis of locally preferred and socially situated forms of participation, acts, and activities and their broader relation to social positionings, institutions, belief and knowledge systems, and aesthetic judgments. Language socialization studies take as central the idea that nurturing arrangements are motivated by a community's repertoire of shared and varied cultural beliefs about social reproduction, including personhood, sociality, emotions, knowledge, and human development, which are given materiality through language and other semiotic forms in everyday life. Language ideologies, for example, infuse and guide verbal input to children and other novices, profoundly affecting the form and content of communication in the presence of language-acquiring children (Paugh, this volume; Riley, this volume; Solomon, this volume).

Semiotic Resources for Socialization

Two important features distinguish language socialization as theoretical inquiry: (1) an analytic focus on speech, writing, gesture, images, music, and other signs

as primary means and endpoints of the socialization process and (2) an ethnographic sensibility that accounts for the socializing force of these semiotic resources in terms of enduring and shifting socioculturally meaningful practices, events, situations, institutions, relationships, emotions, aesthetics, moralities, bodies of knowledge, and ideologies.

As originally defined, language socialization comprises 'socialization through the use of language and socialization to use language' (Schieffelin and Ochs 1986b: 163). A central goal has been to discern the role of language and other semiotic systems in the quotidian reproduction and innovation of social order and cultural knowledge, beliefs, values, ideologies, symbols, and indexes. Language socialization research has concentrated on the socializing affordances of grammar (e.g. evidentials), lexicon (e.g. kinship terms), phonology (e.g. exaggerated intonation), speech acts (e.g. directives), conversational sequences, genres, registers, channels (e.g. written, oral), and codes. It also attends to other expressive forms (e.g. gesture, corporeal demeanor and positioning, figurative representation) that enable and structure the process of becoming a competent communicator and member of one or more social groups. Cook (this volume) demonstrates, for example, that different Japanese morpho-syntactic forms repeatedly and effectively cue children and adult language learners into degrees of certainty of knowledge and the limits of imputing others' unexpressed subjective states. For instance, in interactions with learners (who demonstrate awareness), Japanese caregivers use bare verb forms to index kinds of knowledge, for example psychological states, that only subjective experiencers can access and express. Alternatively, they use particles (e.g. *deshoo*) to mark other knowledge, for example the tastiness of cuisine, that both the subject and others can have the authority to access and express. Similarly, Muang adults in Northern Thailand direct children's attention to lexical, grammatical, and embodied markers of politeness (Howard, this volume).

Language socialization brings linguistic anthropological perspectives (Duranti 1997) into the study of how linguistic and cultural competence emerges across lifespans and histories. These perspectives include the notion that signs are routinely and hence indexically linked to social contexts (Peirce 1931–58; Silverstein 1996). As such, signs are lampposts that point to facets of social worlds for children and other novices to recognize and refashion in coordination with other community members (Ochs 1990). Language socialization research also builds upon studies of linguistic and sociocultural heterogeneity and hybridity to analyze how children are socialized into forms of cultural capital (Bourdieu 1979) that privilege certain languages, dialects, registers, genres, and styles over others and the consequences for language maintenance and shift (cf. among others, Garrett and Baquedano-López 2002; Kulick 1992; Schieffelin et al. 1998).

The analysis of linguistic resources for socialization predominantly relies upon (1) systematic audio and visual documentation (e.g. recordings, photographs, maps) of embodied communicative practices in the context of the social life of communities, (2) collection of relevant texts and other artifacts, and (3) in-depth extensive ethnographic field observations and interviews, which are critical to

gaining divergent and common understandings of complex situated relationships, symbols, and orientations. Language socialization research classically involves longitudinal data collection on socialization into/through and emergence of communicative practices over developmental time (Garrett and Baquedano-López 2002). While developmental time is associated with the early stages of life, it holds as well for the development of skills and ideas in the world of youths and adults. Language socialization research has also relied upon cross-sectional studies of novices in the context of families, schools, workplaces, and recreational and other settings (Goodwin and Kyratzis, this volume; Ochs and Taylor 1992; Stivers, this volume). Moreover, language socialization can be examined in the form of a single case study over a brief period of time (Aronsson, this volume; Aronsson and Cederborg 1996).

Attention to the details of temporally unfolding communication involving novices in relation to public webs of significance, including prevailing power asymmetries, is a hallmark of language socialization scholarship. These linked methodologies allow researchers to pursue the challenging Vygotskian concept that continuity and change transpire at interactional, diurnal, developmental, and sociohistorical levels. Language socialization studies tend to layer levels of analysis, looking at children and other novices' involvement in social life from the top down, looking into the organization of involvement itself for the socializing potentialities of semiotic forms and communicative arrangements, and looking up from micro-movements of bodies, gestures, and verbal acts to longer-term sociocultural and political implications. The threading of these methodologies provides crucial perspectives on the communicative roots of continuity, change, and marginalization in spheres such as religion, aesthetics, gender, peer and family relationships, classroom life, and ethnic diasporas.

Language Socializing Practices

At the risk of belaboring the obvious, language socialization does not boil down to a set of behaviors that are explicitly and intentionally oriented to enhance a novice's knowledge or skill. Emphasized throughout this volume are ways in which durative and emergent beliefs about speaking, acting, thinking, and feeling; the organization of communicative environments; the array of communicative activities, artifacts, and technologies available; the positioning of novices in interactional participant roles; and the socially differentiated accessibility of semiotic repertoires potentiate or hinder specific communicative and social habits and skills and evoke vital indexical meanings tied to context of situation and context of culture for novices of all ages. Language socialization rests upon the availability of these conditions and more.

Language socialization may transpire through explicit practices that express goals and instruct novices, yet vastly more pervasive is socialization through novices' routine participation in semiotically mediated practices, whose temporally unfolding structuring scaffolds and informs their experience, cuing them as

to how they should initiate moves and interpret and respond to situational contingencies.

Bourdieu and Passeron (1990: 102) remarked on the distinction between explicit and implicit socialization, emphasizing the ubiquity of the latter:

> The pedagogic work of inculcation – together with institutionalization, which is always accompanied by a degree of objectification in discourse . . . is one of the major occasions for formulating and converting practical schemes into explicit norms . . . As is suggested by a reading of Plato's *Meno*, the emergence of institutionalized education is accompanied by a crisis of diffuse education, which moves directly from practice to practice without passing though discourse.

According to this perspective, educational institutions present rules and explanations in an attempt to objectify and codify knowledge, while all around novices acquire practical mastery without a whisper of objectifying discourses. Instead, Bourdieu emphasized the importance of hexis or corporeal involvement as the medium for gaining practical knowledge. In line with this position, Heath (this volume) argues that the body, especially vision, has for centuries been the seat of creative learning in the arts and sciences and that only recently have these enterprises been transformed into spoken and written verbal instruction in classroom settings. This distinction is not only historical but also cross-culturally consequential when indigenous ways of acquiring ecological knowledge through experiential keen observation contrasts with school-based expectations of learning through objectifying scientific discourse.

Between 'pedagogic inculcation' and 'diffuse education,' however, lies a range of language socializing affordances that are more or less overt and presuppositionally or declaratively codified than as projected by Bourdieu. Indeed, even gaining practical knowledge through corporeal immersion is not totally 'diffuse,' in that caregivers use pointing to deliberately orient children's bodies to entities or hold children up to engage them in rhythmic activities. Moreover, novices', especially children's, practical mastery is assisted by speech acts and activities that orient them to what matters in situations and life in general. As Riley (this volume) points out, in some speech communities, caregivers believe that children must be explicitly taught to speak correctly through prompting in everyday social engagements.

In other words, ordinary apprenticeship into practical logic is not immune to objectifying discourse. Novices engaged in both institutional (e.g. school) and informal conversational interactions are recipients of error-corrections, assessments, reminders, calling out and other attention-getting moves, prompts, commands, suggestions, requests, threats, warnings, insults, shaming, teasing, praise, confirmation, rhetorical and test questions, common sense and other evidential particles, proverbs, idioms, gossip, moralizing narratives, reported speech, explanations, and other metapragmatic discourse.

These speech acts and activities may occur before, during, immediately following, or some later time after the behavior that warrants the attention of others. In the throes of playing a fast-moving computer game, for example, Swedish

children rapidly assess one other's moves, alerting them to 'what is risky, novel or noteworthy in the game […] socializing each other into gamers' (Aronsson, this volume). And, in the midst of musical performances, performers and audience may evaluate novices' improvisational forays and aesthetic standards through comments, nodding, and laughter (Duranti and Black, this volume).

In Japanese households, caregivers also routinely monitor children in the midst of social practices, demonstrating and prompting young children how to appropriately use the body and language to greet and show appreciation during the appropriate moment (Burdelski, this volume). Similarly, in a rural Kam Muang community in Thailand, adult kin and teachers instill respect by referring to themselves with the address term/respect level that the child should use and correcting speech considered disrespectful (Howard, this volume). In a different part of the world, mothers in a New York Hasidic Jewish community also keep a watchful eye over their young daughters' demeanors and deploy praising, prompting, rote repetition, and ordering to apprentice them into 'a gendered ethical subjectivity' that includes delayed gratification, modesty, prayer, and acceptance of authority (Fader, this volume).

After a transgression has occurred, Taiwanese and South Korean caregivers and teachers frequently shame children to get them to reflect upon their transgression and its moral consequences (Lo and Fung, this volume). Sometimes entire narratives of a child's shameful actions are recounted in front of others, who are invited to join in explicit and elaborated shaming practices. The robust practice of using narrative to challenge children's behaviors is also common in working-class urban Euro-American households (Miller, Koven, and Lin, this volume). Yet, the endpoint is not so much to instill respect as to encourage the children to defend themselves against others, as part of developing the moral quality of 'hard individualism' (Kusserow 2004). In these and other communities, children are drawn into narrative interactions that problematize and give advice about life experiences (Ochs and Capps 2001). In some communities, narrative is used among peers to the same end of pointing out transgressions. As noted by Goodwin and Kyratzis (this volume), peers may use gossip and hypothetical and other kinds of narratives to 'police the local social landscape and make evaluative commentary to one another.'

Language Socialization and Speech Communities

Children's linguistic and social competence has been viewed as a dynamic system of development, but, in light of the social and cultural heterogeneity that prevails across the world's communities, language socialization research holds that (1) languages and communities are themselves also undergoing transformation, (2) children's linguistic and cultural production is influenced by this transformation, and (3) children themselves contribute to this transformation.

Given that most communities are characterized by heterogeneity of linguistic and cultural ideologies and practices, the linguistic and cultural lives of many

children and adults lie in 'zones of contact' (Pratt 1991) between social and linguistic groups, which may be stable at times or fluid, leading to language shift, loss, and change. Arguing against utopian and idealized conceptions of unified speech communities with shared codes, conversational sequence preferences, and cooperative maxims, Pratt (1996: 6) presents contact zones as

> social and cultural formations [that] enter a long term, often permanent state of crisis that cannot be resolved by either the conqueror or the conquered. Rather the relationships of conquered/conqueror, invaded/invader, past/present, and before/after become the medium out of which culture, language, society and consciousness get constructed. That constructing . . . involves continuous negotiation among radically heterogenous groups whose separate historical trajectories have come to intersect; among radically heterogenous systems of meaning that have been brought into contact by the encounter; and within relations of radical inequality enforced by violence.

When Schieffelin entered the Bosavi (Kaluli) community in the 1970s to document language acquisition and socialization, she knew that the social and communicative practices she observed had been in place for at least twenty years before her arrival (Schieffelin 1990). But the 1970s ushered in a very dramatic change as a result of intensive missionization, which is one of the oldest and most pervasive language socializing institutions. Mission workers used translations to socialize Bosavi people into and through new genres such as sermons and literacy skills to read the Bible and other texts (Schieffelin 1996, 2000). Awkward translations cobbled from semantically distant Bosavi words attempted to codify and thereby impose ways of thinking and communicating that were indigenously unfamiliar and inappropriate (Schieffelin 2007). The power of the mission as a world-wide institution negotiated with the power of local institutions and meaning systems, with uneven consequences.

Postcolonial societies create sites of language shift, with language socialization interactions involving young children as the ground zero of linguistic transformation. Paugh (this volume), for example, demonstrates how the diminishing status of the Afro-French Creole in relation to English in Dominica (West Indies) is linked to a language socialization condition in which caregivers privilege English as the language of respect and discourage children from using the Creole, which is deemed vulgar. Garrett (this volume) proposes that micro-processual changes evident in language socialization practices 'may be, in some cases, one of the most important mechanisms of language shift.' His study of language socialization on the Caribbean island of St. Lucia ties the loss of Kwéyòl in favor of English among children to home and school socialization practices that position English as vital and Kwéyòl as inevitably acquired, which turns out not to be the case. While adults use Kwéyòl to preverbal infants, they insist that they switch to English once they begin to speak. Similar micro-processes of language socialization impact the vitality of the vernacular Kam Muang in Northern Thailand, in that village children are told to speak Thai to address their non-Muang classroom teachers and

classmates as a sign of respect (Howard, this volume). Alternatively, Nonaka's analysis of a spontaneous sign language used in Ban Khor, Northern Thailand (this volume) and Friedman's study of the revitalization of Ukrainian (this volume) emphasize that continuation of local languages may be fueled through language socialization ideologies and practices that widely expose children to these codes and encourage their acquisition. Nonaka's study also reveals how government policies that may appear benevolent in fact undermine and endanger the robustness of such sign languages.

Immigration also portends zones of contact wherein children and youths become at once agents and targets of language socialization. As noted by Baquedano-López and Mangual Figueroa (this volume), the study of the language socialization of young immigrants entails 'processes and practices of continuity, identification, discontinuity, and dis-identification' as part of the experience of immigration. Violence comes in many guises for these children and youths, especially language practices by native-speaking peers to establish social barriers between 'them' and 'us.' García-Sánchez's study (this volume) of the exclusion of Moroccan immigrant children in Spain is a case in point. Spanish classmates used an array of embodied language practices to directly or indirectly negatively sanction and marginalize their Moroccan-born peers. On the agentive side, these and other immigrant children are themselves language socializers when they act as language and culture brokers for adults in their family and community, mediating encounters in medical, educational, and state institutions (Orellana 2008; Zentella 1997). Moreover, immigrant children can draw upon linguistic and cultural resources from their homeland and host country to improvise genres that build their hybrid identities (Baquedano-López and Mangual Figueroa, this volume). In addition to ethnic-minority children, children of fundamentalist religious groups and children who live in relative poverty may be monitored and corrected by inside members, who judge certain behaviors to be out of line with community expectations (Baquedano-López and Mangual Figueroa, this volume; Fader, this volume; García-Sánchez, this volume).

The field of linguistic anthropology abounds with studies of language forms that index and evoke social meanings, and language socialization studies evidence how novices are drawn into these meanings over the life course. As noted, the acquisition of languages is simultaneously coupled with language socialization practices that construct novices as certain kinds of situationally organized persons, with certain emotions, moral understandings, and beliefs, who engage in certain kinds of social and cognitive activities. Nowhere is this potential of language socialization more evident than in the worlds made desirable and to varying extents accessible through second language socialization (Duff, this volume). Second languages may, for example, usher in alternative subjectivities wherein interlocutors can revision their gendered self-construction and can engage in informal social relationships appropriate to certain second language situations. A twist in the interface of language learning and socialization into identity construction is the phenomenon of heritage language socialization, in which learners are expected to use the heritage code that displays them as suitable moral persons as

envisioned by an idealized 'heritage culture' (He, this volume; Lo and Fung, this volume). Heritage and second language learners, like many caught in zones of contact, however, often manage multiple, morally conflicting selves and loyalties.

Conclusion

In summary, language socialization research examines the semiotically mediated affordances of novices' engagement with culture-building webs of meaning and repertoires of social practice throughout the life cycle. Language socialization also subscribes to the idea that a person may be an expert in one situation but a novice in another. Researchers view communicative practices involving novices as deeply sociocultural, in that:

- novices are socially defined and positioned as certain kinds of members;
- conversation and other discourse genres and practices are embedded in and constitutive of larger social conditions;
- semiotic forms are complex social tools that are situationally and culturally implicative;
- codes are parts of repertoires and morally weighted;
- learning and development are influenced by local theories of how knowledge, maturity, and wellbeing are attained.

The Handbook of Language Socialization presents cross-cultural research on each of these themes. It captures children's and other novices' involvement in social life and cultural sense-making and the language socialization practices and frameworks that mediate their path to competence.

This volume is the product of a scholarly community that has grown through the kind of collaborative language socializing practices we have observed in our field sites. Scholars have drawn from one another's research to co-produce knowledge, allowing it to be transformed by a host of influences and ultimately to have a generative intellectual life of its own. When we returned from our respective fieldwork in Papua New Guinea and Western Samoa and began to draft 'Language acquisition and socialization: Three developmental stories' (Ochs and Schieffelin 1984), we considered the study of language socialization to be a germinal project. The collection of studies herein realizes the flourishing of this vision, with endeavors that have taken the field in creative directions.

NOTES

1 These quotes are taken from http://www.babyoffice.com, but *Bébé Sounds Prenatal Talker* is available on numerous websites.

2 Studies indicate that, as they mature, fetuses become attuned to the mother's voice and language (DeCasper and Fifer 1980). At 27 weeks the fetus responds sporadically to low-frequency tones and speech and requires high levels of auditory stimulation. Reliability increases as the fetus reaches 35 weeks (Lasky and Williams 2005).

REFERENCES

Aronsson, K. and Cederborg, A.-C. (1996) Coming of age in family therapy talk: Perspective setting in multiparty problem formulations. *Discourse Processes* 21: 191–212.

Baquedano-López, P. (2001) Creating social identities through *doctrina* narratives. In A. Duranti (ed.), *Linguistic Anthropology: A Reader*. 343–58. Oxford: Blackwell.

Bates, E., Camaioni, L., and Volterra, V. (1979) The acquisition of performatives prior to speech. In E. Ochs and B. B. Schieffelin (eds.), *Developmental Pragmatics*. 111–31. New York: Academic Press.

Bentham, J. (1791) *Panopticon*. London: T. Payne.

Boas, F. (1911) Introduction. In *Handbook of American Indian Languages*. Vol. BAE–B 40, P. I. Washington, DC: Smithsonian Institution.

Boas, F. (2004 [1932]) *Anthropology and Modern Life*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.

Bourdieu, P. (1979) *Distinction*. Paris: Éditions de Minuit.

Bourdieu, P. and Passeron, J. C. (1990 [1977]) *Reproduction in Education, Society and Culture*. London: Sage.

Cole, M. (1996) *Cultural Psychology: A Once and Future Discipline*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

DeCasper, A. J. and Fifer, W. P. (1980) Of human bonding: Newborns prefer their mothers' voices. *Science* 208: 1174–6.

de León, L. (1998) The emergent participant: Interactive patterns in the socialization of Tzotzil (Mayan) infants. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 8(2): 131–61.

Duff, P. and Hornberger, N. (eds.) (2008) *Encyclopedia of Language and Education, Vol. 8: Language Socialization*. 2nd ed. New York: Springer.

Duranti, A. (1997) *Linguistic Anthropology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Duranti, A. (2009) The relevance of Husserl's theory to language socialization. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 19(2): 205–26.

Enfield, N. and Levinson, S. C. (eds.) (2006) *Roots of Human Sociality: Culture, Cognition, and Interaction*. Oxford: Berg.

Fader, A. (2009) *Mitzvah Girls: Bringing Up the Next Generation of Hasidic Jews in Brooklyn*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Foucault, M. (1979) *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. New York: Random House.

Garfinkel, H. (1967) *Studies in Ethnomethodology*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Garrett, P. B. and Baquedano-López, P. (2002) Language socialization: Reproduction and continuity, transformation and change. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 31: 339–61.

Geertz, C. (1973) Thick description: Toward an interpretive theory of culture. In *The Interpretation of Cultures*. 1–30. New York: Basic Books.

Goodwin, M. H. (2006) *The Hidden Life of Girls: Games of Stance, Status, and Exclusion*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Goodwin, C. (1996) Transparent vision. In E. Ochs, E. A. Schegloff, and S. Thompson (eds.), *Interaction and Grammar*. 370–404. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gumperz, J. J. and Hymes, D. (1964) The ethnography of communication. *American Anthropologist* 66(6) (special issue) 137–53.

Harkness, S. and Super, C. M. (eds.) (1996) *Parents' Cultural Belief Systems: Their Origins, Expressions, and Consequences*. New York: Guilford Press.

He, A. (2003) Linguistic anthropology and language socialization. In S. Wortham and B. Rymes (eds.), *Linguistic Anthropology of Education*. 93–119. Westport, CT: Praeger.

Heath, S. B. (1983) *Ways with Words: Language, Life and Work in Communities and Classrooms*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Heath, S. B. (2008) Language socialization in the learning communities of adolescents. In P. Duff and N. Hornberger (eds.), *Encyclopedia of Language and Education, Vol. 8: Language Socialization*. 2nd ed. 217–30. New York: Springer.

Herskovits, M. J. (1952) *Man and His Works*. New York: Knopf.

Kulick, D. (1992) *Language Shift and Cultural Reproduction: Socialization, Self, and Syncretism in a Papua New Guinean Village*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kulick, D. and Schieffelin, B. B. (2004) Language socialization. In A. Duranti (ed.), *A Companion to Linguistic Anthropology*. 349–68. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Kusserow, A. (2004) *American Individualisms: Child Rearing and Social Class in Three Neighborhoods*. New York: Palgrave.

Lasky, R. E. and Williams, A. L. (2005) The development of the auditory system from conception to term. *NeoReviews* 6: 141–52.

Lave, J. and Wenger, E. (1991) *Situated Learning: Legitimate Peripheral Participation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Malinowski, B. (1935) *Coral Gardens and Their Magic*. New York: Dover.

Mandelbaum, D. G. (ed.) (1958) *Selected Writings of Edward Sapir in Language, Culture, and Personality*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Mead, M. (1928) *Coming of Age in Samoa*. New York: William Morrow.

Mead, M. (2001 [1950]) The school in American culture. *Society* 39(1): 54–62.

Mehan, H. (1996) The construction of an LD student: A case study in the politics of representation. In M. Silverstein and G. Urban (eds.), *Natural Histories of Discourse*. 253–76. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Mertz, E. (2007) *The Language of Law School*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Michaels, S. (1981) 'Sharing time': Children's narrative styles and differential access to literacy. *Language in Society* 10: 423–42.

Moore, L. (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): 109–26.

Ochs, E. (1990) Indexicality and socialization. In J. W. Stigler, R. Shweder, and G. Herdt (eds.), *Cultural Psychology: Essays on Comparative Human Development*. 287–308. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ochs, E. (1988) *Culture and Language Development: Language Acquisition and Language Socialization in a Samoan Village*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ochs, E. (1996) Linguistic resources for socializing humanity. In J. J. Gumperz and S. C. Levinson (eds.), *Rethinking Linguistic Relativity*. 407–37. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ochs, E. and Capps, L. (2001) *Living Narrative: Creating Lives in Everyday Storytelling*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Ochs, E. and Schieffelin, B. B. (eds.) (1979) *Developmental Pragmatics*. New York: Academic Press.

Ochs, E. and Schieffelin, B. B. (1984) Language acquisition and socialization: Three developmental stories. In R. A. Shweder and R. A. LeVine (eds.), *Culture Theory: Essays on Mind, Self, and Emotion*. 276–320. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ochs, E. and Schieffelin, B. B. (1995) The impact of language socialization on grammatical development. In P. Fletcher and B. MacWhinney (eds.), *The Handbook of Child Language*. 73–94. Oxford: Blackwell.

Ochs, E. and Schieffelin, B. B. (2008) Language socialization: An historical overview. In P. Duff and N. Hornberger (eds.), *Encyclopedia of Language and Education, Vol. 8: Language Socialization*. 2nd ed. 3–15. New York: Springer.

Ochs, E., Solomon, O., and Sterponi, L. (2005) Limitations and transformations of habitus in child-directed communication. *Discourse Studies* 7(4–5): 547–83.

Ochs, E. and Taylor, C. (1992) Science at dinner. In C. Kramsch (ed.), *Text and Context: Cross-disciplinary Perspectives on Language Study*. 29–45. Lexington, MA: D. C. Heath.

Orellana, M. (2008) *Translating Childhoods: Immigrant Youth, Language, and Culture*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Ortner, S. B. (1997) Introduction. In S. B. Ortner (ed.), *The Fate of 'Culture': Geertz and Beyond*. 1–13. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Parsons, T. and Bales, R. F. (1956) *Family: Socialization and Interaction Process*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Peirce, C. (1931–58) *Collected Papers*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Philips, S. U. (1982) The language socialization of lawyers: Acquiring the cant. In G. Spindler (ed.), *Doing the Ethnography of Schooling*. 176–209. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Pontecorvo, C., Fasulo, A., and Sterponi, L. (2001) Mutual apprentices: The making of parenthood and childhood in family dinner conversation. *Human Development* 44: 340–61.

Pratt, M. L. (1991) *Arts of the Contact Zone*. *Profession* 91: 33–40. Modern Language Association.

Pratt, M. L. (1996) Apocalypse in the Andes: Contact zones and the struggle for interpretive power. In *Encuentros, Vol. 15*. Inter-American Development Bank.

Prout, A. and James, A. (eds.) (1997) *Constructing and Reconstructing Childhood: Contemporary Issues in the Sociological Study of Childhood*. London: Routledge Falmer.

Richerson, P. J. and Boyd, R. (2004) *Not by Genes Alone: How Culture Transformed Human Evolution*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Riley, K. C. (2008) *Language socialization*. In B. Spolsky and F. M. Hult (eds.), *Handbook of Educational Linguistics*. 398–410. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Rogoff, B. (1990) *Apprenticeship in Thinking*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Rogoff, B. (2003) *The Cultural Nature of Human Development*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Rogoff, B., Paradise, R., Arauz, R.M., Correa-Chávez, M., and Angelillo, C. (2003) Firsthand learning through intent participation. *Annual Review of Psychology* 54: 175–203.

Sapir, E. (1924) Culture, genuine and spurious. *Journal of Sociology* 29: 401–29.

Sapir, E. (1929) The unconscious patterning of behavior in society. In E. S. Dummer (ed.), *The Unconscious: A Symposium*. 114–42. New York: Knopf.

Sapir, E. (1933/1958) Language. In D. Mandelbaum (ed.), *Selected Writings of Edward Sapir in Language, Culture, and Personality*. 7–32. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Schegloff, E. A. (1986) The routine as achievement. *Human Studies* 9: 111–51.
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. A. Schegloff, and S. A. Thompson (eds.), *Interaction and Grammar*. 435–60. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Schieffelin, B. B. (2000) Introducing Kaluli literacy: A chronology of influences. In P. Kroskrity (ed.), *Regimes of Language*. 293–327. Santa Fe, NM: School of American Research.
Schieffelin, B. B. (2007) Found in translating: Reflexive language across time and texts. In M. Makihara and B. B. Schieffelin (eds.), *Consequences of Contact: Language Ideologies and Sociocultural Transformations in Pacific Societies*. 140–65. New York: Oxford University Press.
Schieffelin, B. B. and Ochs, E. (eds.) (1986a) *Language Socialization Across Cultures*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
Schieffelin, B. B. and Ochs, E. (1986b) Language socialization. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 15: 163–91.
Schieffelin, B. B. and Ochs, E. (1996) The microgenesis of competence: Methodology in language socialization. In D. Slobin, J. Gerhardt, A. Kyratzis, and J. Guo (eds.), *Social Interaction, Social Context and Language: Essays in Honor of Sue Ervin-Tripp*. 251–86. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
Schieffelin, B. B., Woolard, K., and Kroskrity, P. (eds.) (1998) *Language Ideologies: Practice and Theory*. New York: Oxford University Press.
Shweder, R. A., Mahapatra, M. and Miller, J. G. (1987) Culture and moral development. In J. Kagan and S. Lamb (eds.), *The Emergence of Morality in Young Children*. 1–82. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
Silverstein, M. (1996) Indexical order and the dialectics of sociolinguistic life. In R. Ide, R. Parker, and Y. Sunaoshi (eds.), *Third Annual Symposium About Language and Society (SALSA)*. 266–95. Department of Linguistics, University of Texas, Austin, TX.
Slobin, D. I. (ed.) (1967) *A Field Manual for Cross-Cultural Study of the Acquisition of Communicative Competence*. Language Behavior Research Laboratory, University of California: Berkeley, CA.
Tomasello, M., Carpenter, M., Call, J., Behne, T., and Moll, H. (2005) Understanding and sharing intentions: The origins of cultural cognition. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences* 28: 675–735.
Vygotsky, L. (1986) *Thought and Language*. A. Kozulin, transl. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
Weisner, T. (2002) Ecocultural understanding of children's developmental pathways. *Human Development* 45(4): 275–81.
Whiting, B. B. and Edwards, C. P. (1988) *Children of Different Worlds: The Formation of Social Behavior*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
Whiting, B. B. and Whiting, J. M. W. (1975) *Children of Six Cultures: A Psycho-Cultural Analysis*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
Wittgenstein, L. (1958) *Philosophical Investigations*. 2nd ed. G. E. M. Anscombe, transl. Oxford: Blackwell.
Wortham, S. (2005) Socialization beyond the speech event. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 15(1): 95–112.
Zentella, A. C. (1997) *Growing Up Bilingual: Puerto Rican Children in New York*. Oxford: Blackwell.
Zentella, A. C. (ed.) (2005) *Building on Strength: Language and Literacy in Latino Families and Communities*. New York: Teachers College Press.