4

LANGUAGE SOCIALIZATION APPROACHES TO SECOND LANGUAGE ACQUISITION

Social, cultural, and linguistic development in additional languages

Patricia A. Duff and Steven Talmy

Overview

Language socialization represents a broad framework for understanding the development of linguistic, cultural, and communicative competence through interaction with others who are more knowledgeable or proficient. As a branch of linguistic anthropology, it is often described as a theoretical and methodological approach, or "paradigm" (e.g., Ochs & Schieffelin, 2008; Watson-Gegeo, 2004). Based on early theorizing by Hymes (1972), Halliday (1980/2003), Vygotsky (1978), Heath (1983), Schieffelin and Ochs (1986a), and others, language socialization examines macro- and micro-contexts in which language is learned and used, and employs longitudinal research designs that feature ethnography and linguistic/discourse analytic methods.[1]

A primary aim of much cognitivist second language acquisition (SLA) research is to provide descriptions of and explanations for linguistic development, for example the acquisition of L2 morphosyntax, phonology, lexis, and pragmatic phenomena such as speech acts. There is naturally an attendant concern with cognition, particularly in terms of the internalization, integration, storage, retrieval, and use of linguistic knowledge. In contrast, language socialization research seeks to account for and explain learning in much broader terms, examining not only linguistic development, but also *the other forms of knowledge* that are learned in and through language. These other forms of knowledge include *culture*, for example stances of morality or respect that are learned along with the linguistic forms that mark them. They include *social knowledg*e as well, such as how certain types of language practices produce and reflect social stratification, hierarchy, and status marking. Language socialization research also examines *ideologies* (e.g., of the

world, of nationality, of language itself); *epistemologies* (reflecting sources of knowledge, degrees of certainty, evidentiality); gendered and other *identities and subjectivities* (e.g., "nonnative speakers"); and *affect* (e.g., the expression of positive or negative emotions such as pleasure or shame), to name a few commonly studied dimensions. Furthermore, because of language socialization's origins in the study of children's social, cultural, and first language (L1) development through interaction, much language socialization research looks not at discrete linguistic items at the level of lexis and morphology, but at interactional or sociolinguistic *routines* that become part of language learners' and users' communicative repertoires. In other words, the learning object, or "language," is fundamentally redefined from a language socialization perspective: In contrast to a restricted and decontextualized view of language as a neutral transmitter of information made up of morphemes, syntactic structures, lexis, and pragmatic norms, language socialization conceives of language as one of a multitude of in-flux, contested, and ever-changing *social practices* that in part constitute particular dynamic communities of practice. Language socialization also differs from cognitivist SLA in its focus on the local social, political, and cultural contexts in which language is learned and used, on historical aspects of language and culture learning, on contestation and change across timescales, and on the cultural content of linguistic structures and practices.

Like other alternative approaches to SLA, L2 socialization, as it has entered its "second wave" (Bronson & Watson-Gegeo, 2008) of scholarship, is now garnering greater attention, acceptance, and visibility than ever before. Evidence of this development can be found in recent comprehensive volumes on SLA in which L2 socialization is discussed (e.g., Ellis, 2009; Mitchell & Myles, 2004; Ortega, 2009); in the addition of a new volume on language socialization to the *Encyclopedia of Language and Education* (Duff & Hornberger, 2008); in the multitude of handbooks and related reference works on language acquisition that have appeared in recent years (e.g., Watson-Gegeo & Nielsen, 2003); in articles in mainstream journals directly relevant to language learning and education (e.g., *Applied Linguistics; Journal of Pragmatics; Linguistics and Education; TESOL Quarterly*); and in a recent volume on sociocognitive approaches to second language learning and use (Batstone, 2010).

With some important differences (see below), L2 socialization shares many underlying principles with other socially oriented theories, models, or accounts of SLA, including several discussed in this volume. Commonalities include a commitment to a deeply ecological perspective of learning-in-context (Kramsch & Steffensen, 2008), and a concomitant analysis of learning through praxis—that is, through observation, participation, and performance—in the everyday activities of communities of language users (Bourdieu, 1991). L2 socialization also shares important theoretical linkages with other alternative approaches to SLA, including neo-Vygotskian sociocultural theory (Duff, 2007; Ochs, 1996), ethnomethodology (Garrett & Baquedano-López, 2002; Schieffelin & Ochs, 1986a), and systemic functional linguistics (see, e.g., Bernstein, 1972; Williams, 2008). Additionally, there is acknowledgment that L2 learning is mediated not only by social agents but also

by other affordances of the learning setting, such as modality (oral, written, visual, electronic) and additional semiotic resources, including physical artifacts, other people, and language itself. As well, L2 socialization views language learners/users as sociohistorically, socioculturally, and sociopolitically situated individuals with multiple subjectivities and identities (e.g., not only as *language learners*), which are inculcated, enacted, and co-constructed through social experience in everyday life.

Theoretical Principles

Language socialization has its theoretical roots in a variety of disciplines that are drawn on to different degrees by scholars doing L2 or multilingual socialization research: linguistic anthropology (Duranti, Ochs, & Schieffelin, in press; Hymes, 1972; Schieffelin & Ochs, 1986a), sociology (e.g., Bernstein, 1972; Bourdieu, 1977; Giddens, 1979, 1984), cultural psychology (Lave & Wenger, 1991; Rogoff, 1995, 2003), cultural-historical psychology/sociocultural theory and activity theory (Engestrom, 1999; Leontiev, 1981;Vygotsky, 1978), systemic functional linguistics (e.g., Halliday, 1980/2003), semiotics (e.g., Hanks, 1992), literary theory (e.g., Bahktin, 1981) and, more recently, discursive psychology (e.g., positioning theory; Bamberg, 2000; Korobov & Bamberg, 2004).[2] Recent work drawing on poststructuralist theories focuses especially on subjectivity in language learning and use, and the emergence of a sense of self through socialization (e.g., Garrett, 2007).

In contrast to L1 socialization, L2 socialization addresses the manifold complexities of children or adults with already developed repertoires of linguistic, discursive, and cultural practices as they encounter new ones. Thus, the interactions between prior and current learning go well beyond those described traditionally in SLA as "cross-linguistic influence" or "transfer" (Duff, in press-a). Learners in L2 socialization, like those undergoing L1 socialization, may be in home, school, peer group, university, or workplace contexts.

Language socialization researchers have typically acknowledged some degree of agency, contingency, unpredictability, and multidirectionality in terms of learners and their language learning trajectories—that is, learners are *agents* who may contest or transform as well as accommodate practices others attempt to induct them into (e.g., Duff, 2002; Kulick & Schieffelin, 2004; Talmy, 2008). Furthermore, learners socialize caregivers, teachers, and other "experts" into *their* identities and practices. A great deal of L1 socialization research has nonetheless focused on socialization as a powerful process whereby newcomers or novices accommodate, apprentice to, and resist linguistic and cultural norms they are exposed to. Yet, for a variety of reasons, some L2 learners do not experience the same degrees of access or acceptance within their new discourse communities as their L1 counterparts do. Despite their desire in many cases to be apprenticed into the practices of new L2 communities, they may face opposition from others (see Norton, 2000; Norton & McKinney, this volume). Or they may be embraced by new communities but themselves not be fully invested in learning particular community ways because their future goals may not require it, or because they remain actively

committed to competing social networks. They may want to retain an identity that is distinct from a particular (e.g., target language) community (e.g., Bronson & Watson-Gegeo, 2008), or for practical reasons they may be unwilling to straddle both (and perhaps other) community expectations and learning/performance demands simultaneously. Furthermore, they may feel conflicted about becoming fuller members in certain new L2-mediated social worlds.

To summarize, from a (second) language socialization perspective, social interaction with more proficient members of a particular community centrally mediates the development of both communicative competence *and* knowledge of the values, practices, identities, ideologies and stances of that community. However, these more proficient interlocutors are also socialized by novices/newcomers into their expert/old-timer roles, identities, and subjectivities, they learn from novices/newcomers their specific and perhaps unique communicative needs, and they also learn from these learners' own perspectives and prior experiences. Thus, socialization is bidirectional (or multidirectional) and can lead to the internalization and reproduction of existing L2 cultural and communicative practices. However, because socialization involves myriad complexities concerning relations of power, access, identity, and sociopolitical and sociohistorical constraints, it is a necessarily contingent process, and can thus lead to unanticipated outcomes, such as the development of hybrid practices, identities, and values, the incomplete or partial appropriation of the L2, or a lower-than-desired status within the L2 community. Finally, because language learning and socialization are lifelong processes in which new ways of acting, communicating, and thinking require new discursive practices, longitudinal perspectives are important for better understanding learner trajectories.

Research Methods

In language socialization, studies are typically ethnographic, providing a broad description of the cultures, communities, classrooms, and other dynamic social settings in which language is learned and used, based on persistent engagement in and extensive observation of the context (Bronson & Watson-Gegeo, 2008; Duff, 1995, 2002; Garrett, 2008; Kulick & Schieffelin, 2004; Schieffelin & Ochs, 1996). Ethnographic research involves understanding the cultural patterns and values of groups in their local contexts. For example, Duff (1995, 1996) video-recorded dual-language English/Hungarian classrooms over two years in three schools in different parts of post-1989 Hungary. She examined the changing dynamics of oral classroom discourse as it connected with the introduction of English as a medium of instruction and emerging notions of democratization. Specifically, she demonstrated how the quest for democratization outside of schools was paralleled in classrooms, for example in the abandonment of a cornerstone of Hungarian education and assessment—daily classroom recitations called *felelés*—which were being replaced by new forms of discourse, interaction, and assessment. The study exemplifies the effort that is common in language socialization research to bring together both macro- and microanalysis, that is, how processes that are evident in a wider

sociocultural context (e.g., democratization in post-1989 Hungary) are realized in particular local circumstances (e.g., a shift to new forms of assessment). The study also looked at language acquisition: how teachers and students corrected one another as part of the negotiation and internalization of correct English forms and as a way of showcasing their (emerging) identities as proficient English speakers or bilingual Hungarians.

True to its ethnographic orientation, data sources in language socialization research, as illustrated by Duff's (1995, 1996) study, typically include some combination of the following:

- fieldnotes generated from some form of participant observation;
- site artifacts such as relevant policy documents, books, magazines, and other print-text materials; multimodal texts including photographs, pictures, and artwork; and participant-generated texts such as classwork, writing assignments, drawings, among much else;
- interviews, ranging from one-on-one semi-structured or unstructured formats, to focus groups, to retrospective "stimulated recall" sessions, to email and other forms of computer-mediated communication;
- audio- and/or video-recordings of socializing interactions from the particular speech event, activity, interaction type, or other language/social practice under investigation.

Typically, data are subjected to intensive, iterative analysis of the linguistic and other social and cultural practices being investigated, with a focus on the contextual dimensions within which these practices occur, as well as close analysis of the changes in and development (if any) of participants' competencies over time.

Ordinarily, a longitudinal presence on site or engagement with the community ensures that the research will involve regular observations by researchers over an extended period. One reason for this sort of prolonged engagement with the community is to understand recurring cultural and linguistic patterns of interaction that constitute processes of socialization. For example, Talmy's (2008, 2009) 2.5-year critical ethnography in a Hawai'i high school described several social practices that constituted an old-timer "Local ESL" community of practice in the school's ESL program. He showed how student participation in these practices worked on the one hand to socialize newcomer ESL students into negative language ideologies constituting the "stigma" associated with ESL, and, on the other, to apprentice three novice ESL teachers into an infantilizing ESL pedagogical practice.

A focal social practice, speech event, or activity may be selected so comparisons can be made over time. Within this activity, particular interactional routines (e.g., greetings), linguistic elements (e.g., sentence-final particles in Japanese), or turn-taking behaviors may be examined. Morita (2000), for example, studied the socialization of international and domestic graduate students into an academic community, specifically as they participated in the speech event of the oral academic presentation in their classes. Vickers (2007), too, examined a single speech

event—the "team meeting"—in her study of nonnative English-speaking students' socialization into the practices of a group of student engineers. These researchers then engaged in discourse analyses of data concerning the speech event under consideration. Common approaches for such discourse analyses in language socialization include systemic-functional grammar, conversation analysis, interactional sociolinguistics, or positioning analysis. Coding, counting, or content analysis may be undertaken, or the analysis may be completely qualitative.

Language socialization research often pays more attention to the interactional and linguistic *processes* of socialization in real interactional time than to the systematic study of *outcomes*. Indeed, since language socialization is a complex, lifelong process, no single study can be sufficiently longitudinal to capture the ebb and flow of socialization and its many milestones over a lifetime. In shorter-term studies, the process of language education and enculturation often supersedes detailed analyses and evidence of linguistic, affective, and other (e.g., cognitive) outcomes of language socialization. That is because language socialization underscores the values being inculcated, the challenges facing learners and agents of socialization, and (although less so) the degree of success in learning such practices. This characteristic of L2 socialization may be a by-product of L1 socialization studies in which the eventual attainment of target practices was often taken for granted.

However, some L2 socialization studies focus less on the particular activity settings and more on the sociolinguistic dispositions and forms to be mastered, such as those entailed in showing respect to one's elders (Howard, 2008) or politeness and empathy (Cook, 2008a, 2008b). As in much other ethnographic research, participants' own (or *emic*) perspectives on socialization processes are often generated with researchers through interviews, if interviewees have the ability to engage in metalinguistic reflections. Exceptions to typical instances of socialization toward desired goals are also important to note.

Although these methodological principles are commonly acknowledged as being hallmarks of language socialization, some concerns have been raised about the orientation of earlier (L1) studies in this tradition. Articulated most clearly by scholars of L2 socialization (e.g., Bayley & Schecter, 2003a; Duff, 2003; He, 2003a, 2003b; Schecter & Bayley, 2004), the concerns include a prevailing focus on socializing processes that take place in comparatively homogeneous, monolingual contexts; on the socialization of young children by parents and caregivers; on successful cases of language socialization; and on socialization through face-to-face interaction. Such empirical foci have resulted, Schecter and Bayley argued, in a "more restricted . . . [and] deterministic" (p. 620) conception of language socialization, one that is "static, bounded and relatively unidirectional" (p. 605). Because of the emphasis on how experts socialize novices, He (2003b) has maintained that "the process of socialization [is] often characterized as smooth and seamless, [with] novices . . . presumed to be passive, ready, and uniform recipients of socialization" (p. 128). Consequently, the categories of "novice" and "expert" have been reified and power relations obscured, it has been argued, as have the fundamentally contested and contingent character of socializing processes, the agency

of novices, and how experts themselves are socialized through participation in socializing interactions. Additional concerns include the comparative neglect of the socialization of older youth and adults, socialization in more heterogeneous, multilingual, and transnational contexts, and the multiple modalities through which language socialization can occur, including computer-mediated communication, academic discourses, and popular media. Such problematics have resulted in a call for a "dynamic model" of language socialization (Bayley & Schecter, 2003a), one which works to complicate and go beyond "the limitations of more static models of language socialization" (Schecter & Bayley, 2004, p. 611) by focusing on power, contingency, and multidirectionality in socializing processes, socialization across the lifespan, and "the complexities of language socialization in bilingual and multilingual settings" (p. 606).

The implications of these critiques are significant. First, they entail an expansion in the scope of study for language socialization research in terms of populations (from children to include youth and adults), settings (from monolingual to bi- and multilingual settings; from naturalistic home and community settings to school and workplace contexts), empirical focus (from successful socialization to cases of unsuccessful or unexpected socialization), and modality (from face-to-face interaction to multiple modalities). Second, methodologically, such critiques imply a need to broaden the range of options for conducting language socialization research, from long-term ethnographically based accounts of a community's language and other social practices, derived from analysis of observational fieldnotes, site artifacts, and audio- and/or video-recordings, to potentially shorter-term research engagements, smaller data sets, data generated primarily or even exclusively from interviews (i.e., participant reports of socialization experiences), and, thus, little or perhaps even no direct firsthand ethnographic fieldwork in the community whose practices are under investigation.

It should come as no surprise that the critiques enumerated above, and their implications for language socialization research, have themselves engendered critical response. One form of response has been to reject the underlying premises of these critiques. Garrett (2004), for example, disputed the contention that language socialization has neglected power, learner agency, bi-directionality, and socialization across the lifespan. Talmy (2008, pp. 620–621) argued that the call for a "dynamic model" of language socialization, while superficially "compelling," was in fact "unwarranted" because language socialization's analytic framework not only "allows . . . analyses to be grounded in ways unavailable to other [sociological and anthropological] models of socialization" but also provides "the means to demonstrate the fundamental contingency and multidirectionality of socialization as it is—or is not—collaboratively achieved" (p. 620).

A second form of response to the above-mentioned critiques is an apparent effort to secure the boundaries of what constitutes "genuine" language socialization research. Such an effort is evident in Baquedano-López and Kattan (2008), who distinguished two different approaches to language socialization research: (1) as a "theoretical and methodological paradigm," which holds true to principles

enumerated by, for example, Schieffelin and Ochs (1986a) and Kulick and Schieffelin (2004); and (2) as a "theme of study," which includes studies in which the above critiques were raised. Bronson and Watson-Gegeo (2008), too, suggested an informal four-part taxonomy to describe the differing degrees to which language socialization research conforms to the paradigmatic principles put forth by its originators. Similar to Baquedano-López and Kattan's "theme of study," they asserted that *language socialization as topic* "is often based on relatively thin data sets, perhaps interviews and a few examples without intensive analysis of primary discourse data in a longitudinal frame" (Bronson & Watson-Gegeo, p. 48). In contrast, their *language socialization as method* is research that:

> adhere[s] to the highest standards, including full-blown longitudinal ethnographic research and discourse analyses of relevant data. Well-designed language socialization research must embody design and methods that are congruent with the theoretical and philosophical underpinnings of the tradition in order to count as genuine contributions. A high degree of transparency about the nature of the context, participants, setting, data, and analysis is essential. Methods may be eclectic . . . [However, t]o achieve what we might call a "gold standard" for design and methodological rigor . . . certain characteristics and strategies are essential.
>
> (p. 48)

On the one hand, these sorts of "intra-paradigmatic" debates attest to the theoretical and methodological development and expansion of language socialization since its original articulation by Schieffelin and Ochs (e.g., 1986a), and point to its viability as an approach to investigating the complex set of phenomena that has been glossed as "L2 learning." On the other hand, attempts to define "genuine" language socialization, calls for "gold standards," mention of a language socialization "canon" (Bronson & Watson-Gegeo, 2008, p. 48), and methodological prescriptions for conducting research may perhaps be premature and overly restrictive. Certainly, to qualify as "language socialization," research ought (ideally) to be ethnographic, document changes in language and other social practices, explain development in terms of socialization, and involve close analysis of a rich primary data record derived from participant observation, documents, and audio- and/or video-recordings, among other methods. Further, research that relies on data generated in interviews in language socialization (or any other approach to investigating SLA, either alternative or cognitivist), should have an adequately conceptualized theory of interview, that is, as a speech event into and through which interlocutors are socialized and positioned, and through which "content" is co-constructed. However, our concern with the unequivocal demarcation of paradigmatic boundaries, at least at this point in the "second wave" of language socialization's development, is that it could foreclose potentially important avenues and methods of inquiry in the future, thus delimiting investigation into the diverse, variable, and ever-changing means and social practices that novices/newcomers

and experts/old-timers may be socialized through and into. Thus, in certain respects (and somewhat ironically), the debates about the need to secure language socialization's paradigmatic boundaries resemble the dispute that arose in the mid-1990s among proponents of cognitivist SLA with those of alternative approaches (see, e.g., Block, 1996; Firth & Wagner, 1997; Kasper, 1997; Long, 1997), when the former decried the proliferation of sociocultural approaches to L2 learning (including language socialization). One implication of these critiques in L2 socialization research, as a particular orientation to SLA research, is that cognitivist SLA, too, would do well to include more critical reflection on its paradigmatic assumptions, epistemology, favored approaches to research, methods of data analysis, and the claims about SLA that are generated on the basis of these.

Supporting Findings

We emphasize that the goals of cognitivist SLA and L2 socialization research overlap in important ways, but are by no means the same. Therefore, the findings that support L2 socialization research might not be considered adequate as evidence of SLA, particularly if the focus of SLA is primarily on linguistic forms. Although both L2 socialization and cognitivist SLA deal with language learning and language learners, and both ideally are concerned with learners' development and increasing participation in social life, in L2 socialization, what is learned is much more than aspects of a linguistic code (e.g., grammar). Furthermore, much SLA research looks at "learning" in the short term—over the negotiations for meaning in a single task-based interaction session, for example, or over a two-week period; there are relatively few studies of the lasting effects of instructional or interactional interventions on particular linguistic forms or functions (Lightbown & Spada, 2006). In addition, unlike cognitivist SLA research, the focus in language socialization tends to be the *group* or *community* and a set of communal practices more than the individual, though focal case study participants are frequently very helpful at illustrating language acquisition and socialization processes (Duff, 2008).

One of the criticisms of L2 socialization research from cognitivist SLA researchers—and one that is justified to some extent—is that it tends to focus more on the macro/sociological than micro/linguistic aspects of language development, even when there is fine-grained analysis of discourse. A macro perspective permits an examination of the linguistic affordances of speech events or situations and not only what is said or done at the micro level. Alternatively, the critique focuses on the privileging of personal experience—the emic perspective—over etic analysis (by the researcher) of attested language capabilities. Ellis (2009), for example, while observing that some of the most robust findings in L2 socialization research to date have been in the area of L2 pragmatics, suggested that a "narrower, more linguistic focus . . . will make language socialization theory relevant to [cognitivist] SLA" (p. 335), and that "ideally, language socialization theory needs to marry a broad scope of explanation with a narrow, linguistic focus" (p. 335). Although perhaps in the minority, detailed analyses of this sort do exist. One such example is Cook's

(2008b) longitudinal analysis of the acquisition of *-masu/-desu* versus unmarked verb endings by learners of L2 Japanese in Japan, which Cook contextualized within a wider cultural and sociolinguistic framework.

While Ellis's (2009) observation may have merit, the influence of broader macro-social and cultural processes should not be underestimated in either cognitivist SLA or language socialization. After all, current mainstream SLA theory holds that opportunities for appropriate input/intake, interaction, and output, plus feedback of particular types, are indispensable for SLA. Therefore, if students' access to meaningful input is blocked or if they are provided insufficient or inhospitable opportunities to interact in significant ways, their language production will also be curtailed and their learning goals (plus their sense of themselves as people whose learning is valued and supported) will likely be negatively influenced. A common consequence, studied too seldom in SLA, is attrition in language learning programs and the reasons underlying the termination of students' L2 study.

Indeed, the advantage of a longitudinal approach that permits tracking students' learning trajectories is clear. If students learn prescribed linguistic forms in the first month of their coursework but end up dropping out of their classes because they feel neglected or discriminated against (to use extreme cases), their short-term successes will have little meaning. A similar point was made by Atkinson (2003) when he described Indian students' "socialization and dys-socialization" in a South Indian college context where English was the medium of instruction. By dys-socialization, he meant that "some students appear[ed] to be developing and having reinforced social identities that militate[d] *against* the acquisition of English" (p. 148). The disadvantaged students in that context were lower caste, lower socio-economic background, first-generation male college students who did not come from English-speaking backgrounds and who had had little prior instruction in English, in contrast to their wealthier, more cosmopolitan, and more English-proficient classmates. However, the practices of the disadvantaged students—not bringing or having their English textbooks, sleeping or chatting in class, their seating position (at the back), and other forms of "resistance"—were in no way helping them acquire the valued standard English proficiency and academic skills necessary for their longer-term academic success and upward social mobility.

Talmy (2008, 2009) observed a similar phenomenon in secondary ESL classrooms in Hawai'i, with students who had been in the state for several years already but continued to be positioned as recently arrived immigrants with little competence in English. Norton (2000), too, observed that motivation and good will on the part of her immigrant language learners were not enough to ensure that they would be able to engage with English speakers in society in a manner that would facilitate further learning.

Ortega's (2009) brief overview of language socialization in her SLA textbook identified the constructs of *access* and *participation* as being at the core of language socialization studies as well as other alternative approaches (e.g., Norton, 2000; Norton & McKinney, this volume; Wenger, 1998). Ortega cited Morita's (2004) study of Japanese women studying at a Canadian university to support the notion

that, if learners are positioned in disadvantageous ways and thereby silenced by their interlocutors (e.g., instructors, peers), either knowingly or unknowingly, the students' opportunities for learning, participating in classroom discourse, and feeling like they are legitimate speakers may also be stifled. Abdi (2009) reported on this phenomenon in her Canadian high school study of learners of L2 Spanish from various ethnolinguistic backgrounds, including Spanish-speaking backgrounds in Latin America. The Anglophone Spanish teacher assumed that certain students were not from Spanish-speaking homes, when in fact they were, thereby denying them—but giving others—opportunities to display their Spanish skills prominently in class and to be conferred the status of proficient Spanish speakers. Some students' opportunities for SLA were inadvertently impacted in other ways as well, based on something as seemingly mundane as the seating plan (cf. Toohey, 1998). For example, when one (heritage-language) Grade 9 student who had previously been an enthusiastic classroom participant was assigned to sit with several Grade 12 students, she was effectively silenced because her new group members positioned her as immature and not a valued peer. Her opportunities for learning and using Spanish, or for socializing others into Spanish language practices, were therefore reduced. Thus, studies of the social conditions of learning and local classroom cultures can have a great bearing on students' global possibilities for SLA, as well as their academic advancement and affective states, even if the details of, say, their L2 morphological development, question formation, or word order are not systematically tracked. If students are made to feel like outsiders and illegitimate users of a language, their prospects for longer-term language learning success are compromised (Duff, in press-b; Toohey, 1998).

Access and participation are, to be sure, key components of language socialization and optimal SLA, particularly within a community of practice perspective (Lave & Wenger, 1991). However, language socialization entails much more: It is not only concerned with the affordances of particular language learning contexts or participation frameworks, but also with the social, cultural, pragmatic, and other meanings that come bundled with language and various interactional routines and activities. Thus, the meanings conveyed by the linguistic and nonlinguistic forms that students encounter in SLA, the textbooks used, the prevailing ideologies of learning and using language, plus the identities made available to learners and whether they are taken up or contested are all important aspects of L2 socialization, and clearly extend far beyond the acquisition of linguistic forms and their meanings. The systematic "error" correction reported by Friedman (2010) in the national language classrooms she studied in Ukraine, for example, did not represent random phonological or lexical deviations from the "pure" Ukrainian sought by—and actively socialized by—the teacher; rather, the forms that got corrected were phonologically or lexically Russian in origin, though often quite similar to the corresponding Ukrainian words. However, the Russian forms betrayed colonial (Russian-dominant) ideologies of nation, based on the Russian language that teachers were trying to eradicate in the post-Soviet era. Error correction itself was therefore a significant form of language socialization, revitalization, and nation rebuilding.

A number of publications on L2 Japanese pragmatic and grammatical development (e.g., Ohta, 1994, 2001) have looked more systematically at L2 development in relation to socialization. In general, the studies demonstrate how learners of Japanese are socialized to be *empathetic* listeners and members of society, able to use linguistic resources (e.g., sentence-final particles) that display their affective engagements appropriately. Relevant studies include those in the 1999 special issue of the *Journal of Pragmatics* (Kanagy, 1999), with a set of articles on L1 and L2 socialization in Japanese, plus Cook's (2008a) review of this and related research, including her own on L2 socialization in Japanese, as well as earlier work by Siegal (1994, 1996) on Western women learning Japanese. These studies offer insights into how Japanese experts mentor novices into the language and culture, as seen in the novices' growing proficiency with various kinds of sentence particles (e.g., *ne*, *no*), tag questions (*deshoo*), and other constructions. Ohta's (1999) year-long study of multiple lessons taught by the same four teachers examined socialization into Japanese-specific "interactional style." She described how the process of acquisition (through socialization) requires that novices become more aware of the function of the target routines they are learning, then understand what resources are available to enact the routines and the social roles involved, and, finally, extend them to an ever wider range of contexts. In particular, Ohta examined the discursive and affective alignments between listeners and speakers through verbal assessments, equivalent to expressions of concern or empathy, such as *Wow, that's too bad*, especially those using the Japanese utterance-final particle *ne*. Using data from one of her participants at four points in time, Ohta illustrated how the participant, with support from the modeling of assessments by the teacher, became increasingly adept at such expressions of alignment/assessment herself. In the same special issue, Yoshimi (1999) studied *ne* and its role in creating harmony, cooperation, and rapport between speaker and listener. As a set, studies of this sort demonstrate that studying morphology without also capturing its social role in interactional contexts to index affective stances and relationships is inadequate in SLA. Furthermore, by examining interactional routines, L2 socialization goes beyond the morpheme/particle, word, phrase, or clause level and deals with pragmatics within a larger interpersonal discourse context.

In a number of studies, He (2000, 2003a, 2003b, 2004, 2008) has examined Chinese-American children's socialization into Chinese as a heritage language in the United States. Her focus has included different forms and functions of teachers' directives to students, their use of modal auxiliaries, the use of pronouns such as *women* (we/us) and *tamen* (they/them) to index in-group ("we/Chinese") versus out-group ("they/Americans") membership and identities, and the kinds of interactional roles or participation statuses that are attributed to the students by the teacher. Although He didn't track students' use of these same constructions over time, she did analyze the cultural foundations for the teachers' behaviors and sometimes the students' subversive responses. She also inferred from the classroom observations and discourse analysis that students would eventually internalize teachers' messages.

In L2 English contexts, SLA-oriented language socialization research has examined learners' development over time as well. Li (2000) observed how the requesting behaviors of the adult immigrant women participating in her study became increasingly target-like on the basis of their growing confidence and exposure to appropriate L2 forms in class and at work. In a high school context, Huang (2004) observed changes in ESL students' use of definitions, nominalization, and generic nouns over time in their science class, and Duff (1995) noted how students learned to correct one another's L2 English mistakes—and eventually to correct their teachers' mistakes as well. Finally, Kobayashi's research (e.g., 2003, 2004; Duff & Kobayashi, 2010) revealed how, in one program context, Japanese exchange students in Canada learned to socialize one another, with the assistance of modeling and preparation by their teacher, in their joint planning of oral group presentations. Kobayashi tracked students' use of their L1 (Japanese) to mediate their cognitive and linguistic planning, focusing on how they prepared their oral presentations, including helping each other to correct mistakes. He also examined some of the interactional routines and strategies used by the students, such as displaying mock gratitude to their teacher during a presentation (e.g., to make the veiled complaint: "We really appreciate [the teacher] giving us such a good opportunity [forcing us to work together]"). By following up on their performance, Kobayashi could determine whether the students repeated utterances they had carefully co-constructed days earlier and refined grammatically. These forms had not been taught by the teacher but were elicited and negotiated by the students in their group meetings. However, studies such as this one and many others on L2 socialization, apart from the Japanese studies and Li's aforementioned research, have not typically focused on the development of just one type of grammatical or pragmatic construction (e.g., a particular adjective, relative clause, morpheme, or type of request). Rather, they have looked at the development of growing grammatical and pragmatic sensitivity and performance through social interaction, negotiation, and in some cases explicit instruction and correction across a range of linguistic areas.

Differences vis-à-vis Other Alternative Approaches to SLA

The similarities that a language socialization approach to SLA shares with the other approaches presented in this volume are perhaps as important as the differences. In this section we briefly consider both similarities and differences between language socialization and conversation analysis (CA), identity and power, complexity theory, neo-Vygotskyan sociocultural theory, and sociocognitive and ecological theories of learning.

CA-SLA

CA (see Kasper & Wagner, this volume) has had substantive influences on theory and methodology in language socialization (e.g., Schieffelin & Ochs, 1986a, 1996).

Language socialization in part traces its "roots" (Garrett & Baquedano-López, 2002, p. 343) to CA's intellectual forebear, ethnomethodology, specifically the ethnomethodological interest in people's sense-making practices in everyday social life. Methodologically, CA has contributed to language socialization's powerful analytic framework, providing access to socializing processes in situ, and "to the ways in which social relations (including caregiver–child and novice–expert relations) are maintained, contested, and transformed across a variety of socializing interactions" (p. 342). That said, language socialization researchers employ CA to varying extents, and some not at all, preferring discourse analysis or the ethnography of communication instead (Duff, 2007).

Language socialization differs most substantively from CA in terms of its in-built *theory of learning*: The former has been developed specifically to document and explain (a lack of) change in and the (non)development of linguistic, cultural, and communicative competence over time. In contrast, as Kasper (2009) noted, CA's "object of study, in the broadest sense, is the interactional competencies of social members, specifically their sense-making practices and their methods to establish and maintain social order in their activities" (p. 11). It is because CA does not have its own (endogenous) theory of learning that scholars in CA-SLA have, in the past, turned to sociocultural theory (e.g., Mondada & Pekarek-Doehler, 2004), situated learning (e.g., Hellermann, 2008), and language socialization (e.g., He, 2003a, 2004) for (exogenous) theories of learning for their studies, although calls are increasing (e.g., Kasper, 2009; Markee & Seo, 2009) for a move to discursive psychology (Edwards & Potter, 1992, 2005) as a more compatible theoretical alternative for conversation-analytic studies of SLA.

Identity and Power

As described above, social identity has long been a central consideration in language socialization. The same has become true more recently in SLA based on other social approaches (see Norton & McKinney, this volume). Whereas identity studies in SLA have strong roots in poststructuralist feminist theory, the centrality of identity in language socialization can be traced more to its practice-oriented theoretical framework (e.g., Bourdieu, 1977; Giddens, 1979), its four-dimensional conceptualization of "social context" (as consisting of social identities, social acts, social activities, and affective and epistemic stances), and what Ochs (1996) called the Indexicality Principle, whereby "*indexical meanings* (e.g., temporal, spatial, social identity, social act, social activity, affective or epistemic meanings)" are assigned "to particular [linguistic] forms (e.g., interrogative forms, diminutive affixes, raised pitch, and the like)" (p. 410, italics in original). Simply put, participation in socializing interactions fundamentally implicates identity, as individuals accommodate, resist, subvert, and/or transform the acts, stances, and activities that constitute particular social identities/identity categories.

Power, too, is an inherent focus of language socialization, critiques such as those enumerated above (e.g., Bayley & Schecter, 2003a) notwithstanding. It is most

clearly evident in the related concepts of *contingency*, that is, the basically unpredictable nature of socializing processes, and *multidirectionality*, or the consequences of socialization, not only on those being socialized, but on those doing the socializing (see Schieffelin & Ochs, 1986b, p. 165; see also Duff, 2002; Talmy, 2008). That is, power here is not a fixed or assured attribute of those who are older, more experienced, and so on, but can also be demonstrated by novices who contest practices or demonstrate expertise or understanding lacking in their mentors. However, power has not always been as prominently featured in language socialization research, especially in earlier "first generation" studies. As Kulick and Schieffelin argued:

> That the majority of language socialization studies have focused on [cultural and social] reproduction is a strength—they provide us with methodological and analytical tools for investigating and interpreting . . . continuity across generations. But the focus on expected and predictable outcomes is a weakness if there is not also an examination of cases in which socialization doesn't occur, or where it occurs in ways that are not expected or desired. To the extent that [language socialization] studies only document the acquisition of normatively sanctioned practices, they open themselves up to the charge that they are merely behaviorism in new clothes.
>
> (2004, p. 355)

Implicit in this comment is a recognition that power, agency, contestation, and resistance, and, by extension, the contingent and bi- or multidirectional character of socializing processes, need foregrounding in language socialization research, lest the image emerge that cultural and social reproduction is inevitable. Talmy (2008) has argued that the comparative lack of attention to these topics in especially "first generation" studies of language socialization:

> appears to come down to at least some combination of empirical focus . . . (e.g., highlighting processes involved when L1 socialization is achieved) and historical moment (i.e., establishing and elaborating the [language socialization] paradigm) . . . rather than some problem endemic to [language socialization] itself.
>
> (pp. 622–623)

Although there is a great deal that language socialization research shares with studies that highlight identity and power in L2 learning, it also departs from them in significant ways. Once again, it is distinguished most clearly by its theory of learning. It also differs in terms of its clear methodological specifications, particularly those concerning longitudinality, an ethnographic orientation, and the detailed analysis of the language and other social practices that are the learning object in language socialization. Although these may be implied in accounts of identity in language learning, often the latter's empirical approach involves retrospection

on the part of learners about their experiences in accounts generated in interviews, for example, or written in journals, with little direct, on-the-ground evidence of how identity is negotiated or the L2 learned in specific interactions, with particular interlocutors, in actual settings, as is typically the case in language socialization. Finally, most of the current work on language, identity, and power comes from sociology (with some significant earlier work coming out of the sociology of language and sociolinguistics), whereas language socialization originates from linguistic anthropology.

Complexity Theory

Complexity theory is still so new in empirical investigations of SLA that it remains unclear what its typical methodological approach or linguistic focus will be. To date, at least to us, the approach represents more a philosophical and metaphorical framework than a sustained and systematic empirical approach to tracking SLA, although the science it is based on has a firm empirical basis.

Sociocultural, Sociocognitive, and Ecological Approaches

As we pointed out earlier and elsewhere (e.g., Duff, 2007), language socialization has much in common with neo-Vygotskian sociocultural theory and related sociocognitive and ecological accounts of learning (e.g., Atkinson, this volume; Lantolf, this volume). These approaches all have a social, interactional, and cognitive orientation to language learning. They also share an appreciation for the importance of culturally organized activities (or tasks) and interactional routines as a locus for meaning-making and learning. Finally, they all acknowledge the key role played by more proficient interlocutors, peers, caregivers, or teachers in helping novices/newcomers reach their potential by means of scaffolding or guided assistance. Learning, knowledge, and socialization—that is, the development of the human mind—are seen to be processes that are distributed across many co-participants or members in a community and that have historical antecedents.

However, language socialization differs from these approaches in important ways. These differences include the use in language socialization of anthropological methods, as well as its orientation to *enculturation*—i.e., not the accumulation of linguistic knowledge or communicative competence alone. Thus, whereas many recent social accounts of language acquisition conceive of it as the intersection of *social* and *cognitive* processes, often giving a privileged status to the linguistic forms that are acquired by learners in the context of social interaction, language socialization places a greater premium on the *social* and the *cultural* in psychological experience, including language learning. Also, much current language socialization research is distinctive in its focus on how learners can also be agents of socialization for those who are presumed to have greater expertise than they do, and that they can resist socialization or be highly selective in their own or others' socialization.

Additionally, language socialization research and theory has long been interested in both the language and literacy practices of novice or junior members of society and those of experts, as well as development across the lifespan as people encounter new forms of language and literacy use. It is only recently that SLA has become more interested in the relationship between literacy and oral language development (Tarone & Bigelow, 2009) and in the language learning of people with advanced levels of proficiency (Ortega & Byrnes, 2008). Furthermore, as mentioned earlier, L2 socialization research often looks simultaneously at the socialization of L1, L2, and multilingual learners in situations of language contact (e.g., Moore, 2008). The monolingual bias that is sometimes critiqued as part of SLA is often addressed in L2 socialization by attempts to capture the rich (often multilingual and multimodal) diversity of learners' semiotic repertoires, identities, and social engagements mediated through language.

Future Directions

If the past is any indication, the future of L2 socialization research holds tremendous promise. As the second wave of language socialization gives way to the third, we anticipate that its already impressive catalogue of research will yield even greater insights into the complex phenomenon that is typically referred to as L2 learning. In order to do so, we expect that future studies will move beyond past and current foci to include:

- more in-depth analysis of language capabilities and how they evolve over time;
- a wider range of target languages and language practices;
- greater attention to L1, L2, L3, etc. socialization in bilingual and multilingual settings;
- increased consideration of the essential unpredictability, contestedness, and fluidity of socialization, as it is or is not achieved, in ways anticipated or not;
- more investigation into the multiple and ever-changing modalities through which L2 socialization does (or does not) occur, including computer-mediated socialization through social networking sites, synchronous and asynchronous chat/texting, online gaming, and "simulated" environments such as *Second Life*;
- more sustained examination of language socialization in workplace and institutional settings in the current era of globalization, transmigration, and internationalization.

As the various alternative approaches to SLA, including language socialization, continue to evolve and perhaps cross-fertilize, SLA will be enriched by more deeply and broadly contextualized studies of contemporary linguistic and cultural development and use across time, space, and language communities. We have tried to indicate the distinctive contribution of second language socialization to this larger project here.

Notes

1 For historical overviews of language socialization, see, for example, Garrett and Baquedano-López (2002), Ochs and Schieffelin (2008), and Watson-Gegeo and Nielsen (2003).
2 See Garrett and Baquedano-López (2002) and chapters in Duff and Hornberger (2008) for more detailed discussion on theories informing language socialization.

References

Abdi, K. (2009). *Spanish heritage language learners in Canadian high school Spanish classes: Negotiating ethnolinguistic identities and ideologies*. Unpublished master's thesis, University of British Columbia.

Atkinson, D. (2003). Language socialization and dys-socialization in a South Indian college. In R. Bayley & S. Schecter (Eds.), *Language socialization in bilingual and multilingual societies* (pp. 147–162). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Bakhtin, M. (1981). *The dialogic imagination: Four essays by M. M. Bakhtin* (M. E. Holquist, Ed.; C. Emerson & M. Holquist, Trans.). Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.

Bamberg, M. (2000). Critical personalism, language and development. *Theory & Psychology*, *10*, 749–767.

Baquedano-López, P., & Kattan, S. (2008). Language socialization and schooling. In P. A. Duff & N. H. Hornberger (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of language and education, Vol. 8: Language socialization* (pp. 161–173). New York: Springer.

Batstone, R. (Ed.). (2010). *Sociocognitive perspectives on language use and language learning*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bayley, R., & Schecter, S. R. (2003a). Introduction: Toward a dynamic model of language socialization. In R. Bayley & S. R. Schecter (Eds.), *Language socialization in bilingual and multilingual societies* (pp. 1–6). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Bayley, R., & Schecter, S. R. (Eds.). (2003b). *Language socialization in bilingual and multilingual societies*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Bernstein, D. (1972). Social class, language and socialization. In P. P. Giglioli (Ed.), *Language and social context* (pp. 173–178). New York: Penguin Books.

Block, D. (1996). Not so fast: Some thoughts on theory culling, relativism, accepted findings and the heart and soul of SLA. *Applied Linguistics*, *17*, 63–83.

Bourdieu, P. (1977). *Outline of a theory of practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bourdieu, P. (1991). *Language and symbolic power* (G. Raymond & M. Adamson, Trans.). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Bronson, M., & Watson-Gegeo, K. (2008). The critical moment: Language socialization and the (re)visioning of first and second language learning. In P. Duff & N. H. Hornberger (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of language and education, Vol. 8: Language socialization* (pp. 43–55). New York: Springer.

Cook, H. M. (2008a). Language socialization in Japanese. In P. A. Duff & N. H. Hornberger (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of language and education, Vol. 8: Language socialization* (pp. 313–326). New York: Springer.

Cook, H. M. (2008b). *Socializing identities through speech style: Learners of Japanese as a foreign language*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Duff, P. A. (1995). An ethnography of communication in immersion classrooms in Hungary. *TESOL Quarterly*, *29*, 505–537.

Duff, P. A. (1996). Different languages, different practices: Socialization of discourse competence in dual-language school classrooms in Hungary. In K. Bailey & D. Nunan

(Eds.), *Voices from the language classroom: Qualitative research in second language acquisition* (pp. 407–433). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Duff, P. A. (2002). The discursive co-construction of knowledge, identity, and difference: An ethnography of communication in the high school mainstream. *Applied Linguistics*, *23*, 289–322.

Duff, P. A. (2003). New directions in second language socialization research. *Korean Journal of English Language and Linguistics*, *3*, 309–339.

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

Duff, P. A. (2008). *Case study research in applied linguistics*. New York: Erlbaum/Taylor & Francis.

Duff, P. A. (in press-a). Second language socialization. In A. Duranti, E. Ochs, & B.B. Schieffelin (Eds.), *Handbook of language socialization*. New York: Blackwell.

Duff, P. A. (in press-b). Identity, agency, and SLA. In S. M. Gass & A. Mackey (Eds.), *Handbook of second language acquisition*. London: Routledge.

Duff, P. A., & Hornberger, N. H. (Eds.). (2008). *Encyclopedia of language and education, Vol. 8: Language socialization*. New York: Springer.

Duff, P. A., & Kobayashi, M. (2010). The intersection of social, cognitive, and cultural processes in language learning: A second language socialization approach. In R. Batstone (Ed.), *Sociocognitive perspectives on language use and language learning* (pp. 75–93). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Duranti, A., Ochs, E., & Schieffelin, B. B. (in press). *Handbook of language socialization*. Malden, MA: Wiley Blackwell.

Edwards, D., & Potter, J. (1992). *Discursive psychology*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Edwards, D., & Potter, J. (2005). Discursive psychology, mental states, and description. In H. te Molder & J. Potter (Eds.), *Conversation and cognition* (pp. 241–259). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ellis, R. (2009). *The study of second language acquisition* (2nd ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Engestrom, Y. (1999). Activity theory and individual and social transformation. In Y. Engestrom, R. Miettinen, & R. L. Punamaki (Eds.), *Perspectives on activity theory* (pp. 19–38). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Firth, A., & Wagner, J. (1997). On discourse, communication, and (some) fundamental concepts in SLA research. *Modern Language Journal*, *81*, 285–300.

Friedman, D. (2010). Speaking correctly: Error correction as a language socialization practice in a Ukrainian classroom. *Applied Linguistics*, *30*, 346–367.

Garrett, P. B. (2004). Review of Bayley & Schecter, 2003. *Language in Society*, *33*, 776–779.

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, Vol. 10: Research methods* (pp. 189–201). New York: Springer.

Garrett, P. B., & 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*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Giddens, A. (1984). *The constitution of society*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Halliday, M. (1980/2003). Three aspects of children's language development: Learning language, learning through language, learning about language. Reprinted in J. Webster (Ed.), *The language of early childhood* (pp. 308–326). London: Continuum.

Hanks, W. (1992). The indexical ground of deictic reference. In A. Duranti & C. Goodwin (Eds.), *Rethinking context* (pp. 46–76). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

He, A. W. (2000). The grammatical and interactional organization of teachers' directives: Implications for socialization of Chinese American children. *Linguistics & Education*, *11*, 119–40.

He, A. W. (2003a). Linguistic anthropology and language education: A comparative look at language socialization. In S. Wortham & B. Rymes (Eds.), *Linguistic anthropology of education* (pp. 93–120). Westport, CT: Praeger.

He, A. W. (2003b). Novices and their speech roles in Chinese heritage language classes. In R. Bayley & S. R. Schecter (Eds.), *Language socialization in bilingual and multilingual societies* (pp. 128–146). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

He, A. W. (2004). CA for SLA: Arguments from the Chinese language classroom. *Modern Language Journal*, *88*, 568–582.

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. 201–213). New York: Springer.

Heath, S. B. (1983). *Ways with words: Language, life, and work in communities and classrooms*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hellermann, J. (2008). *Social actions for classroom language learning*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Howard, K. M. (2008). Language socialization and language shift among school-aged children. In P. A. Duff & N. H. Hornberger (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of language and education, Vol. 8: Language socialization* (pp. 187–199). New York: Springer.

Huang, J. (2004). Socialising ESL students into the discourse of school science through academic writing. *Language & Education*, *18*, 97–123.

Hymes, D. (1972). On communicative competence. In J. B. Pride & J. Holmes (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics: Selected readings* (pp. 269–293). Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Kanagy, R. (Ed.). (1999). Language socialization of affect in first and second language acquisition [Special issue]. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *31*(11).

Kasper, G. (1997). "A" stands for acquisition: A response to Firth and Wagner. *Modern Language Journal*, *81*, 307–312.

Kasper, G. (2009). Locating cognition in second language interaction and learning: Inside the skull or in public view? *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, *47*, 11–36.

Kobayashi, M. (2003). The role of peer support in ESL students' accomplishment of oral academic tasks. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, *59*, 337–368.

Kobayashi, M. (2004). *A sociocultural study of second language tasks: Activity, agency, and language socialization*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of British Columbia.

Korobov, N., & Bamberg, M. (2004). Positioning a "mature" self in interactive practices: How adolescent males negotiate "physical attraction" in group talk. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, *22*, 471–492.

Kramsch, C., & Steffensen, S. V. (2008). Ecological perspectives on second language acquisition and socialization. In P. A. Duff & N. H. Hornberger (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of language and education, Vol 8: Language socialization* (pp. 17–28). New York: Springer.

Kulick, D., & Schieffelin, B. (2004). Language socialization. In A. Duranti (Ed.), *A companion to linguistic anthropology* (pp. 349–368). Malden, MA: Blackwell.

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

Leontiev, A. (1981). *Psychology and the language learning process*. London: Pergamon.

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.

Lightbown, P., & Spada, N. (2006). *How languages are learned* (3rd ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Long, M. (1997). Construct validity in SLA research: A response to Firth and Wagner. *Modern Language Journal*, *81*, 318–323.

Markee, N. P., & Seo, M. S. (2009). Learning talk analysis. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, *47*, 37–63.

Mitchell, R., & Myles, F. (2004). *Second language learning theories* (2nd ed.). London: Hodder Arnold.

Mondada, L., & Pekarek-Doehler, S. (2004). Second language acquisition as situated practice: Task accomplishment in the French second language classroom. *Modern Language Journal*, *88*, 501–518.

Moore, L. C. (2008). Language socialization and second/foreign language and multilingual education in non-Western settings. In P. A. Duff & N. H. Hornberger (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of language and education, Vol. 8: Language socialization* (pp. 175–185). New York: Springer.

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

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

Norton, B. (2000). *Identity and language learning: Gender, ethnicity, and educational change*. Harlow: Pearson Education.

Ochs, E. (1996). Linguistic resources for socializing humanity. In J. J. Gumperz & S. C. Levinson (Eds.), *Rethinking linguistic relativity* (pp. 407–437). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ochs, E., & Schieffelin, B. B. (2008). Language socialization: An historical overview. In P. A. Duff & N. H. Hornberger (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of language and education, Vol. 8: Language socialization* (pp. 3–15). New York: Springer.

Ohta, A. (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. (1999). Interactional routines and the socialization of interactional style in adult learners of Japanese. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *31*, 1493–1512.

Ohta, A. (2001*). Second language acquisition process in the classroom: Learning Japanese*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Ortega, L. (2009). *Understanding second language acquisition*. London: Hodder Education.

Ortega, L., & Byrnes, H. (Eds.). (2008). *The longitudinal study of advanced L2 capacities*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum/Taylor & Francis.

Rogoff, B. (1995). Observing sociocultural activity on three planes: Participatory appropriation, guided participation, and apprenticeship. In J. V. Wertsch, P. D. Rio, & A. Alvarez (Eds.), *Sociocultural studies of mind* (pp. 139–164). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Rogoff, B. (2003). *The cultural nature of human development*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Schecter, S. R., & Bayley, R. (2004). Language socialization in theory and practice. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, *17*, 605–625.

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

Schieffelin, B. B., & Ochs, E. (1986b). Language socialization. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, *15*, 163–191.

Schieffelin, B. B., & Ochs, E. (1996). The microgenesis of competence: Methodology in language socialization. In D. Slobin, J. Gerhardt, A. Kyratzis, & J. Guo (Eds.), *Social interaction, social context, and language* (pp. 251–263). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Siegal, M. (1994). *Looking East: Learning Japanese as a second language in Japan and the interaction of race, gender and social context*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of California, Berkeley.

Siegal, M. (1996). The role of learner subjectivity in second language sociolinguistic competency: Western women learning Japanese. *Applied Linguistics*, *17*, 356–382.

Talmy, S. (2008). The cultural productions of ESL student at Tradewinds High: Contingency, multidirectionality, and identity in L2 socialization. *Applied Linguistics*, *29*, 619–644.

Talmy, S. (2009). A very important lesson: Respect and the socialization of order(s) in high school ESL. *Linguistics & Education*, *20*, 235–253.

Tarone, E., & Bigelow, M. (2009). *Literacy and second language oracy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Toohey, K. (1998). "Breaking them up, taking them away": Constructing ESL students in grade one. *TESOL Quarterly*, *32*, 61–84.

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

Vygotsky, L. (1978). *Mind in society*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Watson-Gegeo, K. (2004). Mind, language, and epistemology: Toward a language socialization paradigm for SLA. *Modern Language Journal*, *88*, 331–350.

Watson-Gegeo, K., & Nielsen, S. (2003). Language socialization in SLA. In C. Doughty & M. Long (Eds.), *Handbook of second language acquisition* (pp. 155–177). Malden, MA: Blackwell.

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

Williams, G. (2008). Language socialization: A systemic functional perspective. In P. A. Duff & N. H. Hornberger (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of language and education, Vol. 8: Language socialization* (pp. 57–70). New York: Springer.

Yoshimi, D. R. (1999). L1 language socialization as a variable in the use of *ne* by L2 learners of Japanese. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *31*, 1513–1525.