1. INTRODUCTION

The discussion that follows centers on the enterprise of conducting language socialization research. We consider practical and theoretical issues and tools that enhance description and analysis of communicative practices and their socialization within culturally organized speech communities. Our discussion outlines five goals of language socialization research. In so doing, we suggest a framework for comparative research on language socialization across communities.

A turning point in the history of research on the cultural organization of children's talk was a symposium on child discourse organized by Susan Ervin-Tripp and Claudia Mitchell-Kernan at the 1974 Meetings of the American Anthropological Association. Both authors of this paper participated, one as presenter (Ochs) and the other as a member of the audience (Schieffelin). The session stimulated at least two important outcomes: one, an enduring collaborative partnership between the co-authors of this chapter; and two, the volume, *Child Discourse* (Ervin-Tripp & Mitchell-Kernan, 1977), which was the first comprehensive appraisal of the complexity of children's discourse across speech communities and genres. This volume inspired a number of research projects that formed the basis for a second collection, *Developmental Pragmatics* (Ochs & Schieffelin, 1979). In the last fifteen years developmental pragmatics has become an important theoretical domain of inquiry, examining children's developing competence in the use of language within and across socially organized contexts. Ervin-Tripp's studies of children's competence in performance of speech acts, conversational turn-taking, and verbal activities more broadly (Ervin-Tripp, 1976, 1977, 1978, 1979, 1982) have been a model for many of us engaged in research on children's pragmatic competence (cf., Andersen, 1990; Clancy, 1986; Garvey, 1984; Iwamura, 1980; Keenan & Schieffelin, ...
In the discussion that follows we will detail five goals of language socialization research and methodological tools for achieving those goals.

2. GOALS OF LANGUAGE SOCIALIZATION RESEARCH

In the discussion that follows we will detail five goals of language socialization research and methodological tools for achieving those goals.

2.1. The organization of communicative practices

A basic goal of language socialization research is to articulate the organization of recurrent communicative practices of novice and expert members. These members routinely use a range of vocal and nonvocal semiotic modalities to convey and interpret messages including grammatical, lexical, discursive, and gestural structures.

To analyze the linguistic organization of speech activities language socialization researchers prefer not to use idealized accounts of talk or reports of ideological stance, nor do they rely on spot observations or randomly taken language samples without contextual notes. Instead, they examine in detail video/audio-taped naturally occurring social interaction organized as coherent practices or activities related to each other over time and across situations (Bourdieu, 1977, 1991; Leontiev, 1981). Electronical recording and analyzing both the details and cultural framing of such naturalistic dat distinguishes language socialization research from other socialization research based on hand recorded field notes of observations.

Video and audio taperecording with contextual notetaking allows the researcher to capture a continuous lengthy behavioral record of interactions involving young children and those with whom they regularly interact, including peers and more mature members. Continuous recording of interaction enables analyses of how novices become competent in recognizing shifts from one type of communicative context to another. A continuous detailed record provides a basis for establishing the extent to which children and older members utilize diverse linguistic and nonlinguistic structures to signal and interpret shifts in communicative act, activity, identity, affect, and knowledge of interlocutors (Goodwin, 1990; Ochs, 1990; Schieffelin & Schieffelin, 1984; Schieffelin, 1979; Watson-Gegeo & Gegeo, 1986). Such a record allows the researcher to illuminate not only how novices are socialized to develop communicative skills within a single language but also how they are socialized to draw on multiple codes to constitute shifts in communicative acts, activities, identities, and knowledge of interlocutors (Goodwin, 1990; Ochs, 1979a; Schieffelin, 1979; Watson-Gegeo & Gegeo, 1986). Continuous audio and video record also allows analysts to explore how novice interlocutors are socialized to use immediate and more distant interactional history to make sense of attitudes and ideas conveyed through talk and action.

If we want to understand ordinary, unremarkable, taken-for-granted everyday events from the perspectives of the participants, attention to the details of talk, including pause and overlaps, unintelligible utterances, is critical (Atkinson & Heritage, 1984; Schegloff & Jefferson, 1974). These details provide critical information about stance, actions, activities, and social identities of interlocutors as well as the cultural pattern of conversation and other discourse genres in diverse speech communities. We should not be fooled into thinking that ambiguity and indeterminacy disappear because we have captured interaction through electronic recording and detailed transcriptions. Ambiguity and indeterminacy are important social and communicative resources, necessary interlocutors and social life, and the best we can do is identify them as such when they occur. As Goffman (1976) reminds us, the laconicity of talk, what is not said, is cen-
interpretation and social conduct. We need to incorporate speakers' interpretations into our own linguistic and ethnographic accounts, including local theories of interpretation and intentionality (Duranti, 1993a, 1993b). Native speakers do not rely on the spoken word alone — neither should we.

An annotated transcript is an important theoretical and methodological component of language socialization research, and the first step in its creation is the integration of contextual notes with transcription of speech and nonvocal conduct (Ochs, 1979b; Schieffelin, 1990). Preparation of an annotated transcript, however, is neither a simple task nor a mechanical data collecting task, but is itself a deeply ethnographic process. Notation and translation require on-going discussions with native speakers about the cultural and linguistic details of the recorded events, culturally recognized types of speech activities and named discourse strategies, all of which contribute to the interpretation of conduct and speech (Goodwin, 1990).

Both participants in those events, for example, caregivers and older siblings and other members of the community are often excellent assistants in the transcription and annotation process in that they can identify speakers in multi-party talk, specify the history and ownership of objects involved, and convey their own interpretations and evaluations of the event itself. Re-listening with them provides a context for their opinions about the speech and conduct of novices and others, which in turn, are valuable sources for constructing analyses of local interpretive procedures and linguistic ideologies (Miller, Potts, Jung, Hoogstra, & Minta, 1990).

In Schieffelin's field research on language socialization of Kaluli children, meta-commentaries by members of the community who did not participate in the recorded interactions were especially critical in learning how features such as prosody, voice quality, affect-marked affixes and expressions and formulaic expressions convey affect and stance (Schieffelin, 1990). In Kaluli, requests for assistance, food, and other objects are usually in one of two modalities: an assertive, demanding modality or one based on appeal where the speaker hopes to get what is wanted by making the addressee “feel sorry” and comply. In Kaluli request sequences based on appeal, these metacommentaries revealed that children must demonstrate particular verbal competence to achieve the desired responses. They must select the appropriate set of linguistic resources, including expressive words to elicit compassion, vocatives to frame the request within a particular relationship based on sharing, and morphemes to mark affect such as intimacy and to intensify each repeated request. By selecting the appropriate affect-marked pronouns to elicit pity, particular syntactic constructions to put the agent in focus in addition to the use of a whining voice, which Kaluli call geset. Transcripts of situated speech plus elicited commentary on them thus provide important sources for examining and interpreting linguistic details of the interactions between experts and novices, including how they are organized to achieve particular social ends.

2.2. The Context of Situation

A second goal in language socialization research is to examine the context of situation (Malinowski, 1978) relevant to talk and nonvocal conduct. In coming to understand the context of situation as constructed by novice and expert members, the researcher asks questions such as: When do different utterance types and actions of novices and experts occur? How are these utterances and actions organized with respect to one another? How do novice and expert members use these structures to form coherent sequences, practices, acts, and/or activities (Crago, 1988; Duranti & Ochs, 1986; Ervin-Tripp, 1979; Heath, 1983; Michaels & Cazden, 1986; Miller et al., 1990)? What are the preferred and dispreferred, routine and unusual, participant roles in interactions involving novice and expert members (Goffman, 1979; Jacoby & Gonzales, 1991; Lave & Wenger, 1991; Phillips, 1983)? How is attention to the situation socialized (Ochs, 1979a; Rogoff, 1990)?

Features of the context of situation interact in nonrandom, that is, culturally coherent ways. Indeed, such syntagmatic relations are a crucial component of what novice members must come to master to successfully participate in social life (Ervin-Tripp, 1972). When particular contextual features routinely co-occur to create recognizable situations, the signaling of one contextual feature through language or other means may invoke other contextual features that usually accompany it. For example, in Kaluli communities, children must come to understand that when they use a particular type of vocative (ade), they not only signal a particular named relationship (siblingship), they also invoke a type of affect (sympathy) and social act (a request based on appeal). Requests for food are more frequently made by males to females, less often the reverse. This is consistent with Kaluli gender appropriate behaviors which vary according to recipient, activities, and developmental time, and language encodes these relevant factors. All Kaluli children are socialized to use these forms to invoke these situational features (Schieffelin, 1990).

2.3. The Context of Culture

A third goal of language socialization is to situate the socialization and emergence of communicative practices within the context of culture. A defining perspective of language socialization research is the pursuit of cultural underpinnings that give meaning to the communicative interactions between expert and novice members within and across contexts of situation. While researchers theorize about culture within different theoretical frameworks, we take culture to include "bodies of knowledge, structures of understanding, conventions of the world, and collective representations [which are] extrinsic to any individual and contain more information that any individual could know or learn" (Ochs & Schieffelin, 1984, p. 284). The analysis of how communicative practices of experts and novices are organized by and organize cultural knowledges, understandings, beliefs, and feelings is what distinguishes language socialization approaches from developmental pragmatics.

For example, a developmental pragmatic analysis of Kaluli children's communicative skills might focus the extent to which Kaluli children are able to use the range of appropriate linguistic forms to perform the act of requesting (Schieffelin, 1990, pp. 183-201). A language socialization analysis, on the other hand, embeds that analysis in a larger discussion of how the acquisition of these practices is also part of a broader socialization into Kaluli about notions exchange and social relationships. From a Kaluli perspective, social relationships are fundamentally constituted through giving and sharing, a primary
social relationships are fundamentally constituted through giving and sharing, a primary means of conveying sentiment and affection. A primary means for accomplishing these sharing activities is through the use of appropriate request forms. Competence underlying sharing is indexed and socialized in everyday talk to children, and children’s own ways of speaking express fundamental cultural concerns about reciprocity and social relationships. Sharing, accomplished through requests and responses, is linked to other social practices and symbolic forms such as exchange systems, gender roles, sibling relationships, rituals and myths. In Kaluli society, as in many others in Papua New Guinea, sharing, reciprocity, and exchange more generally organize and give meaning to social life.

Our approach to language socialization is similar to the anthropological perspectives of Bateson (1972), Gluckman (1958), and Turner (1967) — exploring a culturally focal event and its relation to other events and cultural meaning systems. However, language socialization research tends to focus on everyday, informal, even routine events and draws out connections between these ordinary events and the socialization of social and cultural skills. Such mundane events are significant in that they provide a basic, recurrent grounding for the socialization of cultural meanings.

2.4. The Context of Human Development

A fourth goal of language socialization research is to contribute to an understanding of connections between human development and culture, including relation between language acquisition and the socialization of cognitive and social competence. In other words, we are interested in how human development is situated in a cultural matrix.

One way of addressing the interface between culture and human development is to investigate developmental constraints on children and other novice’s participation in particular communicative practices. For example, a discussion of Kaluli children’s participation in culturally salient activities of sharing objects (reciprocity and exchange) could, and perhaps should, consider cognitive and biological processes that help organize children’s performance and recognition of requests and other forms of conduct that are integral to these activities. Thus in examining the acquisition of requests based on appeal, we observe that Kaluli children’s speech evidences formal elaboration over developmental time that reflects these cognitive and biological factors (Schieffelin, 1990, pp. 128-135, 183-201).

On the other hand, language socialization research suggests that, in certain communities, cultural preferences facilitate the use of certain grammatically more complex forms earlier in the developmental cycle than less complex comparable forms (Ochs & Schieffelin, 1995). For example, while there is an acquisition trend among Kaluli children towards increased complexity within the category of requests based on appeal, there is another acquisition trend in which Kaluli children acquire the category of requests based on appeal before the grammatically less complex category of assertive requests. Requests in both modalities can be accomplished by single words, either imperative verbs or indirect pronouns. Young children’s assertive requests, however, are usually single word utterances while requests based on appeal are multiword utterances constructed with vocatives, expressives, direct and/or indirect pronouns and imperative verbs that are marked with emphatic particles (Schieffelin, 1990, pp. 187-198). What is surprising from a developmental psycholinguistic perspective, this developmental progression is entirely compatible with Kaluli notions that children “naturally” beg, but must explicitly socialized to request assertively using a different set of linguistic resource (Schieffelin, 1990, pp. 132-135). Similarly, young Samoan children produce the semantically more complex deictic verb give/bring related to begging before the simpler deictic verb come related to requests of change of location of addressee. This developmental progression can be explained, in part, by the cultural appropriateness of children begging for food, but the inappropriateness of their directing others to come to them (Platt, 1986). Thus there are indications that socially appropriate demeanors guide acquisition of particular linguistic forms. Children are not only immature speakers, they also social beings participating in socially ordered interactions.

2.5. Universals and Particulars

For some time now an important goal of language socialization research has been to articulate a model that reconciles what is particular and what is universal about communicative practices of novices and of experts (Ochs, 1986, 1988, 1990, 1992; Ochs & Schieffelin, 1984, 1989, 1995; Schieffelin & Ochs, 1986a). The feeling of the author is that anthropologists have been miscast as seekers of the exotic and the unique, revelers in the exception to the rule. In our loosely articulated language socialization paradigm, universal and cultural are not logical oppositions but rather potentially compatible qualities of practices; the same communicative practice may be both universal and cultural at once. If we examine ordinary verbal practices that constitute daily interaction, we find that the vast majority of these practices are cultural universals. Further, we feel that these practices also have a similar linguistic form. For example, the cultural practices of asking questions, requesting, and clarifying unintelligible utterances or express affect or epistemic stance are both universal in appearance and realized through common linguistic structures (Besnier, 1990; Levinson, 1983; Ochs, 1982, in press; Ochs & Schieffelin, 1989). These observations lead us to posit certain universal relations between utterance form and utterance function and certain universal outcomes of language socialization. In many respects, children everywhere have been socialized to use language similar ways. Such similarities provide us with a basis for accounting for how people from vastly different speech communities manage some level of communicative sharing, reciprocity, and exchange more generally organize and give meaning to social life.

Then what is culturally particular? In our view, while a particular communicative practice may occasionally vary in form across social groups, cultural variation is primarily in the features of the situation and cultural contexts which that practice invokes. In terms of the immediate context of situation, the same practice may differ cross-culturally in the extent to which it is preferred or expected given certain social identities and settings. In one community, the practice may be unmarked for certain identities and settings, that is, expected and preferred; in another, its occurrence unusual and inappropriate for comparable identities and settings.

The same communicative practice in different communities may also differ in duration across interactional time. A practice may recurrently endure over twenty tu
Similarly, in cases in which interlocutors perceive their own utterances to be unintelligible, they universally set in motion the following four conversational strategies in responding to another's unintelligibility:

1) ignore unintelligibility;
2) display nonunderstanding;
3) verbally guess at what another might be saying;
4) negatively sanction addressee's unintelligibility (e.g., by teasing or shaming).

Similarly, in cases in which interlocutors perceive their own utterances to be unintelligible to others (speaker-rooted unintelligibility), they universally set in motion any of the following cultural strategies:

1) ignore unintelligibility;
2) repeat own utterance;
3) reformulate own utterance by simplifying, expanding, or otherwise paraphrasing it;
4) negatively sanction addressee's nonunderstanding of speaker's utterance.

We have pointed out that while universal, these practices differ in the extent to which they are employed and the contexts in which they are employed in different social communities. Thus in American White middle class communities, verbally guessing is a highly preferred response to addressee-rooted unintelligibility (Scheffelin, Jefferson, & Sacks, 1977), whereas in Kaluli (Scheffelin, 1990) and Samoan (Ochs, 1988) communities, verbal guessing is rare, particularly where the unintelligible utterance is produced by a child. Kaluli and Samoans tend to ignore, display nonunderstanding and or shame the producer of unintelligible utterances. In both communities, these preferences are tied to local notions of thinking and knowing. For both Kaluli and Samoan interlocutors, there is a strong dispreference for guessing what another is thinking, that is, making explicit another's unexpressed intentions and feelings. Kaluli children cannot know what another person thinks or feels, which results in extreme reluctance to explicitly verbalize or guess what another speakers means wants (Scheffelin, 1990, pp. 72-73).

Additionally, in Samoan communities, tolerance for and accommodation to unintelligibility is hierarchically distributed in that unintelligibility among high ranking persons is tolerated and accommodated to by low ranking persons far more than the reverse is true. This sense each time American, Kaluli, and Samoan children produce unintelligible utterances and are exposed to the unintelligible utterances of others, they are provided with opportunities for learning universal ways of responding to unintelligibility, yet at the same time, variation in these responses across contexts provide opportunities for local ideologies and social orders.

Similarly, in American White middle class speech communities, speakers very often grammatically simplify their utterances if they perceive that their utterances are unintelligible, particularly when talking to a young child (Cross, 1977; Ferguson, 1982; Newport, Gleitman, & Gleitman, 1977). In Kaluli and Samoan communities, speakers typically assist the production of comprehension by repeating or paraphrasing a difficult utterance without necessarily grammatically simplifying it. These preferences in turn are tied to local ideologies and social order. Kaluli dispreference for grammatical simplification is tied to a local ideology of language acquisition in which children are thought to need to hear complex language to become competent interlocutors (Scheffelin, 1990). In Samoan communities, grammatical simplification is a form of psychological and social accommodation approach in speaking to high ranking addressees (Ochs, 1988). One finds grammatical simplification in talk to high ranking foreigners but not in talk to young children.

As the social and cultural contexts of grammatical simplification vary across communities, so does the social meaning of this practice in these communities. In one community (Samoan), the use of grammatical simplification indexes only that the speaker is talking with a foreigner. In another community (mainstream White middle class American), grammatical simplification can index that one is talking either to a foreign young child, an elderly person, or a pet. It is in this sense that a single practice has
cultural and universal structure. While speakers the world over struggle to achieve intelligibility, they do so in culturally arranged ways.

3. CONCLUSION

Language socialization research is committed to articulating interfaces between language, mind, and society by exploring the role of language in human development and socialization. Our perspective pushes research on children's pragmatic competence beyond the bounds of children's capacity to perform particular actions and participate in particular activities towards an integrated cultural account of children as members of communities with histories, values, ways of understanding the world and organizing their identities and interactions. This includes culturally-specific theories and practices surrounding child development. While language socialization is centrally engaged in the close analysis of perfectly ordinary recurrent language practices involving language and cultural apprentic­

es, the field is more broadly dedicated to situating and visualizing the specific linguistic and interactional structures that constitute such practices in terms of culturally universal and particular processes and meanings.
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