ACADEMIA
Accelerating the world's research.

Language socialization among Latinos: Theory, method and approaches

Jorge Solís

Handbook of Latinos and education: Theory, research and practice

Related papers

Download a PDF Pack of the best related papers

Language Socialization Across Educational Settings
Sera Hernandez

Language Socialization Across Educational Settings (Baquedano-López & Hernandez)
Patricia Baquedano-López

The Intersections of Language Socialization and Sociolinguistics
Matthew Bronson

23 Language Socialization Among Latinos

Theory, Method, and Approaches

Patricia Baquedano-López and Gabino Arredondo
University of California, Berkeley

Jorge Solís
University of California, Santa Cruz

The education of Latinos continues to be a central topic of inquiry and concern in educational research. When young Latino students enter schools, they learn more than just subject matter, they must also learn to negotiate cultural expectations, languages, dialects, registers, and the often conflicting ideologies of what counts as knowledge and how to learn it. The increase in the number of Latinos in the overall U.S. population and their growing presence in public schools are making it imperative that researchers, administrators, and government agencies coalesce around an educational agenda that would maximize the educational attainment of Latino students. Earlier research on Latinos in schools aimed to solve the "Mexican problem" and attempted to provide explanations for their limited educational achievement. Latino cultural and linguistic practices and the lack of English language proficiency (often meaning the Standard English variant) were attributed to a lack of assimilation into the American mainstream (García, 2001; G. G. González, 1997; Trueba, 2002). Building on a legacy of work that has challenged a deficit approach to understanding Latino experience in schools (Durán, 1981; Valencia, 1997, 2002; Zentella, 1997), linguists, sociolinguists, and language development professionals are pushing educational and research agendas that invite us to reconsider the affordances of the language practices of many bilingual, bi-dialectical, and Spanish-speaking Latino students as resources for learning (K. D. Gutiérrez, Baquedano-López, & Alvarez, 2001; Moll, 1990; Valdés, 1996; Wong-Fillmore, 1992; Zentella, 1997). Among these efforts, researchers working within the language socialization paradigm have contributed a unique perspective on the role that language plays in the learning process, in particular, in the development of multiple competencies (linguistic and cultural) across a myriad of social institutions, but most particularly, in schools. Building on human developmentalist notions of learning, in particular social and cognitive competences that arise in interaction, language socialization research offers a complementary view to psychological approaches to learning. Thus language socialization research offers a linguistic anthropological perspective to address the complex questions of learning to participate in multiple communities and institutions. This chapter provides a review of this work with particular attention to Latino populations in the United States. In the next sections we review the goals and premises of language socialization research. We then discuss the influence of Latino experiences on language socialization research and related studies on language use and learning. We also review language socialization studies across different educational contexts. We conclude our chapter with a discussion on how language socialization research on Latinos can provide a window into understanding the role of language across contexts of learning.

Language Socialization Research

It has been more than 20 years since the first programmatic statement was published in which the language socialization paradigm emerged as a research perspective (Ochs & Schieffelin, 1979, 1984; Schieffelin & Ochs, 1986a, 1986b). Deeply influenced by theories on socialization

(Bernstein, 1971/1974) and acculturation (M. Mead, 1950), language socialization research emerged from a body of work studying child language and cognitive development in (social) context (Ervin-Tripp & Mitchell-Kernan, 1977). The influence of Basil Bernstein's theories reverberated across studies of family and school interactions examining the socialization of the child and the relationship between cognitive development, including language, and social stratification. Cook-Gumperz (1973) captured the significance of language as part of the process of socialization being studied at the time:

> [T]he study of socialization is the study of how the child learns to demonstrate his [sic] membership of the society, to recognize and practice the making of social events and structures in common with others. The key to this process which makes it *visible* for everyday members, and for members as researchers, is language, or rather *talk*. (p. 9)

Engaging in the study of this form of socialization required a view of the child as participating in interpretive social practices or in "the interpersonal activity of becoming," and not simply as a product of biology or a repository of social structure (Cook-Gumperz & Corsaro, 1986). Inspired by this perspective and the growing research on developmental and social approaches to child language acquisition of the time, a body of work firmly grounded in anthropological fieldwork began to focus on what was beginning to be called, *language socialization*.

Tenets of Language Socialization Research

The language socialization approach seeks to understand the ways in which individuals acquire the norms and competencies valued and expected by members of their social group. Branching out of the studies on the pragmatics of early child language acquisition (Ervin-Tripp & Mitchell-Kernan, 1977; Schieffelin & Ochs, 1986a, 1986b), language socialization research began to be identified as a unique research approach in the mid-eighties. In their 1986 essay in the *Annual Review of Anthropology*, the co-founders of the language socialization paradigm, Elinor Ochs and Bambi Schieffelin, proposed that the acquisition of language and socio-cultural dispositions was best understood through an integrated, means-ends theoretical and methodological approach. This approach, supported by longitudinal empirical research, captured the process of socialization *through the use of language* and *to the use language* (1986a). The study of socialization interactions, the authors indicated, was not to be limited to young children and their caregivers in everyday activity as was the focus of the early work in developmental pragmatics but rather, the focus was to be longitudinal, across developmental time, and across the lifespan. Through a focus on everyday routines embedded in social interaction, it was possible to capture how individuals acquired dispositions and behaviors, much of what Bourdieu (1977) has called *habitus*, and how individuals interacted with social structures and institutions (Giddens, 1977). In short, language socialization provided a way to empirically illustrate the patterns of social reproduction, transformation, and change.

While the general criteria for what constitutes a language socialization study can be found in the earlier programmatic statements of the paradigm (Schieffelin & Ochs, 1986a, 1986b), these have been expanded to clarify its theoretical and methodological underpinnings. The criteria include an orientation towards socialization research that is (a) longitudinal and ethnographic with the aim of describing an individual's acquisition of socio-cultural knowledge across time and contexts (Garrett & Baquedano-López, 2002; Kulick & Schieffelin, 2004; Schieffelin & Ochs, 1986a); (b) analytical and descriptive of field-based data, with reliance on recorded data where possible (Garrett, 2006); and (c) concerned with studying the connection between micro and macro processes, that is, focusing analytical attention to the ways in which everyday, face-to-face interactions both construct and reflect the social order (Garrett & Baquedano-López, 2002;

Kulick & Schieffelin, 2004; Ochs, 2002). These criteria have made it possible to articulate an important distinction between language socialization studies and studies that look at language socialization interactions. The former adhere to the tenets outlined above, the latter vary in methodology and disciplinary orientation and follow a synchronic approach to socializing interactions.

The interest in language socialization as a viable method and theory for studying language development and cultural competence across the life span is evident in the fast growing number of recent anthologies, special journal issues, and reviews of research in psychology (Cervantes & Perez-Granados, 2002), education (Bayley & Schecter, 2003; Hornberger & Duff, 2008; Zentella, 2005), applied linguistics (Auer & Wei, 2007), and linguistic anthropology (Garrett & Baquedano-López, 2002; Kulick & Schieffelin, 2004). We also note the inclusion of a language socialization entry in the recently published *The Prager Handbook of Latino Education in the U.S.* (Bhimji, 2007; Soto, 2007). Across these studies, the questions guiding the work have been influenced by the learning experiences and linguistic practices of different cultural and linguistic groups, including Latinos in the United States.

The Latino Diacritic in Studies of Language Use and Language Socialization

The rich range of linguistic and cultural experiences among Latinos has been central to empirical research that has pushed the theoretical scope of language socialization research and related studies. While not necessarily a unique or explicit focus of the earlier studies, the experiences of Latinos[1] were documented as exemplars of the complexity of the acquisition of communicative competence and knowledge and especially in the context of multilingual contact. We call this significant imprint the "Latino diacritic" to capture the multilingual contact, semiotically and materially experienced, that was studied through the analysis of everyday language practices among Latinos. These experiences were foundational to the analysis of studies of speech communities, classroom studies, and studies of peer cultures. We review some of this work below.

Drawing from a longitudinal, linguistic acquisition corpus from Quiché-speaking Guatemalan toddlers, Pye's (1980, 1983) findings demonstrated how children's early higher cognitive and complex understandings of language were evidenced in their selective use of linguistic and cultural expectations. Pye's work became part of the empirical research that supported Schieffelin and Ochs' (1986a) distinction between major forms of communicative accommodations given to children in their description of child-centered versus situation-centered approaches to socialization (p. 175) (that is the idea that across cultural groups, there is variability among caregivers in the ways they produce "baby talk" or accommodate talk to infants and young children), and how much of this variability (never a dichotomous "either/or" approach) would depend on the context of interaction or learning situation. Thus, the cross-cultural comparison of children's language development, and among them Latinos, was used to develop a nascent field studying cognition in social context. We will return to this point, and, in particular, the researchers' focus on Latino language practices in a moment, but we first want to provide the scope of this work.

A brief overview of other research on Latinos that influenced early language socialization research include the study of code-switching practices among Puerto Rican speakers (Zentella, 1981), sayings and clichés in Puerto Rican (Lauria, 1964) and Mexican communities (Farr, 1994), and teasing routines among Mexican families (Eisenberg, 1986). Schieffelin and Ochs cite (1986b) Eisenberg's research as evidence of language socialization of children in multi-cultural, multilingual, and polyadic communities in contrast to dyadic turn-taking models in White middle-class family interactions. Eisenberg (1986) had examined the socializing routines of two Mexican immigrant families living in northern California. Her study of "teasing" as a speech form in Mexican families suggested that the activities in which it occurred were varied in range and form, these included: (a) forms of play, (b) part of social bonds and means of social control/

moralizing values, and (c) valued social skills in adult interaction (p. 182). This work illustrated the multifaceted nature of one speech event in its varied contexts of interaction. Other sociolinguistic work on transnational Mexican families engaged similar analytical attention to teasing, this time as verbal art among Mexican immigrant family members in Chicago (Farr, 2006; Farr & Domínguez Barajas, 2005). Spanish-English speaking Latino practices and settings thus provided a context for cross-cultural comparisons and challenged the dominant American White middle-class models of interaction, learning, and development that were predominant in earlier research on acquisition and competence. These and other language practices became central to discussions of speech community. Derived from earlier work on recognizable language patterns that identified a social group (Bloomfield, 1933/1984), the notion of speech community as a more dynamic, heterogeneous analytic concept did not emerge as such until the work of John Gumperz (1968) and Dell Hymes (1972). Instead of the traditional one to one correspondence between a language and their speakers/ethnic groups, a speech community began to be seen as a complex of multiple languages, codes, and registers not necessarily determined by locale (i.e., practices could be learned or shared across geographical and temporal boundaries, that is in a broader socio-historical context).

In addition to monographs describing the Latino speech community (Peñalosa, 1980), we mention two noteworthy volumes addressing the Spanish language context for Latinos in the U.S.—*Latino Language and Communicative Behavior* (Durán, 1981) and *Spanish in the United States: Sociolinguistic Issues* (Bergen, 1990). Many of the studies included in these two collections ranged from formal linguistic analysis of local varieties of Spanish (M. Gutiérrez, 1990; Jacobson, 1990) to pragmatic concerns including the usage of *tu* and *usted* (Jaramillo, 1990). In these early studies there is the recognition of the diversity *within* community rather than across community. A prime example of this work is Ana Celia Zentella's (1981) ethnographic study of a Puerto Rican neighborhood in New York City, mentioned at the outset of this section, a study documenting the cultural logic of code-switching strategies among Latino youth—work that would lead to her landmark monograph, *Growing Up Bilingual*, where she examined those code-switching socializing practices in their contexts of immigration and socio-political contact (Zentella, 1997). Similarly, Valdés' (1981) and Silva-Corvalán's (1991, 1994) studies on code-switching and language patterns also influenced the study of language development and practices of immigrant Latino groups in the United States, including important studies of language learning in school and of language contact and change in Los Angeles.

Drawing on research carried out in England and the United States, Gumperz (1982) became a leading figure in studying language competence in context, what we now know as sociolinguistics. The major premises for defining sociolinguistic competence were derived from analyses of audio-recorded talk of a range of bi-dialectical and bilingual speech communities including those of English, Slovenian-German speakers, and those of Spanish-English Chicano[2] interlocutors. Gumperz' early analyses of code-switching and language borrowing were laden with references to language attitudes and identity markers that reflected a variety of language repertoires and worldviews of Chicano Spanish and *Caló*[3] as were used by Mexican American speakers residing in the U.S. Southwest. In his collaborative work with noted Chicano sociolinguist Enrique Hernández-Chávez, both authors asserted, and in effect, advanced earlier work on language ideologies, now an area of central concern in language socialization research:

> [W]hen political ideology changes, attitudes to code switching may change also. In California and elsewhere in the South West *pocho* or *caló* served as a pejorative term for the Spanish of local Chicanos. But with the awakening of ethnic consciousness and the growing pride in local folk traditions, these speech styles and the code switching they imply have become symbolic of Chicano ethnic values.... In bilingual groups as in other human com-

> munities the relationship of language usage to language ideology is a complex one which cannot be taken for granted. (Gumperz & Hernández-Chávez, 1972, p. 63)

It is important to recognize that Latino scholars at the time wrote theoretical and reflective pieces on the research that was being carried out among Latinos, or as they were increasingly being recognized, Chicanos. In a poignant critique of anthropological and linguistic research on Chicano[4] language practices, Américo Paredes (1977) reminded linguists and anthropologists that code-switching and word play expressed particular worldviews and histories beyond their denotational forms. He warned that a narrow understanding of distinct (and rich) language practices could lead to essentializing descriptions of their speakers and their practices and produce an early mapping of language practice with ethnic group. Regrettably, in spite of Paredes' call, essentializing analyses of Latinos and their practices remain a problem in the study of minority groups and their cultural and linguistic practices. Briggs (1984) has provided a methodological approach to Paredes' critique. Drawing on his experience conducting fieldwork among Mexicano[5] communities in New Mexico, Briggs wrote on the importance of conducting field interviews through the identification of what he called, metacommunicative actions, or actions that provide insight into cultural specific beliefs about language. In his words: "Native meta-communicative routines provide a rich source of sociolinguistic and social/cultural data and that awareness of theses repertoires can assist fieldworkers in using interviews more appropriately and effectively" (Briggs, 1984, p. 2). Thus, it is not just the linguistic data that matter in fieldwork situations, but developing the socio-cultural sensitivities through extended observation and participation in the activities being investigated.

The study of everyday language use and the language learning experiences of Latinos in the United States contributed to theoretical developments in the related field of second language acquisition (SLA). For example, Schumann's *Acculturation Model* (1978) was largely based on the communicative experiences of his Costa Rican informant, Alberto, who did not display language development beyond a certain measurable point. In the larger project from which Schumann's theory was developed, a study looking at discrete acquisition of English grammar among adults, there were four other Latino immigrant informants from Colombia and Puerto Rico (Cancino, Rosansky, & Schumann, 1975). The practices of these speakers crystallized into theories of language development, and while rigorously adhering to the methodology of the time, absent in this work is an examination of the socio-historical and economic factors that may have influenced these speakers' decisions to either integrate or distance themselves from the mainstream of U.S. society. Notwithstanding, these theories continue to be central to an understanding of SLA theoretical developments and principles.

Classroom Studies

Perhaps the most salient, yet unintended, contribution of Latinos to early language research in general was the description of Latino language practices and cultural worldviews that were captured in the classic classroom discourse studies of the 1970s and early 1980s (Cazden & Hymes, 1972; Mehan, 1979). Of significance, Mehan's (1979) study of interactional routines in the classrooms took place in a San Diego school located in a low-income Black and Mexican American neighborhood. Mehan's study provided foundational evidence for describing how social status and roles are structured through schooling. Mehan's Initiation-Response-Evaluation (I-R-E) model, which captured among other things, the control of knowledge by teachers, has become the cornerstone of classroom discourse analysis validating and inspiring interest in the use of naturalistic language analysis methodology for studying conditions of structure and achievement in schools (Macbeth, 2003).

The earlier focus on studying children and youth in educational contexts which had been led by Bernstein's (1971/1974) in his studies of social stratification and language code differences in London, led to a number of other studies focusing on language code. Most importantly, Bernstein's analysis of the educational opportunities that language code and class afforded made an important argument for looking at the integrated contexts of schooling. Thus, the importance of educational contexts as sites for testing out theories of language use, including code-switching, and for their potential for informing and shaping student achievement disparities was highlighted and was to form the core of new fields that were generated at the time, including sociolinguistic theory and language socialization. The experience of bilingual young Latino children, in particular the contexts for the development of code-switching skills, were also the subject of these earlier research efforts. Early language socialization research focused on the development of communicative competence of Spanish-English bilinguals (Genishi, 1976; Gumperz, 1982). This work represented a blend of approaches to describe the social aspects and parameters of language *in use* through the ethnography of communication framework (Hymes, 1972) and the then emergent language socialization paradigm. Genishi (1976) carried out one of the earliest exploratory studies investigating language socialization of bilingual children.

Predating the current language socialization framework, Genishi's (1976) study of code-switching among 6-year-old Latino Spanish-English bilinguals living in northern California drew on Hymes' ethnographies of communication model describing the "microparameters of language use" defined by four variables including contexts or situations, communicative acts, rules for communication, and the social meaning of talk. Genishi recorded naturally occurring talk among these children in a variety of settings and with different interlocutors. Her work aimed at challenging popular deficit notions of interlanguage interference[6] in the development of two languages. We note that Genishi's work appeared at a time when a number of significant studies were being carried out and when attention to the role of language in context in the learning process was given primary attention across child development studies (Ervin-Tripp & Mitchell-Kernan, 1977; Ochs & Schieffelin, 1979). Genishi's (1976) study thus set the stage for continued work on bilingual code-switching in practice.

Peer Cultures

William Corsaro's (1985) studies provided some of the earliest accounts of childhood socialization in peer cultures, in particular of friendship and social status, among pre-school age children. His studies extended notions of human development by drawing from symbolic interaction theory (Cicourel, 1973; G. H. Mead & Murphy, 1932), bringing a social perspective to the study of questions of growth and maturation. The children participating in Corsaro's studies were from White middle-class backgrounds and minority group populations including Mexican American, Black, and Asian families. His work influenced a number of current studies on peer culture, some of which have critiqued the earlier focus of many language socialization studies which tended to focus on only adult-child based models of socialization (Kyratzis, 2001a, 2004). Kyratzis' (2001b) recent study of male and female peer groups of pre-school age children (3- and 4-year-olds) in a university preschool classroom that included Anglo American and Mexican American students she examined "emotion talk" (p. 361) and peer socialization. Kyratzis has argued for the use of peer-based children's models of language socialization since children produce and organize themselves through a variety of stances and activities "that have not been previously modeled by adults" (Kyratzis, 2001b).

In the tradition of the ethnography of speaking, Goodwin (1995) examined the distinctions made between male and female peer group during play, where female gamesmanship had been seen as less complex and more conflict-free, through the observation of participant routines in the game of Hopscotch. Goodwin set out to understand this perception. The participants in Goodwin's studies were bilingual Spanish/English-speaking second- third-, and fifth-grade girls (mostly second generation Central Americans) residing in Los Angeles. Goodwin observed that girls actively co-constructed and negotiated the rules of their participation in the game. She has provided a nuanced typology of speech acts and pitch alternations through which girls refereed their own participation and stance taking that included calling out transgressors and the strict enforcement of rules. Her work has challenged deficit interpretations that girls' games were not intellectually complex—assertions that had ramifications for understanding the development of social skills socialization among girls. Research among older peer groups have included sociolinguistic studies of Latina gangs in Northern California (Mendoza-Denton, 1999a, 1999c) and of socialization of Latino male gang behavior and language in school (Rymes, 1996, 2001). We will review Rymes' language socialization study in later sections of this chapter.

In this section we have reviewed how the experiences of Latinos have been central to empirical research that pushed the theoretical scope of studies, and which in turn, led to a more defined articulation of the language socialization paradigm among other related disciplines. Yet we note that a notion of Latino as a cultural group remains unproblematized. While "culture" is often used as an identity marker, culture is not synonymous with a particular ethnic, linguistic, racial or national identities, and certainly not with an abstract, unified, or universal pattern of behavior. Cultural phenomena are never universal, they are always varied, local, and situated in a particular social context. Rosaldo (1989/1993) notes the limitations of early (and functionalist) interpretations of culture, which emphasized "shared patterns at the expense of processes of change and internal inconsistencies, conflicts, and contradictions. By defining culture as a set of shared meanings, classic norms of analysis make it difficult to study zones of difference within and between cultures" (pp. 27–28). Language socialization research can move us away from the unproblematic mappings of language onto culture and provide insights into how cultural knowledge is mediated and how membership to particular cultural identities is negotiated by examining both shared *and* varied cultural interactions. But this relationship requires explicit articulation otherwise we run the risk of continuing to work on an ascribed category of "Latino" as a cultural given and not as construct of social analysis.

The work described in this section also raises questions on the role of researchers engaged in studies of Latino populations. We argue that the analytical attention to the language practices of the everyday and routine as promoted in the past (and encouraged today), has the potential to exclude attention to the broader context. Aside from Paredes' and Briggs' critiques, attention to the socio-political context of Latino experience in the United States had been minimized, if not ignored. In the 1970s and 1980s, Latinos had taken significant political stances against poverty and had organized and contributed to the civil rights movement. We note too that by the time studies on the Chicano speech community were published, there were broader discourses on Latinos' organizing efforts around school desegregation and immigration laws (Rosales, 1997; Vigil, 1999). That is, the presence of Latinos in the United States was not simply that of an immigrant or cultural group, but of social actors in the making of a democratic nation.

The attention given to Latinos in early language socialization research and other related areas of inquiry offered at best a limited scope and view of the Latino experience. Perhaps more unsettling is to accept that the focus on collecting data at the local level reinforced the practices of anthropologists and other social scientists concerned with understanding human behavior and development that constructed a cultural "other," a static and invariant object of scrutiny and comparative analysis. The investigative lens hardly ever turned to the researcher engaged in the practice of ethnographic work or disciplinary field expansion (Fabian, 1983; Kulick, 2006). We are compelled to engage this discussion, for while attention to Latino experience provides a much-needed deviation from White middle-class norms and moved us towards a more dynamic understanding of learning, it does not escape the grip of the "otherizing" gaze without conscious investment. These points need to be engaged openly when conducting language socialization research since the paradigm has the potential to analytically tie the local and the global and as we seek to understand the processes of reproduction, transformation, and social change. The research enterprise is also part of these processes of transformation.

Language Socialization Practices of Latinos across Educational Contexts

Today, there is a growing body of language socialization studies examining a variety of educational settings and practices among Latinos. Challenged by the realities of a history of exclusion of Latinos in the academic pipeline, researchers whose work addresses the nexus between language, culture, and education are increasingly turning their attention to the language socialization paradigm to complicate one-to-one correspondences between variables such as low socio-economic status and low educational attainment and to explore the complexity of learning and becoming students in U.S. schools from a more integrated approach.

Language socialization research offers a framework for capturing learning processes in context and as a collaborative activity among experts and novices where language is the main tool for learning (Vygotsky, 1978). In addition to book-length monographs on Latino families and schooling practices (N. González, 2001; Vásquez, Pease-Alvarez, & Shannon, 1994; Zentella, 2005), research drawing on the language socialization research paradigm can now be found across a wide range of journals and disciplinary fields. We sound the same cautionary note stated at the start of this chapter, that is, that much work, and much of it good, has been done under the banner of language socialization research, but the studies, which are often identified as language socialization, are not always so in theoretical or methodological orientation; rather, they often examine instances of language socialization and do not emerge from description and analysis of long-term, ethnographic studies of socialization *to* language as well as socialization *through* language. The notion of "language" that language socialization research undertakes includes the symbolic systems used to encode socio-cultural models of learning and of competence. Ochs (1988) references this meaning of language as including both the grammatical sentence and other structures.[7] Language use encompasses "discourse" which includes sets of norms, preferences, and expectations related to linguistic structures including "speech acts, conversational sequences, episodes, rounds, speech activities, speech events, genres, and registers" (p. 8). The relevance of this notion of language to studies of Latinos and education can be appreciated at two levels. First, as the body of work across discourse-related activities illuminates, there are situated practices that shape a range of social identities. Second, and most importantly, the view of language and discourse afforded by the language socialization paradigm provides opportunities to examine the relationship between language structure and the social processes in which it is embedded.

Home and School Continuities

The investigation of language socialization practices in the home has provided a view into the relationship between home and school that has often highlighted the discontinuities across these two important socializing domains. This concern, first taken up by Heath's (1983) landmark study of Black and White working communities in the Piedmont Carolinas can be traced to Basil Bernstein's discussion of the relationship between restricted and elaborated codes and the opportunities that elaborated codes provided for some children's productive participation in school. Language socialization research began to address this relationship more formally in work carried in Northern California (Pease-Alvarez, 2002; Vásquez et al., 1994) and in New York (Zentella, 1981, 1997), indicating that the discontinuities for Latinos may not be as marked as those outlined in the Heath (1983) study.

The Vásquez et al. (1994) studies built on data they had collected in the late 1980s examining the differences between home and school contexts for language development. Through a comparison of scaffolding scripts between home and school, the authors sought to find discontinuities or mismatches across these settings, to understand school failure of minority students. Ethnographic studies at the time, and many of them language socialization studies (Boggs, 1985; Heath, 1983; Philips, 1983), had indicated that students from ethnic minority communities did not engage in speech with peers and adults in ways that were extended, structured, directive, or expanded as those that occurred among White, middle-class children and their interlocutors. Vásquez et al. (1994) focused on adult "contingent queries" as conversational supports to clarify and elaborate on requests. The authors noted that these conversational patterns functioned to clarify and elaborate on children's requests. This was an important finding that cautioned researchers and educators not to assume that the differences between home and school were neatly separated. The discourse patterns found in Latino homes were similar to discourse patterns of the school, and to those identified with White middle-class homes. The authors also noted the deliberate ways parents enforced maintenance of the home language and culture. This set of language socialization studies opened up opportunities to reframe attention to home-school connections. Farr's (1994) sociolinguistic study of literacy practices of Mexicanos[8] in Chicago supported the Vásquez et al. study. Farr described local literacy practices in public and private domains that overlapped with the contexts of school and home. Her ethnographic observations offered a detailed description of rich literacies outside school that included Catholic religious education using Spanish texts during church services on Sunday, prayer days during the week, and Saturday catechism classes in Spanish (*doctrina*). Farr explained that all oral and written language used by teachers in the religious classes promoted the unique use of Spanish language skills by integrating a range of texts almost exclusively in Spanish as well as other genres in Spanish (such as songs or prayers; p. 32). As with the Vásquez et al. study, the links to classroom practices were seen less discontinuous in these studies, providing an important view on the potential to tap on Latino language and literacy practices across home and school.

Perhaps the most comprehensive and in-depth analysis of language and literacy practices in Latino homes can be found in Norma González' (2001) study of families in Arizona. Designed as a language socialization study, González' research began to incorporate the larger dimensions of the socio-cultural context of the borderlands, including the interplay of political economies and social identities. Her study provided an illustration of the ways in which socialization does not necessarily mean that only one ideology (or cultural norm) is transmitted to young children. On the contrary, what Latino children learn is the unique way their immediate social context of interaction evokes and embodies their race and class minority status. A significant contribution to educational research is her critique of what we generally conceive as "culturally relevant" may actually be more indicative of a position that considers *all* Latinos to share the same socio-historical dispositions. The call here is for research and pedagogy that can consider that while there is a great deal that is shared in terms of linguistic and cultural practices, there are unique practices to households and local communities.

As our knowledge of Latino student experiences in schools increases through multiple methods and theoretical approaches, Rodríguez (2005) reminds us that there are significant numbers of Latino students with special needs in our schools. There is urgency to understand and promote home-school continuities for these students. While language socialization research in other settings has turned its attention to students with special needs (Ochs, 2002), we know relatively little of these language socialization practices among Latino students at home and at school. Rodríguez (2005) conducted observations of Dominican families in New York focusing on literacy practices at home and found that there were many rich literacy texts and activities that involved parents and children in productive and sustained interaction. Of interest, these activities were also related to the practical problems that families needed to solve, such as paying bills or writing money orders or checks. All of these are fundamentally problem-solving practices that invoke not just cognitive attention, but socio-economic dispositions as well. Similar to Rodríguez' study of home interactions, Mercado (2005) investigated the *funds of knowledge* (N. González, Moll, & Amanti, 2005) that underlie the communicative, emotional, and spiritual resources for learning in the homes and community of the Puerto Rican participants in her study. Her research, conducted with a team of teachers, revealed that families valued literacy practices at home which in addition to school subjects, also ran the gamut of family life and experience—legal matters, health concerns, and religious and spiritual activities. Of significance were the teachers' responses to the home visits and interviews they carried out as part of the design of the study. They reported that they had gained,valuable perspectives on how important it was for them to become familiar with not just the socialization practices of the broader community, but also with the socialization practices of their particular students and their families of their classrooms. An important implication of Mercado's study, and indeed of all "funds of knowledge" research, is the assertion that that teacher contact with the home affords the possibility of *informed* curricular reform.

The Broader Context of School Reform

Rymes (2001) study examined the language socialization experiences of Black and Latino students and teachers at a continuation high school in Los Angeles, she focused on the narratives of "dropping out" and "dropping in" that Latino students told to frame the tensions they experienced between their peer activities, many gang-related, and their dis-engagement and participation in school practices. These students' narratives provided insight into the larger tensions that these students experienced as minority youth in Los Angeles (Rymes, 2001). Rymes' nine-month study was the first attempt to examine school reform through the language socialization paradigm. In her study, Rymes (2001) followed the discourses and practices of stakeholders in the creation, and the unfortunate closing, of the school.

The other significant contribution to the study of school reform is Yang's (2004) two-year ethnographic study of a largely Black and Latino school district in northern California. Yang studied more centrally the discourses of school reform at public meetings among parents, school administrators, and the staff of the main school reform office that led to the formation of a small schools movement in northern California, and the eventual autonomy from the school district. Yang contributes an important critique of the "complicitous researcher" who never plays a detached or distant role. In his case, he was a key player in the office for school reform in the district. These two studies provide a broad view of language socialization not appreciated before, that is, how schooling institutions are locally structured and in turn, how these structuring processes shape and influence the dispositions and actions of individuals participating in those institutions (Giddens, 1984). This area of research has the potential to expand into complex and integrative research, especially as education researchers incorporate language socialization approaches to the study of institutional and organizational structures.

Home and Community Contexts

Eisenberg's (2002) study addresses a different type of discontinuity, one previously identified between European and Mexican-descent socialization to cognitive development in children, and that is the quality of maternal teaching talk and register. Eisenberg observed interactions during tasks and activities at home that were coded for teaching and scaffolding registers and which included the use of positive-negative feedback, structuring, questioning, and degrees of demand and directiveness of attention (understood as supporting cognitive complexity). The study uncovered a range of responses across socio-economic statuses and tasks suggesting the importance of examining individual variation in the context of everyday activities (p. 222). While not strictly a language socialization study, Eisenberg's study draws on its distinctive methodology in that it included ethnographic observation and detailed analysis of language form. Bhimji's (2005) study provides a complementary example to Eisenberg's findings as she studied the use of directives, identified as a distinctive dis-preferred feature of American White middle-class maternal discourse in low-income Mexican families. Bhimji relied on longitudinal, ethnographic methodology to document how directives were not uniformly controlling processes or imperative in form, but rather they could include other types of directives (e.g., declaratives and interrogatives) to socialize young children to valued local socio-cultural practices and competencies (p. 75). We find it important to mention here the extraordinary body of work by de León (2000),[9] now spanning 15 years of fieldwork, studying language socialization practices of Tzotzil family interaction in the home in Chiapas, Mexico. Studies by de León have been contributing significantly to language socialization theory and method, particularly for her detailed study of the participatory linguistic and interactional patterns of infants' early communication with caregivers, expanding on the earlier distinction between child-oriented and situation-oriented interactions. Her studies provide a nuanced description of pointing, gaze direction, and directives ("say x") that socialize participatory competence prior to language development (2000, p. 138) beyond the mother-child dyad.

The findings in Schecter and Bayley's (2002) study of Mexican groups in Texas and California incorporate concepts and themes from language socialization research. The study draws on an initial corpus of interviews of forty Mexican-origin families that included both nested and purposeful sampling of parents and children within each family. These data included a smaller pool of interviews of families that ranged in their use of English and Spanish (p. 17). While there is attention to language form and expression, the focus in this study is on language as *habitual* rather than as a tool for learning. A critique advanced in this study is the need to deepen our understanding of how immigrant and language minority communities maintain and manage the use of English and Spanish at home, in school, and at work. This is an example of code persistence that has the potential to counter arguments of language loss, especially in the United States where English is the favored code.

Zentella's long-term ethnographic study (1997) of the language repertoires of *el bloque*, a working-class Puerto Rican community in New York City, demonstrated that bilingual development was a collaborative, multi-directional process that relied on the social interactions between caregivers-children, children-caregivers, children-children, and caregivers-caregivers. These social interactions were multi-layered in that they drew from existing social networks and resources in the community and were composed of a diversity of bi/multi-dialectal repertoires that were complex, dynamic, and strategic. Zentella offered important insight into strategic code-switching of bi/multi-dialectal speakers who through selective code alternation purposefully reconnected "with people, occasions, settings, and power configurations from their history of past interactions, and imprinting their own 'act of identity'" (p. 114). Zentella demonstrated that "language shift," or loss of Spanish and preference for English monolingualism, required a grounded analysis of how social networks and local resources are shaped in turn by macro-structurations that impinge on speech communities, for example, migrations out of the community due to economic flux.

Religious Contexts

A strand of language socialization studies has looked at religious institutions and their socializing force through language and literacy instruction. The analyses of the language socialization practices of the Christian church are not new, and they have also been explored in other cultural contexts by language socialization researchers (Duranti, Ochs, & Ta'ase, 1995; Schieffelin, 2002). More specific to Latino populations, the *doctrina* context for immigrant Mexican children's literacy development had already been identified (Farr, 1994) as a site of potential cultural continuity. Baquedano-López' (1997, 1998, 2001) studies of religious instruction in Spanish for children, *doctrina*, at two Catholic parishes in California have provided a window into understanding the processes of transnational identity formation and literacy. Through narrative tellings of the religious icon of *Nuestra Señora de Guadalupe* (Our Lady of Guadalupe) and other literacy practices such as saying prayers and telling Bible stories, the *doctrina* children were taught to adopt was a collective social identity as they learned to identify with Mexico in the context of Catholic instruction in the United States—even when children participating in these classes were not all of Mexican descent. These practices influenced linguistic and cultural continuity, including actual religious practice across space and time in spite of documented exclusionary debates against Mexican immigrants in the public discourse of the state of California and within one of the parishes where *doctrina* was offered (Baquedano-López, 2004; Baquedano-López, Leyva, & Baretto, 2005). Ek's study (2002, 2005) of a Los Angeles Pentecostal church's classes for adolescents illuminated different socialization dynamics that through the moral force to stay on the Christian path universalized and erased ethnic differences for the mostly Central American congregation. These studies invite an examination of the different political presence of Latino ethnic groups in the United States and of the history of the various religious traditions in the Americas as they illustrate how in one context, students identify ethnically with the majority group and in the other, those ethnicities are minimized.

The responses of Latinos to church discourses and practices are significant as Relaño-Pastor (2005) has illustrated. Drawing primarily from interview data in southern California, Relaño-Pastor explained how immigrants sometimes find themselves at odds with an institution that fails to recognize their cultural values. Relaño-Pastor described a mother's moralizing and socializing responses to what she perceived and evaluated as exclusionary (and insulting) practices during Catholic mass where English was used instead of Spanish for a largely Spanish-speaking audience.

In this section we have reviewed language socialization studies across educational contexts. Our survey of home and school research reveals a tendency in this work to focus on continuities rather than discontinuities. That is, the work we reviewed illustrates that the practices of the home are not always at odds with the practices of school. This might be indicative of the attention that language socialization researchers pay to the use of language in context. Thus attention to routine activities that involve parents, siblings, peers, and others, expand the participation framework in these activities and draw on a variety of resources. The result is a view of Latinos that is not rooted in "deficit" notions of educational attainment. Our review of research of Latino practices across the contexts of home, school, and community provides opportunities to understand the complexity of the social order(s) that Latinos in the United States negotiate in the day to day activities across these domains. There is the pull to assimilate into mainstream practices and schooling plays a significant role in this process, yet there are spaces and opportunities for resistance and change as captured in the studies of school reform movements of Rymes (2001) and Yang (2004). The contexts of religious instruction, for example, provide both the means to reproduce systems of ideology and practice but they also generate the tensions that lead to practices of cultural and linguistic resignification in the context of immigration to the United States. In the following section we review the influence of language socialization research on other disciplines, in particular in second language acquisition research and in behavioral studies.

Language Socialization Research across the Disciplines

While language socialization research is incorporated into other disciplines, the possibilities for change within the paradigm, or of its premises and tenets, are likely to occur. Language socialization research is a relatively new approach and although it has solidified its methodology and theoretical orientation in the last few years, it will be difficult to predict the direction that language socialization research might take as it is used to examine new topics and new questions, and as technology and methods are continually redefining qualitative inquiry. In this section we review two disciplinary fields that have begun to incorporate language socialization approaches to learning and development.

Second Language Socialization Studies and Second Language Acquisition

Language socialization theory and method have inspired new approaches to the study of second-language acquisition (SLA) in ways that are redefining dominant themes, including notions of language, learning, and identity in multilingual settings (Kramsch, 2002). There is however, a distinction here (and a comprehensive review is beyond the scope of this chapter) between language socialization studies carried out in bilingual and multilingual settings and those addressing SLA questions in those communities. SLA studies are characterized by their explicit attention to classic questions of language learning of *individuals* in mixed code settings such as the development of specific linguistic features, the preference for certain codes, or the acquisition of pragmatic competence in another language-culture system. Language socialization studies, on the other hand, give preference to an examination of broader social processes that shape individual and collective cultural identities (Garrett & Baquedano-López, 2002). SLA research has maintained a special position in the study of Latino education in the United States providing explanations and description of contexts of bilingual interaction in and out of school (Valdés, 1981; Zentella, 1997) and language maintenance and shift (Silva-Corvalán, 1991, 1994). Recent contributions drawn from language socialization research in education that examine SLA are proliferating and they are attending to the social contexts for learning in the study of language acquisition.

Rymes' proposal for a new approach to SLA as *second language socialization* (Rymes, 1997) is grounded in her ethnographic study of the linguistic practices of students in an alternative high school in Los Angeles where 50% of the student body was Spanish-speaking Latino. In her study she examined how Latino and African American students contested and engaged, and at times, reframed, the code-switching practices and ideologies about the value of English and Spanish in school and society at large. Rymes suggests that language socialization theory and methodology can contribute to a better understanding of how second-language status is used in daily interactional routines to enforce or resist stigmatized identities. For example, posing questions that are not readily observable in classic SLA research, such as how routines and habits involving second-language speakers or bilingual speakers reproduce languages and ideologies about languages, could provide a view into the socio-historical setting where language acquisition is taking place. Rymes and Pash (2001) expanded on this view. In their study of the classroom experiences of René, a second-grade boy from Costa Rica, Rymes and Pash examined the ways that he compromised his understanding of his social identity and language use. In school he was "passing" as competent in oral skills during classroom interaction, yet he was being designated for special education classes. The study's focus on classroom routines as preserving identity but perhaps standing in contrast with literacy routines is instructive for understanding the multiple meanings and outcomes of seemingly innocuous classroom practices. As René's case illustrates, the participation of a student in classroom routines is intertwined with the expression of other social identities, and in many instances, the conflict generated by participating in classroom routines is not always satisfactorily resolved.

Willet's (1995) study of interactional classroom routines in an ESL classroom was also carried out from a language socialization perspective. She described the socio-cultural dimensions, or what she calls the micro-politics of classroom interaction, to explain how ESL students in first grade become socialized to school routines, communicative competence, and academic identities. While located in a classroom where many languages were being spoken including Korean, Hebrew, Arabic, and Spanish, Willet described the case of Xavier (a Latino Spanish-speaking student) whose classroom strategies were similar to those of René in the Rymes and Pash (2001) study. Willet described, using discourse-analytic methodology and sustained ethnographic observation, how Xavier was set-up to fail in this classroom through routines that positioned him in need of more guided adult support and away from the rich contexts of peer support. Thus, in comparison to two girls, the other focal students in Willet's study, Xavier learned to competently navigate the general social contours of classroom participation, but did not acquire the necessary collaborative strategies that could have helped him develop academic skills.

Relevant to the design and implementation of studies of second language socialization is Watson-Gegeo's (2004) review of the changing nature of second-language acquisition theory. She has called for an integration of socio-cultural "insights" of language socialization research into new developments of SLA theories and perspectives as a way to balance mentalistic learning theories. She proposes that reviewing the classic questions that inspired early language socialization work, including questions about theory of mind and linguistic relativity can bolster and legitimize emerging language socialization research in SLA. According to Watson-Gegeo (2004), language socialization theory can offer six insights that SLA research could incorporate. First, language and culture are mutually constitutive and socially constructed. Second, all cultural activities across different contexts are socio-historically marked. Third, studies of language use offer rich ethnographic context. Fourth, child and adult interactions produce more than grammatical units they generate culturally meaningful ways of thinking, feeling, and being in the world. Fifth, language socialization uses cultural anthropological concepts of development to describe community, cognition, and identity. In summary, she lays out requirements for the application of language socialization theory in SLA studies that must combine ethnographic, sociolinguistic and discourse analytic methods and that may include ecologically valid quantitative methodology. Watson-Gegeo notes that this enterprise could represent the birth of a new paradigm, yet welcomes the idea that SLA research would move away from the study of learning in a context that "typically derives from a positivist, experimental model of research that attempts to control variables rather than account for the complexities of people's real lives situations" (p. 341).

Behavioral and Developmental Studies

In addition to integrating perspectives in the field of Second Language Acquisition, language socialization research has been taken up in the behavioral sciences. We highlight here a thematic issue entitled "Language socialization and Learning in Mexican-Descent Families" where six studies were published in the *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences* (Cervantes & Perez-Granados, 2002). From the editors' perspective, the studies provide a more comprehensive view of Mexican family life and of children's and parents' attitudes and beliefs regarding language choice. Our review of this collection supports the editors' assertion and we further note that the work challenges deficit views of Mexican families' language practices, such as infrequent use of cognitively complex talk by mothers (Eisenberg, 2002; Moreno, 2002). The studies highlight the role of other conversational partners besides the mother (Perez-Granados, 2002), expanding the documentation of the range of participation frameworks for the developing child, breaking away from dyadic interactions. The various articles address topics as diverse as emotion (Cervantes, 2002), the social context of home literacy (role of siblings in socialization) and the learning of normative scripts such as objective labeling and school-like scaffolding strategies (Perez-Granados, 2002). Except for the Pease-Alvarez study, these studies could not be characterized as language socialization studies in their design, but they do focus on many instances of socializing interactions using a variety of methods from quasi-experimental to ethnographic.

Future Trajectories

The review of the work presented in this chapter gives us a way to appraise the development and direction of language socialization research conducted among Latinos. Language socialization is a viable approach for understanding the complex of experience of Latinos in the United States. In this era of high-stakes accountability that drives educational policy, narrow notions of learning are being generated as benchmarks for achievement and competence. This current educational landscape fails to recognize the centrality of language and social interaction and the ways in which Latino students manage the multiple demands of the educational contexts they participate in. As the language socialization approach is taken up by education researchers and researchers in other disciplines, we can begin to move away from attention to the principles and premises of language socialization research (often focusing on both perceived and actual limitations) and move towards more theoretically nuanced and complex studies that could expand its conceptual domain. In her recent edited book, Zentella (2005) reminds us of the work that still needs to be done to counter the ways Latino children are misunderstood and understudied. Language socialization research offers a way to understand the lives of children and their families while attending to both their local and larger contexts of interaction.

Zentella has offered challenging critiques to researchers working among minority populations. She reminds us of the need to be accountable (other than the accountability created through peer-review) for the work that we do. Her call for a more "anthropolitical linguistics" is fitting and relevant to language socialization research as well. In our review of the early research on language use and classroom discourse, it was surprising to find research that did not identify student populations, yet pseudonyms with Spanish-sounding names were the only indicators that the English translated dialogue had taken place among Latinos. As we have indicated, much of the earlier research of Latinos tended to be carried outside of its socio-historical context. To paraphrase Hymes' (1972) call for a fuller description of speech in community—it matters who speaks, to whom, and under what conditions. To revoice Zentella's words—it matters who does the research and for what purposes. We conclude our chapter with two concrete and brief suggestions for language socialization research on Latinos and education.

Revisiting the Meaning of Competence

As research in language socialization proliferates, it is important to revisit the meaning behind the concept of "competence," which does not simply refer to the acquisition of language. Language socialization points to language as the primary tool for expressing socio-cultural and pragmatic meaning and as the focal means for competent socialization. Ochs (1986b) illustrates what it means for children to acquire pragmatic competence:

> One critical area of social competence a child must acquire is the ability to recognize/interpret what social activity/event is taking place and to speak and act in ways sensitive to the context. Children must also have the competence to define activities/events through their language and nonverbal actions...language is not simply responsive to the social activity/event; it is the social activity (Hymes 1974), as in teasing, negotiating, telling a story, tattle-telling, explaining. (p. 3)

In this respect, competence is not simply a means toward a greater end but also an end onto itself. While the quote above references children, it is not difficult to extend this meaning to a variety of contexts and age groups. The core of socialization lies in the ability to display expected competencies, yet it does not always guarantee the display of such knowledge. The research we reviewed here illustrated many instances where norms of expected behavior were not displayed, for example the actions of René in the Rymes and Pash (2001) study. Investigating why competencies are displayed in some cases but not in others demands paying attention to both the local organizations of activities but also the broader socio-political and economic contexts. There is an urgent need to revisit what competence means for Latinos (in particular English-Language Learners) (Dúran, 2008; García, 2005). Language socialization research has the methodological and theoretical tools to help us examine these contexts.

A Move away from Comparisons to American White Middle-Class Norms

As language socialization research expands into other fields and domains, it would be important to see a shift away from the tendency of using AWMC cultural models as benchmarks for understanding Latino practices (and indeed of other minority group practices). After 20 years of language socialization research, we find that this approach still filters through the most recent language socialization studies among Latinos. An exhaustive examination of how home literacy activities in a variety of Latino homes (e.g., across socio-economic statuses, region, country of origin, or language registers) contrasted to those of Anglo families might not necessarily provide a fuller account of how language, culture, and learning are integrated in the context of Latino experience. Language socialization researchers can develop a different approach to conceptualizing socialization practices *within* a broader field of Latino/Chicano Education and culture. In this regard, language socialization with its core approach to understanding learning and development in social context has the potential to bring into focus internal variation, that is, the diversity that exists within Latino linguistic and cultural practices and worldviews. We add here a reference to Mendoza-Denton (1999b) who finds that the study of a "linguistics of contact" (citing Pratt, 1987), and what we capture in this chapter under the rubric *Latino diacritic*, provides a conceptual entry to examine how cultural borders and the practices within and across them are shared and enacted. Mendoza-Denton explains that through this type of analysis we can "find the articulation of different levels of semiotic systems, where subtle linguistic cues work in tandem with material culture to index history and ideology" (p. 388). This is precisely the area where studies of Latino language socialization can deepen our understanding of how macro-social processes shape educational practices and how cultural process become naturalized in face-to-face interaction and in everyday practice. Language socialization research can bridge this divide.

Acknowledgments

We express our appreciation and respect to all the scholars who have contributed to our current understanding of the role of language socialization in learning, in particular Elinor Ochs and Bambi Schieffelin. We thank Ana Celia Zentella for inspiring and challenging the way we frame research for and by Latinos. We are grateful to the members of the Laboratory for the Study of Interaction, Discourse, and Educational Research (L-SIDER) at UC Berkeley for providing us with a resourceful space to collaborate. We thank Sera Hernández, Shlomy Kattan, and Ariana Mangual for comments and suggestions on earlier drafts.

Notes

1. While many studies on Latinos assume that the majority of Latinos speak Spanish, we include here indigenous languages of the Americas and make reference to the research among indigenous groups that have influenced language socialization research.
2. Gumperz refers here to Mexican-Americans of the U.S. Southwest.
3. Spanish variant spoken by Chicanos.

4. We use here Paredes' meaning to indicate Mexican-descent populations in the United States. We acknowledge that the term "Chicano" and the recent variants "Chicana/o" and "Chican@" carry historical meanings and important socio-political connotations. Here we adhere to the use that the authors we review employed in their work.
5. Spanish speakers in northern New Mexico.
6. The idea that in the development of second language grammars learners encounter and work against dissimilar features of each source language.
7. See V. González (2001), however, for an alternative, perhaps less inclusive, interpretation of this definition.
8. Mexican immigrants in Chicago.
9. We direct the reader to de León's article for a complete list of references of this formidable work.

References

Auer, P., & Wei, L. (2007). *Handbook of multilingualism and multilingual communication.* New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Baquedano-López, P. (1997). Creating social identity through doctrina narratives. *Issues in Applied Linguistics, 8*(1), 27–45.

Baquedano-López, P. (1998). *Language socialization of Mexican children in a Los Angeles Catholic parish.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles.

Baquedano-López, P. (2001). Creating social identities through doctrina narratives. In A. Duranti (Ed.), *Linguistic anthropology: A reader* (pp. 343–358). Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Baquedano-López, P. (2004). Traversing the Center: The politics of language use in a Catholic religious education program for immigrant Mexican children. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly, 35*(2), 212–232.

Baquedano-López, P., Leyva, L. R., & Baretto, T. (2005). *Strategies for linguistic and cultural continuity in Spanish-based Catholic religious education programs (doctrina).* Paper presented at the 4th International Symposium on Bilingualism, Tempe, AZ.

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

Bergen, J. J. (1990). *Spanish in the United States: Sociolinguistic issues.* Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.

Bernstein, B. B. (1971/1974). *Class, codes and control.* London: Routledge and K. Paul.

Bhimji, F. (2005). Language socialization with directives in two Mexican immigrant families in South Central Los Angeles. In A. C. Zentella (Ed.), *Building on strength: Language and literacy in Latino families and communities* (pp. 60–76). New York: Teachers College Press.

Bhimji, F. (2007). Mexican American families: Socializing bilingualism/biculturalism in South Central Los Angeles. In L. D. Soto (Ed.), *The Praeger handbook of Latino education in the U.S.* (pp. 300–306) Westport, CT: Praeger.

Bloomfield, L. (1984). *Language.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press. (Original work published 1933)

Boggs, S. (1985). *Speaking, relating, and learning: A study of Hawaiian children at home and at school.* Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Briggs, C. L. (1984). Learning how to ask: Native metacommunicative competence and the incompetence of fieldworkers. *Language in Society, 13,* 1–28.

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

Cancino, H., Rosansky, E. J., & Schumann, J. H. (1975). The acquisition of the English auxiliary by native Spanish speakers. *TESOL Quarterly, 9*(4), 421–430.

Cazden, C. B., John, V. P., & Hymes, D. H. (1972). *Functions of language in the classroom.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Cervantes, C. A. (2002). Explanatory emotion talk in Mexican immigrant and Mexican American families. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences, 24*(2), 138–163.

Cervantes, C. A., & Perez-Granados, D. R. (2002). Language socialization and learning in Mexican-descent families: An introduction. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences, 24*(2), 107–113.

Cicourel, A. V. (1973). *Cognitive sociology: Language and meaning in social interaction.* Harmondsworth, UK: Penguin Education.

Cook-Gumperz, J. (1973). *Social control and socialization: A study of class differences in the language of maternal control.* London: Routledge & K. Paul.

Cook-Gumperz, J., & Corsaro, W. A. (1986). Introduction. In J. Cook-Gumperz, W. A. Corsaro, & J. Streeck (Eds.), *Children's worlds and children's language* (pp. 1–12). Berlin: M. de Gruyter.

Corsaro, W. A. (1985). *Friendship and peer culture in the early years.* Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

de León, L. (2000). The emergent participant: Interactive patterns in the socialization of Tzotzil (Mayan) infants. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology, 8*(2), 131–161.

Durán, R. P. (1981). *Latino language and communicative behavior.* Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Dúran, R. P. (2008). Assessing English-language learners' achievement. *Review in Research in Education, 32,* 292–327.

Duranti, A., Ochs, E., & Ta'ase, E. (1995). Change and tradition in literacy instruction in a Samoan American community. *Educational Researcher,* 57–74.

Eisenberg, A. R. (1986). Teasing: Verbal play in two Mexicano homes. In B. B. Schieffelin & E. Ochs (Eds.), *Language socialization across cultures* (pp. 182–198). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Eisenberg, A. R. (2002). Maternal teaching talk within families of Mexican descent: Influences of task and socioeconomic status. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences, 24*(2), 206–224.

Ek, L. (2002). *Language, identity, and morality in an immigrant Latino Pentecostal church.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles.

Ek, L. (2005). Staying on God's path: Socializing Latino immigrant youth to a Christian Pentecostal identity in Southern California. In A. C. Zentella (Ed.), *Building on strength: Language and literacy in Latino families and communities* (pp. 77–92). New York: Teachers College Press.

Ervin-Tripp, S. M., & Mitchell-Kernan, C. (1977). *Child discourse.* New York: Academic Press.

Fabian, J. (1983). *Time and the other: How anthropology makes its object.* New York: Columbia University Press.

Farr, M. (1994). En los dos idiomas: Literacy practices among Chicano Mexicanos. In B. J. Moss (Ed.), *Literacy across communities* (pp. 9–47). Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press.

Farr, M. (2006). *Rancheros in Chicagoacán: Language and identity in a transnational community.* Austin: University of Texas Press.

Farr, M., & Barajas, E. D. (2005). Mexicanos in Chicago: Language ideology and identity. In A. C. Zentella (Ed.), *Building on strength: Language and literacy in Latino families and communities* (pp. 137–147). New York: Teachers College Press.

Garcia, E. E. (2001). *Hispanic education in the United States: Raíces y alas.* Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

García, E. E. (2005). *Teaching and learning in two languages: Bilingualism & schooling in the United States.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Garrett, P. B. (2006). Language socialization. *Elsevier Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics, 6,* 604–613.

Garrett, P. B., & Baquedano-López, P. (2002). Language socialization: Reproduction and continuity, transformation and change. *Annual Review of Anthropology, 31*(1), 339–361.

Genishi, C. S. (1976). *Rules for code-switching in young Spanish-English-speakers: An exploratory study of language socialization.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of California, Berkeley.

Giddens, A. (1977). *Studies in social and political theory.* London: Hutchinson.

González, G. G. (1997). Culture, language, and the Americanization of Mexican children. In A. Darder, R. D. Torres, & H. Gutiérrez (Eds.), *Latinos and education: A critical reader* (pp. xxii, 488). New York: Routledge.

González, N. (2001). *I am my language: Discourses of women & children in the borderlands.* Tucson: University of Arizona Press.

González, N., Moll, L. C., & Amanti, C. (2005). *Funds of knowledge: Theorizing practice in households, communities, and classrooms.* Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

González, V. (2001). The role of socioeconomic and socio-cultural factors in language minority children's development: An ecological research view. *Bilingual Research Journal, 25*(1, 2), 1–30.

Goodwin, M. H. (1995). Co-constructing in girls' hopscotch. *Research on Language and Social Interaction, 28*(3), 261–281.

Gumperz, J. J. (1968). The speech community. *International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences*, 381–386.

Gumperz, J. J. (1982). *Discourse strategies.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Gumperz, J. J., & Hernandez-Chavez, E. (1972). Bilingualism, bidialectalism, and classroom interaction. In C. B. Cazden, V. P. John, & D. Hymes (Eds.), *Functions of language in the classroom* (pp. 84–108). New York: Teachers College Press.

Gutiérrez, K. D., Baquedano-López, P., & Alvarez, H. (2001). Literacy as hybridity: Moving beyond bilingualism in urban classrooms. In M. Luz-Reyes & J. Halcón (Eds.), *The best for our children: Critical perspectives on literacy for Latino students*. (pp. 122–141). New York: Teachers College Press.

Gutiérrez, M. (1990). Sobre el mantenimiento de las cláusas subordinadas en el español de Los Angeles. In J. J. Bergen (Ed.), *Spanish in the United States: Sociolinguistic issues* (pp. 31–38). Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.

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

Hornberger, N. H., & Duff, P. A. (Eds.). (2008). *Encyclopedia of language in education* (2nd ed., Vol. 8: Language socialization). New York: Springer/Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Hymes, D. (1972). Introduction. In C. Cazden, V. P. John, & D. Hymes (Eds.), *Functions of language in the classroom* (pp. xi–lvii). New York: Teachers College Press.

Hymes, D. (1974). *Foundations in sociolinguistics: An ethnographic approach.* Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Jacobson, R. (1990). Intrasentential code-switching and the socioeconomic perspective. In J. J. Bergen (Ed.), *Spanish in the United States: Sociolinguistic issues* (pp. 59–66). Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.

Jaramillo, J. A. (1990). Domain constraints on the use of *tú* and *usted.* In J. J. Bergen (Ed.), *Spanish in the United States: Sociolinguistic issues* (pp. 14–22). Washington, D.C: Georgetown University Press.

Kramsch, C. J. (2002). *Language acquisition and language socialization: Ecological perspectives.* London: Continuum.

Kulick D. (2006). Theory in furs: Masochist Anthropology. *Current Anthropology, 47,* 933–952.

Kulick, D., & Schieffelin, B.B. (2004). Language socialization. In A. Duranti (Ed.), *A companion to linguistic anthropology* (pp. 496–517). Oxford, UK: Blackwell.

Kyratzis, A. (2001a). Children's gender indexing in language: From the separate worlds hypothesis to considerations of culture, context, and power. *Research on Language and Social Interaction, 34*(1), 1–13.

Kyratzis, A. (2001b). Emotion talk in preschool same-sex friendship groups: Fluidity over time and context. *Early Education & Development, 12*(3), 359–390.

Kyratzis, A. (2004). Talk and interaction among children and the co-construction of peer groups and peer culture. *Annual Review of Anthropology, 33,* 625–649.

Lauria, A. (1964). "Respeto," "Relajo" and inter-personal relations in Puerto Rico. *Anthropological Quarterly, 37*(2), 53–67.

Macbeth, D. (2003). Hugh Mehan's Learning Lessons reconsidered: On the differences between the naturalistic and critical analysis of classroom discourse. *American Educational Research Journal, 40*(1), 239–280.

Mead, G. H., & Murphy, A. E. (1932). *The philosophy of the present.* Chicago: Open Court.

Mead, M. (1950). *Sex and temperament in three primitive societies.* New York: New American Library.

Mehan, H. (1979). *Learning lessons: Social organization in the classroom.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Mendoza-Denton, N. (1999a). Fighting words: Latina girls, gangs, and language attitudes. In D. L. Galindo & M. D. Gonzales (Eds.), *Speaking Chicana: Voice, power, and identity* (pp. 39–56). Tucson: University of Arizona Press.

Mendoza-Denton, N. (1999b). Sociolinguistics and linguistic anthropology of U.S. Latinos. *Annual Review of Anthropology, 28*(1), 375–395.

Mendoza-Denton, N. (1999c). Turn-initial no: Collaborative opposition among Latina adolescents. In M. Bucholtz, A. C. Liang, & L. A. Sutton (Eds.), *Reinventing identities: The gendered self in discourse* (Vol. 1, pp. 273–292). New York: Oxford University Press.

Mercado, C. I. (2005). Seeing what's there: Latino and literacy funds of knowledge in New York Puerto Rican homes. In A. C. Zentella (Ed.), *Building on strength: Language and literacy in Latino families and communities* (pp. 134–147). New York: Teachers College Press.

Moll, L. C. (Ed.). (1990). *Vygotsky and education: Instructional implications and applications of sociohistorical psychology.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Moreno, R. P. (2002). Teaching the alphabet: An exploratory look at maternal instruction in Mexican American families. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences, 24*(2), 191–205.

Ochs, E. (1988). *Culture and language development: Language acquisition and language socialization in a Samoan village.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Ochs, E. (2002). Becoming a speaker of culture. In C. J. Kramsch (Ed.), *Language acquisition and language socialization: Ecological perspectives* (pp. 99–120). New York: Continuum.

Ochs, E., & Schieffelin, B. B. (1979). *Developmental pragmatics.* New York: Academic Press.

Ochs, E., & Schieffelin, B. B. (1984). Language acquisition and socialization: Three developmental stories and their implications. In R. A. Shweder & R. A. LeVine (Eds.), *Culture theory: Essays on mind, self, and emotion* (pp. 276–320). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Paredes, A. (1977). On the ethnographic work among minority groups: A folklorist's perspective, *New Scholar, 6,* 1–32.

Pease-Alvarez, L. (2002). Moving beyond linear trajectories of language shift and bilingual language socialization. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences, 24*(2), 114–137.

Peñalosa, F. (1980). *Chicano sociolinguistics: A brief introduction.* Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Perez-Granados, D. R. (2002). Normative scripts for object labeling during a play activity: Mother-child and sibling conversations in Mexican-descent families. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences, 24*(2), 164–190.

Philips, S. U. (1983). *The invisible culture: Communication in classroom and community on the Warm Springs Indian Reservation.* New York: Longman.

Pratt, M. L. (1987). Linguistic utopias. In N. Fabb, D Attridge, A. Durant, & C. McCabe (Eds.), *The linguistics of writing: Arguments between language and literature* (pp. 48–66). Manchester, UK: Manchester University Press.

Pye, C. (1980). *The acquisition of grammatical morphemes in Quiché Mayan.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Pittsburgh, PA.

Pye, C. (1983). Mayan Telegraphese: Intonational determinants of inflectional development in Quiche Mayan. *Language, 59*(3), 583–604.

Relaño-Pastor, A. M. (2005). The language socialization experiences of Latina mothers in Southern California. In A. C. Zentella (Ed.), *Building on strength: Language and literacy in Latino families and communities* (pp. 148–161). New York: Teachers College Press.

Rodriguez, M. V. (2005). Dominican children with special needs in New York City: Language and literacy practices. In A. C. Zentella (Ed.), *Building on strength: Language and literacy in Latino families and communities* (pp. 119–133). New York: Teachers College Press.

Rosaldo, R. (1989/1993). *Culture and truth: The remaking of social analysis.* Boston: Beacon Press.

Rosales, A. (1997). *Chicano! The history of the Mexican-American civil rights movements.* Houston, TX: Arte Público Press/University of Houston.

Rymes, B. (1996). Naming as social practice: The case of Little Creeper from Diamond Street. *Language in Society, 25*(2), 237–260.

Rymes, B. (1997). Second language socialization: A+ new approach to second language acquisition research. *Journal of Intensive English studies, 11,* 143–155.

Rymes, B. (2001). *Conversational borderlands: Language and identity in an alternative urban high school.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Rymes, B., & Pash, D. (2001). Questioning identity: The case of one second-language learner. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly, 32*(3), 276–300.

Schecter, S. R., & Bayley, R. (2002). *Language as cultural practice: Mexicanos en el norte.* Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Schieffelin, B. B. (2002). Marking time: The dichotomizing discourse of multiple temporalities. *Current Anthropology, 43*(5–17).

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

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

Schumann, J. H. (1978). The Acculturation model for second-language acquisition. In G. Gingras (Ed.), *Second language acquisition and foreign language teaching* (pp. 27–50). Washington DC: Center for Applied Linguistics.

Silva-Corvalán, C. (1991). Spanish language attrition in a contact situation with English. In H. W. Selinger & R. M. Vago (Eds.), *First language attrition* (pp. 151–174). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Silva-Corvalán, C. (1994). *Language contact and change: Spanish in Los Angeles*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Soto, L. D. (2007). (Ed.). *The Praeger handbook of Latino education in the U.S.* Westport, CT: Praeger.

Trueba, H. T. (2002). Multiple ethnic, racial, and cultural identities in action: From marginality to a new cultural capital in modern society. *Journal of Latinos and Education, 1*(1), 7–28.

Valdés, G. (1981). Code switching as a deliberate verbal strategy: A microanalysis of direct and indirect requests among Chicano bilingual speakers. In R. P. Durán (Ed.), *Latino language and communicative behavior* (pp. 95–107). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Valdés, G. (1996). *Con respeto: Bridging the distances between culturally diverse families and schools: An ethnographic portrait*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Valencia, R. R. (1997). *The evolution of deficit thinking: Educational thought and practice*. Washington, DC: Falmer Press.

Valencia, R. R. (Ed.). (2002). *Chicano school failure and success: Past, present, and future* (2nd ed.). New York: Falmer Press.

Vásquez, O. A., Pease-Alvarez, L., & Shannon, S. M. (1994). *Pushing boundaries: Language and culture in a Mexicano community*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Vigil, E. (1999). *The crusade for justice: Chicano militancy and the government's war on dissent*. Madison: The University of Wisconsin.

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

Watson-Gegeo, K. A. (2004). Mind, language, and epistemology: Toward a language socialization paradigm for SLA. *The Modern Language Journal, 88*(3), 331–350.

Willet, J. (1995). Becoming first graders in an L2: An ethnographic study of L2 socialization. *TESOL Quarterly, 29*(3), 473–503.

Wong-Fillmore, L. (1992). Learning a language from learners. In C. J. Kramsch & S. McConnell-Ginet (Eds.), *Text and context: Cross-disciplinary perspectives on language study* (pp. 46–66). Lexington, MA: D.C. Heath.

Yang, W. (2004). *Taking over: The struggle to transform an urban school system*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of California, Berkeley.

Zentella, A. C. (1981). *"Hablamos los dos. We speak both": Growing in el barrio*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.

Zentella, A. C. (1997). *Growing up bilingual: Puerto Rican children in New York*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Zentella, A. C. (Ed.). (2005). *Building on strength: Language and literacy in Latino families and communities*. New York: Teachers College Press.