SECTION C: SOCIAL PERSPECTIVES ON FORMULAIC LANGUAGE

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190512000049 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Annual Review of Applied Linguistics (2012), **32**, 173–188.
© Cambridge University Press, 2012, 0267-1905/12 $16.00
doi: 10.1017/S0267190512000049

Formulaic Language in Language Socialization

Matthew Burdelski and Haruko Minegishi Cook

This article reviews recent research on the roles of formulaic language in language socialization theory and research from the point of view that formulaic language is a chunk of language (e.g., one word, string of several words) repeatedly used in verbal routines and other contexts. Although the notion of formulaic language is not always explicitly discussed in the literature of language socialization, previous research suggests that formulaic language is indeed an important notion within the theory of language socialization, for it often plays a crucial role in socializing novices to social dimensions such as politeness, hierarchy, and social identities including social roles and statuses, and relationships. This article first provides a brief introduction of language socialization theory, its research methods, and recent developments. It then reviews recent language socialization research on formulaic language in first and second language (L1, L2) and heritage language environments, including how novices are socialized to use formulaic language, how they are socialized through its use, and how they actually use it in normative and novel ways in participating in social interaction with experts and/or peers. Finally, the major findings of recent studies are summarized, and the article concludes by suggesting several directions for further research on formulaic language in language socialization.

Formulaic language is an important notion within the theory of language socialization. By formulaic language, we mean lexical chunks—including one word, phrase, or a string of a few words—often used in verbal routines (Schieffelin & Ochs, 1986a) or interactional routines (de León, 2012; Peters & Boggs, 1986). While other approaches such as psycholinguistics and corpus linguistics define formulaic language as a sequence "stored and retrieved whole from memory at the time of use" (Wray & Perkins, 2000, p. 1), from the perspective of language socialization, we consider lexical chunks to be formulaic due to their repeated use in such routines and other recurring contexts. It has been widely observed that in communities across the globe novices acquire language and sociocultural knowledge through participation in routines with more proficient and knowledgeable members of their community. According to Schieffelin and Ochs (1986a), such routines "may involve a member (e.g., caregiver) modeling something to be said and directing the child to repeat it" or "may simply involve

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190512000049 Published online by Cambridge University Press

repeated performances of an action or sequence of actions" (p. 172). Formulaic language, which may be part of such routines, is a powerful means and end of socialization. First, as with other language resources and practices, formulaic language is an end of socialization in the sense that it is something novices have to learn to use in grammatically, pragmatically, and sequentially relevant ways, "as a means of engaging with others in the course of—indeed, in the constitution of—everyday interaction and activities" (Garrett, 2008, p. 190). Second, formulaic language is also a means of socialization in the sense that it is a resource for conveying to novices the norm, values, identities, and stances of members of the target community.

This article discusses formulaic language in language socialization theory and research. It first provides a brief introduction of language socialization theory. It then reviews recent language socialization research on formulaic language, including how novices are socialized to use it, how they are socialized through its use, and how they actually use it in normative and novel ways in order to participate in social interaction and construct their own social worlds. It is important to note here that while the notion of formulaic language is not always explicitly discussed in the literature on language socialization, in the research discussed below it is present either overtly or tangentially. This research suggests that formulaic language is indeed an important notion within the theory of language socialization, for it often plays a crucial role in socializing novices to social dimensions such as politeness, hierarchy, and social identities including social roles and statuses, and relationships. Finally, the article summarizes the findings and offers some directions for future research.

LANGUAGE SOCIALIZATION

Language socialization theory seeks to inform how novices acquire language and culture through participation in socioculturally organized activities (Garrett & Baquedano-López, 2002; Kulick & Schieffelin, 2004; Schieffelin & Ochs, 1986a, 1986b). Emerging out of research on children's first language (L1) acquisition in the 1970s and early 1980s, language socialization has its roots in linguistic anthropology, but draws upon other theories and methodologies that examine the coconstruction of meaning and meaningful realities, including child language studies (e.g., Snow & Ferguson, 1977), Soviet psychology (e.g., Vygotsky, 1978), conversation analysis (e.g., Sacks, Schegloff, & Jefferson, 1974), and cultural psychology (e.g., Lave & Wenger, 1991). The claim that language and cultural meaning are acquired in social interaction is compatible with Bourdieu's notion of *habitus*, which is defined as "a set of dispositions acquired through (formative) early experiences, which incline individual actors to behave in certain ways" (Bourdieu, 1991, pp. 12–13). Language socialization seeks to account for how habitus is produced and reproduced and how it is negotiated and transformed over time (Ochs, Solomon, & Sterponi, 2005).

Language socialization is concerned with two central areas of socialization: "*socialization through the use of language* and *socialization to use language*" [original italics] (Schieffelin & Ochs, 1986a, p. 163). That is, as children and

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190512000049 Published online by Cambridge University Press

other novices learn to use language, they learn how to think, feel, and act in accordance with the values, ideologies, and traditions of the community or social group. In this way, novices' acquisition of language goes hand-in-hand with acquiring "culturally specific subjectivities" (Kulick & Schieffelin, 2004, p. 351). How is this achieved? Ochs (1996, 2002) explained that, in addition to temporal and spatial dimensions, language (verbal and nonverbal signs) directly indexes socioculturally meaningful realities, including social acts (socially recognized goal-oriented utterances such as a request or compliment), and stances (affective and epistemic), which can further index identities (e.g., social roles, status, relationship, and gender) and activities (sequences of actions). In this way, language is a contextual cue (Gumperz, 1982) and thus participates in a process of entextualization (Bauman & Briggs, 1990), whereby language forms come to be associated with certain genres, events, and other meaningful realities (e.g., Hanks, 1996; Silverstein, 1976, 2003). The impact of indexicality on the process of language socialization is immense, as "the greatest part of sociocultural information is keyed *implicitly*, through language use" (Ochs, 1990, p. 291). Indexical meanings are typically not explicitly stated but are implicitly conveyed through language use. Novices have to learn how to interpret and use language in relation to its indexical meanings, which occurs in social interaction.

The research methods central to language socialization studies involve ethnography and linguistic analysis (Garrett, 2008; Garrett & Baquedano-López, 2002; Kulick & Schieffelin, 2004). These methods include longitudinal observations, audiovisually recording and transcribing naturally occurring interaction, and analysis of the data with attention to both micro- and macro-levels of context. Data are mainly analyzed in a qualitative (and in some cases a quantitative) way as researchers look for recurring discursive practices between experts and novices and attempt to account for how these practices are associated with the social norms and ethnotheories of the local community. Ethnographic observations provide insight into macro-level features of context, whereas qualitative analyses of participants' interactions elucidate micro-level patterns of linguistic and nonlinguistic use that are framed by the macro-context. In these ways, language socialization researchers try to connect the micro-organization of interaction to the macro-organization of society. Not all researchers, however, draw upon all of the above methods (Garrett, 2008). Some researchers, particularly in education, may conduct a "macro-level tracking of the reproduction or transformation of ideologies, languages and other behavior" or may examine learners' "participation more globally within their evolving communities of practice" (Duff, 2007, p. 317). In other words, such language socialization researchers attempt to shed light on the reproduction or transformation of language ideologies and practices of a community at a macro-level, rather than examining the details of expert-novice interaction on a micro-level.

Although they are often referred to as novices, learners are not viewed as empty vessels into which language and culture are simply poured (Kulick & Schieffelin, 2004). Rather, they are active agents who socialize caregivers, siblings, and peers (e.g., Goodwin & Kyratzis, 2012; Reynolds, 2008), as well as teachers, co-workers, and others, and may resist and contest the language practices that others attempt to socialize them into (e.g., Duff, 2010).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190512000049 Published online by Cambridge University Press

As mentioned earlier, while early language socialization research primarily examined young children's socialization to their first language and culture in and around the household (Ochs, 1988; Schieffelin, 1990; Schieffelin & Ochs, 1986b), language socialization extends to "the life span process of becoming an active, competent participant" (Ochs, 2001, p. 227), as individuals enter new communities of practice (Lave & Wenger, 1991), such as workplaces, university clubs, or online groups, that require different ways of acting, thinking, and speaking, and the use of new codes and registers (Duff, 2007; Dunn, 2011). Over the last several years, an increasing number of new and established scholars in fields such as applied linguistics, linguistic anthropology, and education in North America, Europe, and Asia have pursued language socialization research in societies across the globe (see Bayley & Schecter, 2003; Duff & Hornberger, 2008; Duranti, Ochs, & Schieffelin, 2012). Although the household and its surround remain an important setting of language socialization, research has examined a range of other settings. In particular, studies have examined classrooms and other contexts of formal instruction (e.g., Baquedano-López, 2000, 2008; Cook, 1996, 1999; He, 2004; Howard, 2004, 2009; Moore, 2006, 2008; Rymes, 2008; Sterponi & Santagata, 2000), playgrounds and other outdoor spaces (e.g., García Sánchez, 2005; Griswold, 2007; Paugh, 2005), and online communities (e.g., Potts, 2005; Thorne, Black, & Sykes, 2009). Some research has examined indigenous groups (Field, 2001; Pesco & Crago, 2008) and children and adults with social and mental developmental disorders such as schizophrenia (Walsh, 2008) and autism (e.g., Ochs, Kremer-Sadlik, Sirota, & Solomon, 2004; Sirota, 2004).

Language socialization research has also examined bilingual and multilingual communities (e.g., Garrett, 2006), as societies around the world have become more ethnically diverse (e.g., Bayley & Schecter, 2003; Duff, 2010). This research investigates the socialization of second language (L2; see Duff, 2010, 2012; Duff & Talmy, 2011) and heritage learners (e.g., He, 2008, 2012). The central areas of investigation include L2 children in classrooms (e.g., Cekaite, 2007; Kanagy, 1999) and religious and other educational settings (e.g., Moore, 2006, 2008); high school students (e.g., Duff, 2009) and college-aged adults inside and outside classrooms (e.g., Atkinson, 2003; Bronson & Watson-Gegeo, 2008; N. Morita, 2000, 2004; Ohta, 1999; Séror, 2009; Siegal, 1996) and in host-family homes abroad (e.g., Cook, 2008), immigrant L2 adult learners in the workplace (e.g., Duff, Wong, & Early, 2000; Li, 2000); and heritage children in households (e.g., Klein, 2009, E. Morita, 2003; Park, 2006, 2008; Song, 2009), classrooms (e.g., Fader, 2008; Friedman, 2010a, 2010b; He, 2003; Klein, in press), and extracurricular activities (Guardado, 2009). This body of research suggests various trajectories of socialization (Wortham, 2005) in which individuals are socialized across a number of activities and settings and may experience diverse and complex paths to linguistic and sociocultural competence. In L2 socialization the goals and outcomes are relatively fluid in comparison to L1 socialization. For example, adult L2 learners may resist socialization into the target community (e.g., Atkinson, 2003; Siegal, 1996) or may be excluded from the community, activities, or discourses through which language and culture are acquired (e.g., N. Morita, 2004).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190512000049 Published online by Cambridge University Press

SOCIALIZING NOVICES TO AND THROUGH FORMULAIC LANGUAGE

This section discusses studies that examine novices' socialization to formulaic language in L1, L2, and heritage language learning environments. This includes how children and adult novices are socialized to use formulaic language, what sorts of sociocultural meanings are indexed by formulaic language, and the kinds of communities in which it is used. As mentioned earlier, formulaic language is considered here to include lexical chunks such as one word, fixed expressions, and a string of up to a few words used repeatedly in interaction across various settings as an index of sociocultural meanings.

Politeness

Several language studies investigated politeness, which is a type of affective stance in the language socialization framework. In particular, so-called politeness routines (e.g., "please X", "thank you") have long been a focus of research in language socialization and related fields (see Li, 2008). These routines often have an adjacency pair (e.g., Schegloff, 2007) turn-taking structure (e.g., Speaker A: "I'm sorry," Speaker B: "That's okay").

In examining Japanese L1 and L2 children's socialization in households, playgrounds, and a preschool, Burdelski (2010, 2012, forthcoming) showed that caregivers, teachers, and siblings socialize children to use formulaic expressions such as *arigatoo* (thank you) for expressing appreciation for food and gifts, *doozo* (Here you are/Please have it) for offers of toys and food (or for compliances with requests for such objects), and *gomen(nasai)* or *gomen ne* (I'm sorry) for apologies for harming others. For instance, Burdelski (2010) showed that in addressing the entire class of preschool children, a teacher voiced a fictive recalcitrant child who refused to share toys. Following this, the teacher encouraged the students to align with the teacher's assessment that the child's response was *dame* (no good) and then demonstrated to the children how to share by pretending to hand over a toy while prompting (e.g., Demuth, 1986; Schieffelin, 1990) them to say *doozo* (Please have it) using a gentle sounding voice (e.g., Teacher: *Ne, otomodachi ga ka:::shite tte yuttara, Ja chotto dake doo::zo: tte*; "if a friend says, 'May (I) borrow it', (you) say, 'Just a little, please have it'."). In these ways, Japanese caregivers socialize children to use formulaic language to display a polite stance toward others, which includes being "kind" (*shinsetsuna*) and "considerate" (*omoiyarinoaru*; Pizziconi, 2007, p. 219) of their needs and wants.

In relation to this, in another study Burdelski (in press) showed that Japanese caregivers socialize children to say some of the same polite expressions, namely apologies (e.g., *Gomennasai* [I'm sorry]), to nonhuman addressees including pets and other animals, flowers and plants, food, stones, bugs, and deity figures. For instance, in an example in which a mother, aunt, and two boys were visiting a shrine, after the older boy (four years old) kicked toward a fox statue (a traditional guardian figure in Shinto, the indigenous religion of Japan), his mother and aunt sanctioned him, and the aunt prompted him to apologize to the statue (Aunt: *Gomennasai yuttoki*; "Say, 'I'm sorry [to the fox]'."). When the

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190512000049 Published online by Cambridge University Press

child repeated the apology expression, the mother voiced the fox's formulaic response, *ii yo* (It's okay), using reported speech as an expression of forgiveness (Mother: *Ii yo tte yuttekureteharu yo, kitto*; "It's surely saying 'It's okay'."). His analysis shows that in encouraging children to say formulaic expressions to nonanimate entities, Japanese caregivers also socialize children to relationships and defining the scope of the social world.

In another study, Dunn (2011) examined the training of Japanese L1 adults in business manner courses to use polite, honorific language in speaking to customers. In particular, Dunn showed that this training involves instruction in how to use "cushion phrases" (p. 3648) that function as a negative politeness strategy preceding a face-threatening act (Brown & Levinson, 1987) such as a personal question or request. Such phrases include the set expressions, *Osoreirimasu ga* (I am fearful but. . .), *Shirtsurei desu ga* (It is rude but. . .), and *Moshiwake gozaimasen ga* (There is no excuse but. . .), which neophyte employees may know tacitly but have rarely ever used. Dunn's analysis links the use of such expressions to politeness as conforming to norms and conventions of the business world. Dunn's findings suggest that adult Japanese L1 business trainees are socialized to use formulaic language in relation to becoming a member of a new community of practice.

Hierarchy

Some studies examine formulaic language in relation to hierarchy. In societies such as Japan, Thailand, Vietnam, and Korea, children may be socialized to use honorific formulaic expressions, such as kinship and other address/reference terms, greetings, and farewell expressions as a display of respect toward others (e.g., Howard, 2009, 2012). In particular, several studies examined the socialization of Korean heritage children (e.g., Byon, 2003; Park, 2006, 2008; Song, 2009). In Korean there are different sets of formulaic expressions used for addressing family members (in-group) and nonfamily members (out-group) who enter and leave the household. The latter include honorific markers that index respect and deference toward the addressee. Such expressions are also used when addressing grandparents, who have the highest status in the Korean family. Korean heritage children are socialized to use these formulaic expressions (along with bowing) in addressing grandparents from a young age.

Park (2006) examined socialization of Korean heritage language children in the United States to use honorifics. In this study, Park showed how a mother socialized her female child (Natalie) to a say an honorific farewell phrase to the grandmother who was leaving the house after a visit. When Natalie produced the incorrect formulaic expression (i.e., the one used when addressing someone coming into the house), the mother recast the expression for the child by saying the formulaic farewell phrase (*Annyeonghi danyeo ose-yo*; "Go and return peacefully"), employing the honorific marker *–yo* from the child's perspective. Park shows that when Natalie repeated the expression, the mother continued by prompting Natalie what to say as a reminder (*Danyeo ose-yo geureoneun geoya*; "(You) should say, 'Go and return'."). Park's study suggests that Korean heritage children are socialized to use formulaic language with higher status addressees

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190512000049 Published online by Cambridge University Press

to display respect and deference, and to understand the self within a relational social hierarchy.

In another study of Korean heritage children in the United States, Song (2009) examined the socialization of honorific reference and address terms (also see E. Morita [2003] on Japanese heritage children's use of these terms). In particular, Song showed that Korean mothers socialize children to refer to and address older peers using honorific kinship terms (e.g., *Nuna*, "elder sister"; *hyeng*, "elder brother") through prompting, modeling, and recasting. For instance, when a child (Joonho, five years old) was recalling to his mother an event of the school day involving a male friend (Sicheol, six years old) using the child's first name, the mother recast his utterance to include an honorific kinship term *hyeng* ("older brother") (Mother: *Sicheol hyenga maliya*? *Sicheol hyengaka way wulessnuntey*? "You mean Sicheol *hyeng*? Why did Sicheol *hyeng* cry?"). The child immediately incorporated this honorific kinship term into his next utterance (*waynyahamyen Sicheol hyengi keympoi kaciko nollyeko hayssnuntey, kaciko kasse*. "Because Sicheol *hyeng* wanted to play with the Game Boy, but [a friend of his] took it away"). Similarly to societies such as Laos (Enfield, 2007), Song's study suggests that Korean caregivers socialize children to a view that reference terms "do more than just refer," rather they "instantiate and stabilize culture-specific views of the person" (Enfield, 2007, p. 97).

Song's (2009) analysis also shows how Korean heritage children are agents in the socialization process. In particular, Song observed that outside the context of his mother's instruction Joonho avoided using the honorific reference term *hyeng* when referring to or addressing his close friend Sicheol. By doing so, Joonho seemed to have rejected the social meaning indexed by this reference term that is relevant in a Korean context but not in an American one. Song reported that Joonho instead created a hybrid form in which he employed the friend's name, which was "distinct from the standard Korean pronunciation of this term as well as from the way English speakers usually pronounced Sicheol's name" (p. 223). Song's findings suggest that Korean-English bilingual children may invent their own address and reference terms in challenging social hierarchies that are prevalent in one of their languages but not in the other.

Social Identity

As suggested in the previous section, formulaic language also plays a role in many communities in socializing novices to identity, including social roles and statuses, and relationships. In relation to this, several studies also suggest that formulaic language plays a role in socializing novices to other aspects of identity, such as ethnicity, religion, and gender. For instance, in her study of a Hasidic Jewish community in New York City, Fader (2012) showed how at the beginning of mealtime a mother prompted her twin boys (one year, seven months old) several times to say a formulaic prayer word (*burikh* "blessed"), using an English command "say" followed by the target word (Mother: Say *burikh*), and also prompted them using the target word followed by rising intonation (Mother: *Burikh*?). According to Fader, in this community, Hasidic Yiddish functions as an index of religious, ethnic, and morally based aspects of identity, and more

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190512000049 Published online by Cambridge University Press

specifically in prayer at mealtime it functions in conveying positive feelings toward God for food. In this way, Fader's study suggests that by prompting young children to say a prayer word at mealtime, Hasidic Jewish caregivers socialize children to use formulaic language to index not only an activity (e.g., mealtime) and action (e.g., thankfulness) but also affect and religious and ethnic identity.

Formulaic language also plays a role in socializing novices to gender identity. In particular, in their study of L1 and L2 children in a Japanese preschool, Burdelski and Mitsuhashi (2010) showed that preschool teachers often address girls using the adjective *kawaii* (cute, lovable, adorable) toward things such as clothes, accessories (decorated with animated characters, flowers, and the like), and particular nonverbal actions (e.g., smiling face or interesting poses). When it is used on its own in interaction (or together with the final particle *ne* "isn't it?"), the word *kawaii* not only is an adjectival predicate (It's cute), but also performs the social action of assessment (e.g., Pomerantz, 1984). While Burdelski and Mitsuhashi found that it is not the case that boys are never the objects of teacher assessments with *kawaii*, it was the girls, both L1 and L2 children, who appropriated and elaborated on the word *kawaii* in both verbal and nonverbal ways, especially by making assessments of themselves and addressees in interaction with female peers. In this way, Burdelski and Mitsuhashi's study suggests that female children deploy the formulaic word *kawaii* together with other language resources as a particular social action (assessment) to index affect and gender.

CHILDREN'S USE OF FORMULAIC LANGUAGE

This section discusses recent research that sheds light on novices', particularly school-age children's, use of formulaic language especially as a resource for participating in social interaction and communities of practices, socializing others, and creating their own meanings and social worlds.

Several studies suggest that formulaic language is an important resource for participating in social interaction with family members, teachers and peers (e.g., Cekaite, 2007; Sirota, 2004). For example, in her study of 8- to 12-year-old L1 English-speaking children diagnosed with autistic disorder or Asperger's disorder (a related condition on the autism spectrum) in the United States, Sirota (2004) found that the children were able to produce a wide range of *positive politeness strategies* (Brown & Levinson, 1987) in family interaction with varying degrees of competence. In particular, Sirota showed that the children "accomplished overall" (p. 234) highly idiomatic language such as greetings, conventionalized agreement, offers, and compliments in sequentially and contextually appropriate ways, and "accomplished selectively" (p. 234) highly contingent language such as joking. Sirota's findings suggest that the autistic children were very competent at deploying formulaic polite expressions, but were less competent at using more open-ended and novel politeness strategies, which suggests that formulaic language may be acquired more easily.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190512000049 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Some studies examine children's use of formulaic language in participating in classroom interaction (Cekaite, 2007; Hawkins, 2005). For example, Cekaite (2007) recorded a 7-year-old Kurdish female child's use and acquisition of Swedish as an L2 in a classroom over a school year. She showed that, at an early phase (outset of the school year), the child (Fusi) had acquired a set of words in Swedish (e.g., *titta* [look], *har* [here], and *nej* [no]) that she combined with nonverbal behaviors to initiate "conventionalized phrases" such as "summonses, simple displays of disagreement, leave-taking, and greeting routines" (p. 49). During the middle phase (middle of the school year), Cekaite showed how Fusi used the set formula in Swedish "My name is X" to pretend to be another student, Rana (whose seat Fusi was sitting in) for the moment in initiating interaction with the teacher (Fusi: JAG HETER RANA! "MY NAME IS RANA!") (p. 50). She also showed that in the latter phase (end of school year), Fusi was able to use the formulaic expression in Swedish "I eight years old" (*Jag är x år*), which was modeled on "self-presentation routines" (p. 54), in order to do other social actions such as introduce a new topic into the classroom discourse and create oppositional moves to the teacher's claim that Fusi was seven years old, not 8. Cekaite's study suggests that formulaic language, particularly set phrases that require the substitution of a word, was an important resource used by an L2 learner over the course of a year to participate in classroom interaction and construct herself as a competent student.

In a study of interaction among Mayan children within a kinship network in a highland Guatemala town, Reynolds (2007) showed how the children used the Spanish polite formulaic greeting *Buenos días* (Good morning) in novel ways. For example, Reynolds shows how a boy used the greeting in a sarcastic way, together with a military salute that typically indexes respect and hierarchy, as a token insult to his younger male sibling who had slapped him on the back. Reynolds observed that this use of the formulaic expression *Buenos días* and accompanying gesture "violates both the indexical temporal grounding of the utterance, as it was spoken in the early afternoon, and the implied relationship between addresser and addressee" (p. 447). Moreover, she shows that following this episode the expression became coined as a ritual insult used among other children in the network including girls, who combined it with impolite address terms in addressing a male peer. In these ways, Reynolds's study suggests that children may use formulaic language in novel ways together with other verbal and nonverbal resources to tease, shame, and instigate arguments in conflict talk with peers, and thereby construct their own social worlds. Reynolds's study on Mayan children's use of the formulaic expression *Buenos días* in creative ways resonates with prior research on language play (see Bell, this volume).

Finally, in another study of peer interaction, this time L2 speakers of English (ESL) in the United States, García Sánchez (2005) examined ways the children used formulaic phrases, such as "You're out," "Shut up," and "You're cheating" in responding to other children's rule violations in a game of hopscotch. In particular, García Sánchez showed how the children used exact repetition and format tying (i.e., repetition of part of the prior speaker's turn with additions or slight transformations; Goodwin, 1990). In these ways, the children used each other's utterances as a template to build their own utterances within conflict

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190512000049 Published online by Cambridge University Press

talk. García Sánchez further observed that such episodes provide opportunities not only for language use and learning in an L2 but also "socialization into local notions of fair play and respectful treatment of others" (p. 69). This study suggests that the ESL children used formulaic language to socialize each other into an activity (e.g., gaming) and how to respond to rule violations in the peer group.

CONCLUSION

This article has discussed the theory of language socialization and recent research on formulaic language in language socialization. The research reviewed has investigated adult and child novices and experts speaking an L1, L2, and heritage language in various societies and settings including households, playgrounds, classrooms, and manners courses. Research suggests that formulaic language, including set phrases and expressions often with accompanying nonverbal actions that are more-or-less fixed, repetitive, and predictable plays an important role in language socialization. In particular, formulaic language is often something that novices have to learn to use in pragmatically and sociоculturally appropriate ways in order to participate in ordinary interaction and communities of practice. It is also a means of socializing novices to social, moral, religious, and emotional subjectivities, and to inculcating them into the norms, traditions, and rituals of their social group. However, novices are also agents in the process of socialization to formulaic language, and to language in general. In particular, they may refuse to use certain formulaic language in order to avoid the sociocultural meanings indexed by it (Song, 2009), or use formulaic language (together with gestures) in novel ways to challenge and transform the norms indexed by it and create their own indexical meanings and realities (Reynolds, 2007).

This research suggests several directions for further research on formulaic language in language socialization. In particular, research could explore socialization to formulaic language used in other oral genres, such as riddles, jokes, tongue twisters, puns, poems, stories, and ceremonial language. In this regard, it would be useful to know how novices are socialized to use formulaic language, and then use it in both normative and novel ways in their own speech or writing. Research could also explore socialization to formulaic language in computer-related discourse, virtual communication, and other settings mediated by technology in the socialization and construction of relationships and identity and participation in communities of practice (e.g., Thorne et al., 2009). While much research shows how novices are socialized to become speakers of formulaic language, further research could explore how novices learn formulaic language through other interactional roles such as observer and hearer (Goffman, 1981), which is particularly relevant in classrooms. Moreover, while much of the reviewed research deals with children (an exception is Dunn, 2011), it would be useful to know how L1 and L2 adult learners are socialized to use formulaic language especially when they enter new communities of practice (e.g., university clubs, workplaces). Finally, in order to build upon our current understanding of formulaic language in language socialization, researchers should continue to

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190512000049 Published online by Cambridge University Press

examine the verbal and nonverbal resources through which it is constituted and the local and broader situated contexts in which it is produced and embedded in everyday lives.

ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Burdelski, M. (2012). Language socialization and politeness routines. In A. Duranti, E. Ochs, & B. B. Schieffelin (Eds.), *The handbook of language socialization* (pp. 275–295). Malden, MA: Blackwell.

This article provides an overview of research on socialization to politeness routines in various communities and examines Japanese L1 and L2 socialization of children (two to five years old) in households and a preschool. The analysis shows the various types of formulaic expressions that children are socialized to say to others and presents three key verbal strategies caregivers deploy in this socialization, namely, speaking for a child, prompting, and reporting speech. The findings reveal that formulaic language is an important part of learning to become a speaker in Japanese society and a key resource for socializing children to affective stance and identity.

Park, E. (2006). Grandparents, grandchildren, and heritage language use in Korean. In K. Kondo-Brown (Ed.), *Heritage language development: Focus on East Asian immigrants* (pp. 57–86). Amsterdam, the Netherlands: John Benjamins.

This study examines the socialization to politeness of Korean heritage language children (two to four years old) in the United States. In particular it shows ways that parents and grandparents instruct children to use honorific greetings and farewells when addressing elder members of the household especially grandparents as an index of respect and deference. The findings reveal ways that formulaic language socializes Korean heritage children to conceptions of self as residing within a relational hierarchy.

Sirota, K. G. (2004). Positive politeness as discourse process: Politeness practices of high-functioning children with autism and Asperger syndrome. *Discourse Studies*, *6*, 229–241.

This research analyzes the politeness practices of L1 English-speaking children (eight to 12 years old) diagnosed with autistic disorder or with Asperger's disorder, a related condition on the autism spectrum. The analysis sheds light on children's sociocommunicative competencies in using a wide range of idiomatic and contingent politeness strategies in naturalistic everyday discourse. The findings suggest that children were most successful at producing the more formulaic politeness strategies, but less successful at producing the more novel strategies such as joking. The article carries forth Brown's (1995) call to examine the contextualized use of politeness forms as an interactional discourse process.

Song, J. (2009). Bilingual creativity and self-negotiation: Korean American children's language socialization into Korean address terms. In A. Reyes & A. Lo (Eds.), *Beyond yellow English: Toward a linguistic anthropology of Asian Pacific America* (pp. 213–232). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

This study examines the socialization of Korean heritage children in the United States. In particular, it shows the strategies that Korean caregivers deploy in encouraging children to use formulaic, honorific terms of address and reference when speaking to or about older peers. For example, caregivers prompt children and

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190512000049 Published online by Cambridge University Press

model what to say, and then recast their utterances to include another child's name followed by an honorific term meaning "older brother/sister." While one of the children examined used the honorific in instructional contexts, the child avoided the term in interaction with peers. Instead, he invented a hybrid form to refer to and address a close friend that was a combination of English and Korean pronunciation. This study suggests children's agency in using formulaic language to create their own meanings within the process of language socialization.

REFERENCES

Atkinson, D. (2003). Language socialization and dys-socialization in a South Indian college. In R. Bayley & S. R. Schecter (Eds.), *Language socialization in bilingual and multilingual societies* (pp. 147–164). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Baquedano-López, P. (2000). Narrating community in *doctrina* classes. *Narrative Inquiry*, *10*, 1–24.

Baquedano-López, P. (2008). The pragmatics of reading prayers: Learning the act of contrition in Spanish-based religious education classes (*doctrina*). *Text & Talk*, *28*, 582–602.

Bauman, R., & Briggs, C. (1990). Poetics and performance as critical perspective on language and social life. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, *19*, 55–88.

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

Bourdieu, P. (1991). *Language and symbolic power*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Bronson, M. C., & Watson-Gegeo, K. (2008). The critical moment: Language socialization and the (re)visioning of SLA. In P. Duff & N. H. Hornberger (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of language and education: Vol. 8. Language socialization* (2nd ed., pp. 1–13). New York, NY: Springer.

Brown, P. (1995). Politeness strategies and the attribution of intentions: The case of Tzeltal irony. In E. N. Goody (Ed.), *Social intelligence and interaction: Expressions and implication of the social bias in human intelligence* (pp. 153–174). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Burdelski, M. (2010). Socializing politeness routines: Action, other-orientation, and embodiment in a Japanese preschool. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *42*, 1606–1621.

Burdelski, M. (2012). Language socialization and politeness routines. In A. Duranti, E. Ochs, & B. B. Schieffelin (Eds.), *The handbook of language socialization* (pp. 275–295). Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Burdelski, M. (in press). "I'm sorry, flower": Socializing apology, relationships, and empathy in Japan. *Pragmatics and Society*.

Burdelski, M., & Mitsuhashi, K. (2010). "She thinks you're *kawaii*": Socializing affect, gender, and relationships in a Japanese preschool. *Language in Society*, *39*, 65–93.

Byon, A. S. (2003). Language socialisation and Korean as a heritage language: A study of Hawaiian classrooms. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, *16*, 269–283.

Cekaite, A. (2007). A child's development of interactional competence in a Swedish L2 classroom. *Modern Language Journal*, *91*, 45–62.

Cook, H. M. (1996). The use of addressee honorifics in Japanese elementary school classrooms. In N. Akatsuka, S. Iwasaki, & S. Strauss (Eds.), *Japanese/Korean Linguistics: Vol. 5* (pp. 67–81). Stanford, CA: Center for the Study of Language and Information.

Cook, H. M. (1999). Language socialization in Japanese elementary schools: Attentive listening and reaction turns. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *31*, 1443–1465.

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

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190512000049 Published online by Cambridge University Press

de León, L. (2012). Language socialization and multiparty participation frameworks. In A. Duranti, E. Ochs, & B. B. Schieffelin (Eds.), *The handbook of language socialization* (pp. 81–111). Malden, MA: Blackwell.
Demuth, K. (1986). Prompting routines in the language socialization of Basotho children. In B. B. Schieffelin & E. Ochs (Eds.), *Language socialization across cultures* (pp. 51–79). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
Duff, P. (2007). Second language socialization as sociocultural theory: Insights and issues. *Language Teaching*, *40*, 309–319.
Duff, P. (2009). Language socialization in a Canadian secondary school: Talking about current events. In R. Barnard & M. Torres-Guzman (Eds.), *Creating communities of learning in school* (pp. 165–185). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
Duff, P. (2010). Language socialization. In N. H. Hornberger & S. L. McKay (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics and language education* (pp. 427–454). Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.
Duff, P. (2012). Second language socialization. In A. Duranti, E. Ochs, & B. B. Schieffelin (Eds.), *The handbook of language socialization* (pp. 564–586). Malden, MA: Blackwell.
Duff, P. A., & Hornberger, N. H. (Eds.), (2008). *Encyclopedia of language and education: Vol. 8. Language socialization* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Springer.
Duff, P., & Talmy, S. (2011). Language socialization approaches to second language acquisition: Social, cultural, and linguistic development in additional languages. In D. Atkinson (Ed.), *Alternative approaches to SLA* (pp. 95–116). London, UK: Routledge.
Duff, P., Wong, P., & Early, M. (2000). Learning language for work and life: The linguistic socialization of immigrant Canadians seeking careers in healthcare. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, *57*, 9–57.
Dunn, C. D. (2011). Formal forms or verbal strategies? Politeness theory and Japanese business etiquette training. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *43*, 3643–3654.
Duranti, A., Ochs, E., & Schieffelin, B. B. (Eds.). (2012). *The handbook of language socialization*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
Enfield, N. J. (2007). Meanings of the unmarked: How "default" person reference does more than just refer. In N. Enfield & T. Stivers (Eds.), *Person reference in interaction: Linguistic, cultural, and social perspectives* (pp. 97–120). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
Fader, A. (2008). Reading Jewish signs: The socialization of multilingual literacies among Hasidic women and girls in Brooklyn, New York. *Text & Talk*, *28*, 621–641.
Fader, A. (2012). Language socialization and morality. In A. Duranti, E. Ochs, & B. B. Schieffelin (Eds.), *The handbook of language socialization* (pp. 322–340). Malden, MA: Blackwell.
Field, M. (2001). Triadic directives in Navajo language socialization. *Language in Society*, *30*, 29–263.
Friedman, D. A. (2010a). Becoming national: Classroom language socialization and political identities in the age of globalization. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, *30*, 193–210.
Friedman, D. A. (2010b). Speaking correctly: Error correction as a language socialization practice in a Ukrainian classroom. *Applied Linguistics*, *31*, 346–367.
García Sánchez, I. M. (2005). More than just games: Language socialization in an immigrant children's peer group. *Texas Linguistic Forum*, *49*, 61–71.
Garrett, P. B. (2006). What a language is good for: Language socialization, language shift, and the persistence of code-specific genres in St. Lucia. *Language in Society*, *34*, 327–361.
Garrett, P. B. (2008). Researching language socialization. In K. A. King & N. H. Hornberger (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of language and education: Vol. 10. Research methods in language and education* (2nd ed., pp. 189–201). New York, NY: Springer.
Garrett, P. B., & Baquedano-López, P. (2002). Language socialization: Reproduction and continuity, transformation and change. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, *31*, 339–361.
Goffman, E. (1981). *Forms of talk*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
Goodwin, M. H. (1990). *He-said-she-said: Talk as social organization among black children*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190512000049 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Goodwin, M. H., & Kyratzis, A. (2012). Peer language socialization. In A. Duranti, E. Ochs, & B. B. Schieffelin (Eds.), *The handbook of language socialization* (p. 365–390). Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Griswold, O. (2007). Achieving authority: Discursive practices in Russian girls' pretend play. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, *40*, 291–319.

Guardado, M. (2009). Speaking Spanish like a boy scout: Language socialization, resistance, and reproduction in a heritage language scout troop. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, *66*, 101–129.

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

Hanks, W. F. (1996). *Language and communicative practices*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Hawkins, M. R. (2005). Becoming a student: Identity work and academic literacies in early schooling. *TESOL Quarterly*, *39*, 59–82.

He, A. (2003). Novices and their speech roles in Chinese heritage language classes. In R. Bayley & S. R. Schecter (Eds.), *Language socialization in bilingual and multilingual societies*, (pp.128–145). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

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

He, A. (2008). Heritage language learning and socialization. In P. A. Duff & N. H. Hornberger (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of language and education: Vol. 8. Language socialization* (2nd ed., pp. 201–216). New York, NY: Springer.

He, A. (2012). Heritage language socialization. In A. Duranti, E. Ochs, & B. B. Schieffelin (Eds.), *The handbook of language socialization* (pp. 587–609). Oxford, UK: Blackwell.

Howard, K. M. (2004). Socializing respect at school in Northern Thailand. *Working Papers in Educational Linguistics*, *20*, 1–30.

Howard, K. M. (2009). "When meeting Khun teacher, each time we should pay respect": Standardizing respect in a Northern Thai classroom. *Linguistics and Education*, *20*, 254–272.

Howard, K. M. (2012). Language socialization and hierarchy. In A. Duranti, E. Ochs, & B. B. Schieffelin (Eds.), *The handbook of language socialization* (pp. 341–364). Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Kanagy, R. (1999). The socialization of Japanese immersion kindergartners through interactional routines. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *31*, 1467–1492.

Klein, W. L. (2009). Turban narratives: Discourses of identification and difference among Punjabi Sikh Families in Los Angeles. In A. Reyes & A. Lo (Eds.), *Beyond yellow English: Towards a linguistic anthropology of Asian Pacific America* (pp. 111–130). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Klein, W. L. (in press). Language ideologies and language socialization in a Sikh education program. *Heritage Language Journal*.

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

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

Li, D. (2000). The pragmatics of making requests in the L2 workplace: A case study of language socialization. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, *57*, 58–87.

Li, D. (2008). Pragmatic socialization. In P. A. Duff & N. H. Hornberger (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of language and education: Vol. 8. Language socialization* (2nd ed., pp. 71–83). New York, NY: Springer.

Moore, L. C. (2006). Learning by heart in Qur'anic and public schools in northern Cameroon. *Social Analysis: The International Journal of Cultural and Social Practice (Special issue: The Cultural Politics of Education and Religion)*, *50*, 209–226.

Moore, L. C. (2008). Body, text, and talk in Maroua Fulbe Qur'anic schooling. *Text & Talk*, *28*, 643–665.

Morita, E. (2003). Children's use of address and reference terms: Language socialization in a Japanese-English bilingual environment. *Multilingua*, *22*, 367–395.

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

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190512000049 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Morita, N. (2004). Negotiating participation and identity in second language academic communities.*TESOL Quarterly*, *38*, 573–603.
Ochs, E. (1988). *Culture and language development: Language acquisition and language socialization in a Samoan village*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
Ochs, E. (1990). Indexicality and socialization. In J. W. Stigler, R. A. Shweder, & G. Herdt (Eds.), *Cultural psychology: Essays on comparative human development*, (pp. 287–307). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
Ochs, E. (1996). Linguistic resources for socializing humanity. In J. J. Gumperz & S. C. Levinson (Eds.), *Rethinking linguistic relativity*, (pp.407–437). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
Ochs, E. (2001). *Socialization.* In A. Duranti (Ed.), *Key terms in language and culture* (pp. 227–230). Malden, MA: Blackwell.
Ochs, E. (2002). Becoming a speaker of culture. In C. J. Kramsch (Ed.), *Language acquisition and language socialization: Ecological perspectives* (pp. 99–120). London, UK: Continuum.
Ochs, E., Kremer-Sadlik, T., Sirota, K. G., & Solomon, O. (2004). Autism and the social world: An anthropological perspective. *Discourse Studies*, *6*, 147–183.
Ochs, E., Solomon, O., & Sterponi, L. (2005). Limitations and transformations of habitus in child-directed communication. *Discourse Studies*, *7*, 547–583.
Ohta, A. S. (1999). Interactional routines and the socialization of interactional style in adult learners of Japanese. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *31*, 1493–1512.
Park, E. (2006). Grandparents, grandchildren, and heritage language use in Korean. In K. Kondo-Brown (Ed.), *Heritage language development: Focus on East Asian immigrants* (pp. 57–86). Amsterdam, the Netherlands: John Benjamins.
Park, E. (2008). Intergenerational transmission of cultural values in Korean American families: An analysis of the verb suffix –ta. *Heritage Language Journal*, *6*, 21–53.
Paugh, A. L. (2005). Multilingual play: Children's code-switching, role play, and agency in Dominica, West Indies. *Language in Society*, *34*, 63–86.
Pesco, D., & Crago, M. (2008). Language socialization in Canadian Aboriginal communities. In P. A. Duff & N. H. Hornberger (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of language and education: Vol. 8. Language socialization* (2nd ed., pp. 273–285). New York, NY: Springer.
Peters, A. M., & Boggs, S. T. (1986). Interactional routines as cultural influences upon language acquisition. In B. B. Schieffelin & E. Ochs (Eds.), *Language socialization across cultures* (pp. 80–96). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
Pizziconi, B. (2007). The lexical mapping of politeness in British English and Japanese. *Journal of Politeness Research*, *3*, 207–241.
Pomerantz, A. (1984). Agreeing and disagreeing with assessments: Some features of preferred/dispreferred turn shapes. In J. M. Atkinson & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Structures of social action: Studies in conversation analysis* (pp. 57–101). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
Potts, D. (2005). Pedagogy, purpose, and the second language learner in online communities. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, *62*, 137–160.
Reynolds, J. F. (2007). "Buenos días/((military salute))": The natural history of a coined insult. Rese*arch on Language and Social Interaction*, *40*, 437–465.
Reynolds, J. F. (2008). Socializing *puros pericos* (little parrots): The negotiation of respect and responsibility in Antonero Mayan sibling and peer networks. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology*, *18*, 82–107.
Rymes, B. (2008). Language socialization and the linguistic anthropology of education. In P. A. Duff & N. H. Hornberger (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of language and education: Vol. 8. Language socialization* (pp. 29–42). New York, NY: Springer.
Sacks, H., Schegloff, E. A., & Jefferson, G. (1974). A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation. *Language*, *50*, 696–735.
Schegloff, E. A. (2007). *Sequence organization in interaction: A primer in conversation analysis: Vol. 1*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
Schieffelin, B. B. (1990). *The give and take of everyday life: Language socialization of Kaluli children*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190512000049 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Schieffelin, B. B., & Ochs, E. (1986a). Language socialization. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, *15*, 163–191.
Schieffelin, B. B., & Ochs, E. (Eds.), (1986b). *Language socialization across cultures*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
Séror, J. (2009). Institutional forces and L2 writing feedback in higher education. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, *66*, 203–232.
Siegal, M. (1996). The role of learner subjectivity in second language sociolinguistic competency: Western women learning Japanese. *Applied Linguistics*, *17*, 356–382.
Silverstein, M. (1976). Shifters, linguistic categories, and cultural description. In K. Basso & H. Selby (Eds.), *Meaning in anthropology* (pp. 11–55). Albuquerque, NM: University of New Mexico Press.
Silverstein, M. (2003). Indexical order and the dialectics of sociolinguistic life. *Language & Communication*, *23*, 193–229.
Sirota, K. G. (2004). Positive politeness as discourse process: Politeness practices of high-functioning children with autism and Asperger syndrome. *Discourse Studies*, *6*, 229–241.
Snow, G. E., & Ferguson, C. A. (Eds.). (1977). *Talking to children*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
Song, J. (2009). Bilingual creativity and self-negotiation: Korean American children's language socialization into Korean address terms. In A. Reyes & A. Lo (Eds.), *Beyond yellow English: Toward a linguistic anthropology of Asian Pacific America* (pp. 213–232). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
Sterponi, L., & Santagata, R. (2000). Mistakes in the classroom and at the dinner table: A comparison between socialization practices in Italy and the United States. *Crossroads of Language, Interaction, and Culture*, *3*, 57–72.
Thorne, S. L., Black, R. W., & Sykes, J. M. (2009). Second language use, socialization, and learning in Internet interest communities and online gaming. *Modern Language Journal*, *93*, 802–821.
Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
Walsh, I. (2008). Language socialization among people with mental disorders. In P. A. Duff & N. H. Hornberger (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of language and education: Vol. 8. Language socialization* (2nd ed., pp. 327–340). New York, NY: Springer.
Wray, A., & Perkins, M. (2000). The function of formulaic language: An integrated model. *Language & Communication*, *20*, 1–28.
Wortham, S. E. F. (2005). Socialization beyond the speech event. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology*, *15*, 95–112.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190512000049 Published online by Cambridge University Press