Plenary speeches

Second language socialization as sociocultural theory: Insights and issues

Patricia A. Duff University of British Columbia, Canada
patricia.duff@ubc.ca

This is a revised version of a plenary paper presented at the Pacific Second Language Research Forum (PacSLRF) and Australian Association of Applied Linguistics joint conferences at the University of Queensland, Australia, July 2006.

In this paper, I describe the relationship between language socialization and sociocultural theory (SCT) and the implications of this connection for second language socialization (SLS) studies. I first describe the theoretical compatibility of language socialization and SCT by examining the basic tenets of each and then also explore how language socialization scholars have explicitly or implicitly drawn on SCT and how SCT scholars, in turn, have positioned research on socialization with respect to their theory. Second, I illustrate two common current theoretical and analytic approaches to research in SLS that exemplify: (1) a focus on indexicality in language learning, and (2) a community of practice orientation to SLS, which also embraces sociocultural theory (Lave & Wenger 1991; Wenger 1998). Third, I illustrate how the community-of-practice approach, combined with SLS, helps account for findings in a sociocultural study of Korean exchange students' experiences of language and literacy socialization at a Canadian university. I conclude by suggesting future directions for SLS studies.

1. Introduction

Although the area of second language socialization (SLS) research is relatively new in applied linguistics (e.g., Duff 2003; Zuengler & Cole 2005), dating back to the early 1990s, it was established on the firm foundation of two decades of primary language socialization research from the 1970s. It was also based on scholarship emerging at the same time on cultural-historical or socio-historical theory, more commonly known as sociocultural theory (e.g., Lantolf & Thorne 2006). In this paper, I describe the relationship between SLS and sociocultural theory (SCT), points of convergence and divergence, and the implications of this connection for second language (L2) studies. As both strands of research become more mainstream in applied linguistics, I think it is important to understand better each of them and also their interconnectedness and points of difference. Furthermore, in the original plenary talk on which this paper is based, I was asked by conference organizers to speak about some aspect of sociocultural theory, in contrast to other invited speakers who spoke about such topics as age and the critical period for L2 learning (including neural perspectives), generative grammatical theory and L2 learning, and other more linguistic or cognitive-psychological approaches to second language acquisition. Since my own specialization is second language socialization, I have taken this opportunity to explore SLS in relation to SCT.

In what follows, I first explore the theoretical compatibility of language socialization and SCT by examining the origins and basic tenets of each. I then examine how language socialization scholars have drawn on SCT and how SCT scholars, in turn, have positioned research on socialization with respect to their theory. Second, I illustrate two common current analytic approaches to research in SLS that exemplify, respectively: (1) a focus on indexicality in language learning, and (2) a community of practice orientation to SLS (Lave & Wenger 1991; Wenger 1998), which embraces sociocultural theory to a greater extent than indexicality does. Third, I illustrate how the community-of-practice approach, combined with a second-language socialization perspective, helps account for findings in a study of Korean exchange students' experiences of language and literacy socialization at a Canadian university. I conclude by suggesting future directions for SLS studies.

2. Language socialization

In this section, I provide an introduction to first and second language socialization and its theoretical foundations, and also describe some of my own

PATRICIA A. DUFF is Professor and Distinguished University Scholar in the Department of Language and Literacy Education at the University of British Columbia. Her interests include second language socialization and qualitative research methods. Her recent books include Inference and generalizability in applied linguistics: Multiple perspectives *(co-edited with Micheline Chalhoub-Deville and Carol Chapelle, John Benjamins, 2006),* Encyclopedia of language and education*, vol. 8:* Language socialization *(in press; co-edited with Nancy Hornberger, Springer) and* Case study research in applied linguistics *(in press, Lawrence Erlbaum/Taylor & Francis).*

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444807004508 Published online by Cambridge University Press

previous research in this area. 'Language socialization' refers to the process by which novices or newcomers in a community or culture gain communicative competence, membership, and legitimacy in the group. It is a process that is mediated by language and whose goal is the mastery of linguistic conventions, pragmatics, the adoption of appropriate identities, stances (e.g., epistemic or empathetic) or ideologies, and other behaviors associated with the target group and its normative practices (Schieffelin & Ochs 1986; Schecter & Bayley 1997; Garrett & Baquedano-Lopez 2002; Ochs & Schieffelin in press; see reviews in Duff & Hornberger in press). Research in language socialization generally recognizes that language and literacy learning involves explicit or implicit socialization through linguistic and social interaction into relevant local communicative practices or ways of using language and into membership in particular cultures or communities, with their own values, ideologies, and activities. Often referred to as a new 'paradigm' by its proponents (e.g., Watson-Gegeo 2004; Duff & Hornberger in press), it is a means of foregrounding social, cultural, and linguistic knowledge and how it is gained, across a variety of language learning situations at various ages and stages of life.

Language socialization has its roots primarily in linguistic anthropology (Hymes 1972; Schieffelin & Ochs 1986) but also borrows from sociology (e.g., Bourdieu 1977), cultural psychology (Rogoff 1990, 1995), sociolinguistics, and perhaps to a lesser extent, education (see Duff & Hornberger in press). Early works on primary language socialization typically examined the interactional routines or speech acts to which young children were exposed from an early age and were expected to emulate or respond to appropriately, such as teasing, shaming, greeting, producing narratives, or expressing empathy toward others. In turn, first language LITERACY socialization examined, on the one hand, the congruence or incongruence of specific narrative and other interactive practices in the home connected with oral and written texts, and, on the other hand, the literacy practices inculcated and rewarded through formal education (Heath 1983; Duff in press a).

Second language socialization shares many of the same principles and objectives as first-language (L1) socialization but with the added complexity of dealing with children or adults who already possess a repertoire of linguistic, discursive, and cultural traditions and community affiliations when encountering new ones. The learners in SLS, like those undergoing L1 socialization, may be in home, school, peer-group, university, vocational, or workplace contexts, although SLS research to date has focused more on school-aged children and adolescents than on adults (Zuengler & Cole 2005; Duff in press b).

However, as I have argued elsewhere (e.g., Duff 2002, 2003, 2004, in press c), SLS participants, for a variety of reasons, may not experience the same degrees of access, acceptance, or accommodation within the new discourse communities as their L1 counterparts do. Some, of course, may be warmly embraced and supported by their new communities. Others may be highly motivated to become socialized into the norms and practices of new L2 communities but may face resistance or opposition from those expected to nurture them; or, regardless of the target community's attitudes toward them, they may not be fully invested in becoming socialized into the ways of this group because their future trajectories and goals may not require it, because they remain actively involved in and committed to their primary communities, or because they cannot straddle both simultaneously, for practical, logistical, or ideological reasons. Furthermore, they may have misgivings or feel conflicted or ambivalent about becoming fuller members in the new L2-mediated social worlds, as first-generation immigrants and expatriate workers often do.

SLS studies over the past ten to fifteen years have been conducted in a range of contexts. For example, they have examined immigrant and international English language learners in schools and universities; students learning languages other than English (e.g., Japanese) with a view to understanding how those languages encode affect, pragmatics, and grammatical and cultural meaning differently than students' L1; socialization to hybrid peer norms in virtual communities such as chatrooms (e.g., Lam in press); and L2 or bilingual academic or professional discourse socialization in higher education where people must learn to speak, think, write, and feel like historians, physicists, lawyers, doctors, call centre workers, and so on (Zuengler & Cole 2005; Duff & Hornberger in press; Duff in press b).

Furthermore, some of the SLS research has been situated in larger (macrosociological) contexts and discourses of sociopolitical transformation, as in my study of recitation practices in Hungary (Duff 1995, 1996). In that work I documented how, to be seen as competent Hungarians within the Hungarian education system (primary through tertiary level), students must know how to participate appropriately – quickly, effectively, concisely, and accurately – in all phases of a particular recitation activity, normally based on the previous lesson's content, which is practiced in almost every lesson and is known as the *felelés*. I also analyzed how, in the wake of macro-sociological changes connected with democratization in the post-1989 era, and with the introduction of Western-European languages in the curriculum in bilingual schools in particular, the centuries-old practice was being contested, transformed, and abandoned in some cases. These changes were most evident in the English-medium bilingual programs, even those taught by Hungarians who were also following the Hungarian curriculum content but doing so in English. Thus, the speech event encapsulated a great deal of sociocultural as well

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444807004508 Published online by Cambridge University Press

as sociolinguistic/pragmatic knowledge about the constitution and evaluation of educated Hungarians and also revealed how societal sociopolitical changes affect classroom discourse and vice versa.

In subsequent research, I have examined how high school students in Canada are socialized into highly intertextual discourse, fusing pop culture and academic discourse, in social studies classrooms (Duff 2004). I found that SLS can lead to variable outcomes for immigrant students depending not solely on how the local 'experts' (teachers and peers more proficient in English) attempt to socialize the newcomers into what the former deem to be 'appropriate' and valued local practices, but also depending on the agency and discernment of the latter groups regarding the practices they may wish to emulate and those they do not (Duff 2002).

To summarize, some of the key tenets of language socialization (see Garrett & Baquedano-Lopez 2002; Duff & Hornberger in press) follow:

- Social interaction contextualized within particular routine activities is a crucial aspect of cultivating communicative competence in one's first or additional languages and knowledge of the values, practices, identities, and stances of the target group.
- Experts or more proficient members of a group play a very important role in socializing novices and implicitly or explicitly teaching them to think, feel, and act in accordance with the values, ideologies, and traditions of the group. However, novices also 'teach' or convey to their more proficient interlocutors what their communicative needs are, and the process of socialization is therefore seen to be bidirectional – or multidirectional if multiple models of expertise co-exist.
- Language and other semiotic systems and tools mediate not only communication in general but specifically the learning of language and other cultural knowledge.
- Language learning and socialization is a lifelong process as we enter new communities of practice in which new ways of acting, communicating, and thinking are required and new codes, registers, genres, or literacies are given priority over others.
- Additional-language (e.g., L2) socialization does not necessarily lead to the reproduction of existing L2 cultural and discursive practices but may lead to other outcomes, such as hybrid practices, identities, and values; the incomplete or partial appropriation of the L2 and status within the L2 community; or rejection of target norms and practices.

3. Sociocultural theory

Although I am certainly not an expert in sociocultural theory, it has gained major attention across the humanities, social sciences, and education in the past two decades and has been championed in the field of applied linguistics by James Lantolf and his colleagues especially (e.g., Lantolf 2000; Lantolf & Thorne 2006, 2007). It is therefore important to understand its contribution to second language learning. Much of the work is grounded in the intellectual thought of Soviet psychologist Lev Vygotsky and his contemporaries and followers (e.g., Alexander Luria, Alexei N. Leontyev). These scholars were most concerned with L1 learning (cultural psychology) and activity theory in monolingual contexts in the (former) Soviet Union. Much of their scholarship only became accessible in English from the 1970s when it was translated into English from Russian (e.g., Vygotsky 1978). SCT is not a monolithic theory, however, and its proponents have varying degrees of allegiance to Vygotsky's original theoretical formulations or to psycholinguistics as opposed to more social interests and theory. 'Neo-Vygotskian' work has also taken SCT in different directions. In the following statement, Lantolf & Thorne (2006) acknowledge the multiple approaches all considered part of, or related to, SCT:

> While current SCT approaches include numerous and somewhat divergent emphases, all would agree with Wertsch (1985, p. 56) that 'the goal of [such] research is to understand the relationship between human MENTAL FUNCTIONING, on the one hand, and CULTURAL, HISTORICAL, AND INSTITUTIONAL SETTING, on the other'. (Lantolf & Thorne 2006: 3, emphasis added)

Indeed, in a colloquium at the America Association for Applied Linguistics in 2004, which Lantolf & Thorne also refer to, presenters Bonny Norton, Joan Kelly Hall, Amy Ohta, Steven Thorne, and I, together with organizers Zuengler & Cole (2004), all of whom consider our work to be 'sociocultural', acknowledged that we represented different but interrelated research foci, methods, and theory – and yet all embrace and attempt to theorize the highly social and situated nature of language learning in our research (in the case of Ohta, Zuengler & Cole, and Duff, frequently in terms of language socialization).

Such diversity perhaps prompted Lantolf & Thorne (2006) to make the following observation:

> Broader sociocultural theory . . . is concerned primarily with SOCIALIZATION and the DISCURSIVE CONSTRUCTION OF IDENTITIES (for example, gender, foreigner, native, worker, child, etc.) and is certainly commensurate with [our] intellectual project. (Lantolf & Thorne 2006: 2, emphasis added)

That is, they distinguish their specifically Vygotskian cultural-historical orientation to SCT from other contemporary, more identity-oriented, social theorizing in applied linguistics and language/literacy education that takes place under the 'sociocultural' banner (e.g., the Zuengler & Cole colloquium) with less attention paid to such Vygotskian notions as REGULATION by self, others, and by objects; the role of INNER SPEECH or PRIVATE SPEECH in learning,

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444807004508 Published online by Cambridge University Press

learning in the ZONE OF PROXIMAL DEVELOPMENT; or activity theory. Some people therefore are careful to differentiate Vygotskian SCT (e.g., Lantolf & Thorne 2006) from other forms of sociocultural theorizing. However, much early language socialization research (especially by Elinor Ochs) drew explicitly on SCT, although current first and second language socialization varies quite a bit in its adoption of Vygotskian psychology.

Some basic tenets of SCT, according to Lantolf & Thorne (2007), are the following:

- SCT is concerned with the development (or phylogenesis) of humans as a species; the development (sociocultural) of human cultures over time, the development of individuals during their lives (ontogenesis); and finally, 'the development of mental functions and processes over shorter periods of time' (Lantolf & Thorne 2006: 19). Most current SCT-informed research in applied linguistics focuses on this last aspect of learning.
- Human mental functioning is MEDIATED (or 'regulated') especially by language and other culturally constructed symbol systems (including literacy, gestures, narrative) and tools (e.g., computers, metaphors), and particularly through PRIVATE SPEECH and INNER SPEECH. SCT is essentially not about social or cultural aspects of learning but is 'a theory of mind' (p. 1), that is, a psycholinguistic theory.
- Human interaction is a fundamental aspect of learning, which provides occasions for OTHER-REGULATION or the scaffolding of people's behaviors, reasoning, and thus learning.
- The psychological process of INTERNALIZATION (also known as APPROPRIATION) and the facilitating role of imitation in the process ensues from interaction on the social plane. This is, the 'interpsychological' becomes the 'intrapsychological' (Lantolf & Thorne 2006: 153). According to Lantolf & Thorne (2006), the concept of internalization (from social to individual) is similar to, but also different from, social-constructionist notions of apprenticeship and guided participation (e.g., Rogoff 1995). They claim that internalization is by its very nature more transformational than apprenticeship is, which they construe to be more reproductive or transmission-oriented.
- Learning is therefore a socially constructed, historically (or temporally) situated cognitive phenomenon involving the various semiotic tools and artifacts that have been produced by communities over time.
- Language and learning are dialogical or dialectical processes.

4. Intersections between SLS and SCT

It should be clear from the brief overviews of language socialization and neo-Vygotskian SCT above that the two have much in common about their understanding of how language learning proceeds. Both have a social, cultural, interactional and cognitive orientation to language learning. They both also appreciate the importance of culturally organized activities and interactional routines in meaning-making and learning (including learning about language, culture, the structure of activities themselves, social status and hierarchy and social order, and other content). And finally, they both acknowledge the key role that is played by interlocutors, peers, relatives, caregivers, or teachers in helping novices reach their goals and potential by means of scaffolding or guided assistance. Learning, knowledge-construction, and socialization – that is, the development of the human mind and the socialized individual – are seen to be processes that are mutually engaged in by members in a community over time.

Now let's consider how first and second language socialization scholars have explicitly drawn on SCT. Ochs (1986: 2), in her introduction to Schieffelin & Ochs (1986), described socialization as follows:

> an interactional display (covert or overt) to a novice of expected ways of thinking, feeling, and acting [e.g., speaking] (Becker et al. 1961; Wentworth 1980). Following Wentworth, we say that social interactions themselves are sociocultural environments (Wentworth 1980, p. 68) and that through their participation in social interactions, children come to internalize and gain performance competence in these sociocultural defined contexts (Leontyev 1981; Vygotsky 1978).

Thus, Ochs cites Vygotsky and Leontyev, both of whom advocated for a non-behaviorist (i.e. a more cognitive), activity-oriented and culturally-responsive approach to psychology. In the same chapter, Ochs mentions Bruner's (1975, 1977) notion of scaffolding (Bruner himself an early SCT devotee) and Vygotsky's (1978) construct of the Zone of Proximal Development, the notion that 'that children develop social and cognitive skills through participating in structured cooperative interactions with more mature members of society' (Ochs 1986: 6).

In the introduction to her own book on culture and language development in Samoa, Ochs also presents a sociocultural framework or model for language acquisition, making a case for the 'interdependence of linguistic and sociocultural knowledge' (Ochs 1988: 14), and devotes more space to exploring the connection between activity (or praxis) and linguistic/sociocultural knowledge, and semiotic mediation of thought, again by drawing on Soviet psychology in the tradition of Vygotsky and his followers, as well as drawing on the 'practice theory' and 'theory of structuration' of sociologists Bourdieu (1977) and Giddens (1979), respectively. Likewise, Schieffelin (1990), in her book on language socialization among the Kaluli of Papua New Guinea, discusses the influences of the same theorists (except

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444807004508 Published online by Cambridge University Press

for Leontyev) on her work, and especially Giddens (1979, 1984).

Therefore, although SCT has had a major theoretical influence on the emerging field of language socialization, it is by no means the only theoretical influence. Other disciplines invoked by both Ochs and Schieffelin in their independent and collaborative writing include the following: anthropology, developmental and narrative psychology, sociology (especially practice theory and structuration/agency referred to above), literary theory (e.g., Bakhtin 1981), linguistics and sociolinguistics (functional linguistics and Hymesian and Gumperzian sociolinguistics), and other disciplines. Interestingly, however, in a more recent short, thirty-year retrospective essay on language socialization theory and research, Ochs & Schieffelin (in press) foreground the contributions of Bourdieu and Giddens (and others) but not Vygotsky.

In contrast, Garrett & Baquedano-Lopez (2002), language socialization researchers and linguistic anthropologists trained by Schieffelin and Ochs (respectively), in their comprehensive theoretical discussion of the state of the art in language socialization, are very explicit about the theoretical relevance of SCT:

> [P]ractice theory was a crucial element in the language socialization research paradigm's formulation . . . As such, it strongly complements socioculturally oriented theories of learning developed by the sociohistorical school of Soviet psychology, particularly in the work of Vygotsky, Luria, and Leontyev (Wertsch 1985), which in turn has stimulated much recent theory building by anthropologists and researchers in related disciplines (Engeström 1987; Rogoff 1990; Lave & Wenger 1991; Chaiklin & Lave 1993; Wenger 1998). (Garrett & Baquedano-Lopez 2002: 344)

Thus, much language socialization is BROADLY based on sociocultural theorizing (if not all aspects of SCT, such as inner or private speech), drawing on a number of emerging traditions, not limited to (neo-)Vygotskian cultural psychology/activity theory but certainly related to the social and cultural contexts of language learning and to the way language also helps create/transform those contexts and human understanding.

In what ways does current language socialization research NOT take up principles and constructs of SCT? In both L1 and L2 socialization, there has been less focus on mental representations, restructuring, or developing L2 systems than in either traditional second language acquisition or SCT. Instead, there has been more emphasis placed on ethnographic methodology and a commitment to community members' own (emic) perspectives of their learning. Also, there is perhaps more attention paid to the cultural significance of particular linguistic and activity structures than in purely Vygotskian SCT. And there has also been more attention paid to issues of transformation vs. reproduction in language patterns over time, especially in contexts of language shift (e.g., Garrett & Baquedano-Lopez 2002). Furthermore, more attention has been paid to sociopolitical processes in language and literacy learning and to the identities (stances, worldviews, and social roles) that are invoked or performed in different learning contexts.

5. Additional theoretical and analytical approaches to SLS

Having established some areas of overlap between Vygotskian SCT and SLS, let us now examine some other current major theoretical influences in SLS that are also 'sociocultural' in nature but not as closely associated with early twentieth-century Vygotskian SCT.

The first is from research in linguistic and semiotic anthropology with a focus on meaning-making systems, indexicality, and referential practices – such as deictics (*we/they*, *come/go*), honorifics, pronouns, sentence-final particles, gendered speech forms and practices (e.g., Cook in press). The second area of research is aligned to a greater extent with the field of education and incorporates Lave & Wenger's (1991) notion of community-of-practice (CoP; see also Wenger 1998). CoP highlights the importance of community membership and participation not only IN learning but AS learning.

5.1 Indexicality: The constitution of sociocultural knowledge and membership categories in linguistic signs

First, let us consider indexicality. One crucial aspect of language learning is that particular kinds of linguistic and non-linguistic cues help people understand the sociocultural contexts they are in or that are being referred to. Learners, like their mentors or interlocutors, must become very good at interpreting and using such cues appropriately. Since the early 1980s, interactional sociolinguists, linguistic anthropologists, and philosophers of language have stressed the importance of contextualization cues that help speakers and listeners understand what is being talked about, what genres or registers are being used, and so on (Gumperz 1982, 1992). A concept that corresponds to Gumperz's contextualization cues is known as INDEXICALITY. Peirce (1955), Silverstein (1976), Hanks (1992) and Ochs (1992) have all used this concept to discuss how linguistic signs, such as words or phrases, point to meanings (see Goodwin & Duranti 1992). They also note how the same signs also invoke or help constitute contexts. Analyses of indexicality have therefore also become common in language socialization research, for example, in relation to gender and other social or linguistic categories, or with respect to code choice itself, in contexts of code-switching. The use of one code

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444807004508 Published online by Cambridge University Press

(or language/register) indexes a particular kind of sociolinguistic context.

The concept might become clearer if we take a look at a few recent SLS studies that have incorporated socioculturally contextualized analyses of indexicality. He (2004) conducted a study in an American Chinese-heritage-language (community) after-school program and examined how personal pronouns in particular 'indexed' the collective ethnolinguistic, national ('Chinese') identity and morality that students were expected to adopt by their native Chinese teachers. It was actually a more ethnomethodological, conversation-analytic study of classroom discourse. However, He examined how the pronominal 'indexes' on the left in (1) below, were associated with the socialization of particular subjectivities or identities indicated on the right.

(1) *women* = 'we/us' = Chinese collective identity (for teacher)
tamen = 'they/them' = Americans (not 'us')

She also noted that the *we/us* vs. *them/they* dichotomy that the teacher was using was an oppositional one, positioning and socializing students as being 'Chinese' or 'American.' For the teacher, Americans and their schooling practices were *tamen* 'they/them'. But the children were using the Chinese pronoun *women* 'us/we' to refer to their American identities, not their Chinese ones.

When setting up an activity in which students would compete in two groups to produce Chinese words as quickly as possible, one girl declared 'shui shu shui jiu mai cookies yeh::' ('whoever loses buys cookies [for everybody]') and the teacher retorted as follows:

(2) Teacher: mai cookie? **Women** shi xuexi ah bu yong chi de
'Buy cookies? **We** are here to learn. We don't need food.'
Girl-4: zai zuexiao Mrs. Colon jiao **women** zhe yang
'At school Mrs. Colon asks **us** to do like this.'
Teacher: zheli- zheli uh shi zhongwen xuexiao ah **women** bu- **tamen** zhe yang **women** bu zhe yang ah
'It's Chinese School here. **We** don't- **They** do this (but) **we** don't.'
(adapted from He 2004: 575f.)
Boy?: Laoshi **women** yin le you extra credit ma?
'Teacher if **we** win do we have extra points?'
Boy-3: **Women** ying le jiu jia fen.
'**We** should receive extra points if (we) win.'
Teacher: **Nimen- women** bu young ah
'**You- we** don't need (to receive extra points).'
Zai xuexiao **tamen** gei jia fen ma?
'Do **they** give (you) extra points at school?'
Ss: ((inaudible))
Teacher: **Women** bu yong- no cookie no extra credit ok?
'**We** don't need- no cookie no extra credit ok?'
(adapted from He 2004: 576)

The teacher, through her use of the indexical pronouns *women* 'we' and *tamen* 'they', tried to stress the differences between Chinese schooling and American schooling, and thus the students' salient identities as Chinese in this heritage-language school context – a context in which food and extra points are not offered to students who win competitions as they are, apparently, in the children's American schools. As He (2004: 577) described the situation:

> [T]he students' self presentation appears to be multi-faceted and fluid; they categorize themselves as members of simultaneously-existing multiple groups and move in and out of groups with ease, aligning themselves with CLS [Chinese language school], their daytime school and/or their teacher at various points in time. The teacher, on the other hand, appears to categorize the students solely as members of CLS.

Ochs & Schieffelin (in press) suggest that such 'studies examine how teachers and other members of the community attempt to socialize diaspora children into affiliating with not only a community-relevant code repertoire [Chinese in this case] but also moral dispositions and social entitlements implicitly indexed through language socialization practices'.

A second example of indexicality comes from Japanese as a second/foreign language. Cook (2007, in press) has conducted research on indexicality in Japanese, not in diaspora contexts but in traditional second- and foreign-language learning situations both in and out of class. She and her colleagues have conducted research on a range of sentence-final particles or markers (*ne*, *yo*, *yo ne*, *and desho*(*o*)), not for their social deixis but for their affective and pragmatic effects. As Cook (2007) points out, *desho* with rising intonation is the Japanese 'tentative form of the copula' (something like the tag question, 'Isn't that right/so?'). It is also referred to as an evidential, which suggests a lack of certainty and seeks confirmation from an addressee. But the form is used to alter others' behavior as well. For example, Japanese mothers use *desho*(*o*) to convey to children what they are expected to understand. Cook's study took place in Japanese homestay situations in Tokyo where learners of Japanese were practicing their Japanese with host family members. She studied how host families used this same form (*desho*) with the Japanese L2 learners

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444807004508 Published online by Cambridge University Press

who stayed with them and in this way socialized them how to use this form appropriately. In her study of nine college-level English-L1 Japanese-L2 exchange students in Japan, Cook analyzed their production of *desho*(*o*) according to their level, revealing that novice learners never produced it, an intermediate learner over-produced it, and advanced learners produced it in an increasingly target-like manner, to index their knowledge about things Japanese or their growing expertise in making assertions about Japan using *desho*. However, in each family context, whether learners never used it or used it a lot, Cook had ample evidence that the learners were being socialized implicitly into the use of this form; it was frequently and emphatically used by all the host family members when talking with them about such topics as Japanese culture. However, only with considerable experience of learning the language were the learners able to use it appropriately themselves.

Thus the micro-analysis of recurring indexical 'signs' within socioculturally organized activities, such as the pronouns used in these examples of classroom interaction or evidentials in Japanese dinnertime conversations, can be mapped meaningfully onto macro-social categories (e.g., ethnicity or nation) and onto particular socio-affective/pragmatic stances in studies of SLS. For other examples of indexicality, see Lo's (2006) study examining indexical pronoun use in a Korean heritage-language context that is similar to He's (2004) and consult Rymes' (in press) useful overview of the relationship between semiotic anthropology, especially indexicality, the ethnography of communication, and language socialization.

5.2 A community-of-practice (CoP) orientation to SLS

The previous section showed how sociocultural knowledge and practices (e.g., particular uses of pronouns and evidentials) are constituted in interactions. I illustrated it with studies that do micro-linguistic analyses of certain words or phrases or oppositional pairs ('us/them') to understand the kinds of social and cultural knowledge they point to or represent. And it is precisely this kind of knowledge and the identities connected to it that learners in those contexts are being socialized into.

A second, parallel, and potentially complementary trend in SLS research is to analyze the activities and communities into which learners are being socialized to a greater extent. These studies then examine the processes that facilitate or obstruct learners' increasing legitimacy, participation, and identities within their new learning communities (Lave & Wenger 1991; Wenger 1998). As in the earlier SCT framework and related theories of practice, both of which contributed to it, the CoP approach maintains that 'joint enterprise' or mutual engagement in activity by 'oldtimers' and 'newcomers' provides the foundation for learning, and that practice (experience) and community belonging are key aspects of learning and identity formation as well. Whereas earlier work in language socialization was more anchored in the sociolinguistic constructs of SPEECH COMMUNITY or DISCOURSE COMMUNITY, much current SLS research has adopted the notion of COMMUNITY OF PRACTICE instead (or in addition to the other terms). CoP draws on Bourdieu's (1977) PRACTICE THEORY (Eckert 1999; Bronson & Watson-Gegeo in press).

SLS research in educational contexts oriented toward a CoP analysis asks the following questions:

- How do newcomers to an academic culture learn how to participate successfully in the oral and written discourse (and related practices) associated with that community or practice?
- How are newcomers explicitly or implicitly inducted or socialized into these local discursive practices? What effect do these experiences have on their evolving identities?
- How does interaction with their peers, instructors, tutors, and others facilitate the process of gaining expertise in those practices and thus full community membership?
- How do the practices and norms themselves evolve over time and across practitioners, given the cultural and historical context of the local community of practice?

For several years, graduate students at the University of British Columbia and I have been examining questions such as these within courses or programs (i.e. communities of practice) in a Canadian university with a mixture of domestic and international students (e.g., Morita 2000, 2004; Kobayashi 2003, 2004; Zappa-Hollman 2007). One of the main classroom practices or activities we have examined, following on my earlier work in Hungary and Canadian high school classrooms (e.g., Duff 1995, 2003), are oral academic presentations typically required in undergraduate and graduate courses. Another type of activity that has been productively studied is students' language socialization in online asynchronous course-related bulletin board discussions (e.g., Potts 2005; Yim 2005).

Some of our ongoing research with international exchange students from Japan, Korea, and Mexico aims to understand students' experiences with oral and written language in and out of class, their assignments, and the support (if any) provided to help them be successful students in their new academic community (Duff 2007). We are also examining the students' trajectories over the course of an academic year, in terms of their alignment or disalignment with the target community and its values, and their opportunities to use English with their Canadian-born English-speaking peers (as in Duff 2002, 2004).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444807004508 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Here I will simply provide a brief synopsis of the ongoing study with Korean undergraduate students in their local Canadian CoPs – which represented a complex intersection of related communities (dormitory communities, clubs, communities of Korean peers, and academic course communities). The Korean students were also engaged simultaneously in communities in Korea, Canada, and perhaps elsewhere. Based on interviews with 45 volunteer participants at different points during their academic year of studying in mainstream content courses, it became clear that the students enjoyed only limited (meaningful) access to local English-medium social networks and communities; for example, pressures of ingroup Korean-conformity and affiliation sometimes forced students to be less active in Anglo-community life, since the Korean affiliation and social networks were important for ensuring future careers and social connections in Korea. Furthermore, the younger Korean university students in the cohort in particular were required to show respect and deference to those older than them and that also necessitated using Korean with them and serving them in various ways, thus precluding greater involvement on the part of the younger students in English-speaking activities and communities.

However, in addition, the students found that, despite their initial intention to become affiliated with local Anglo-Canadian students and their peer groups, after just a few months almost all of the students had resigned themselves to the fact that their original goal was untenable. They had access issues and they felt that they had more in common socially, linguistically, and culturally with other Korean, Asian, or Korean-Canadian immigrant students than with their Anglo-Canadian counterparts.

Thus, their socialization within the Canadian university community, as it turned out, was not unidirectional, toward Anglo-Canadian CoP norms, but was multidirectional – that is, oriented toward Korean and non-Korean-Asian groups and languages, and their respective expectations. In fact, they found the most suitable language/culture brokers, or agents of SLS, to be Generation 1.5 Korean-Canadians who understood both Korean and English. (The term 'Generation 1.5' in the United States and Canada refers to children who immigrated as children or young adolescents, received some or all of their schooling in the immigrant context, and typically are quite fluent in oral English (but not necessarily in written registers) and are acculturated; they are therefore distinct in some ways from both first- and second-generation immigrants but typically have hybrid identities as both/neither Korean and/nor Canadian/American.) Ironically, the Korean international students considered their English-L1 peers to be less effective academic and linguistic mentors (or socializers), proofreaders, and so on. The local Canadian peers, furthermore, engaged in certain sociocultural practices, like watching TV wrestling or ice hockey together, that didn't appeal to the visiting Korean students. So the ethnically Asian, non-Anglo-Canadian groups the sojourners established connections with after several months in the country constituted a kind of 'third space' for the exchange students. In this third space, English was a lingua franca that co-existed with Asian languages, including Korean. However, the Korean students' perceptions, goals, and behaviors vis-à-vis their language socialization were also contingent on how they positioned themselves or were positioned by their interlocutors in their courses and in other social contexts. It remains to be seen how their new social networks, communities, practices, and identities endured after the students' return to Korea. Indeed, follow-up research would greatly facilitate the tracking of students' trajectories of socialization (Wortham 2005) and their interlinking communities of practice, mediated by Korean, English, a mixture of both, and perhaps other languages and literacies.

This, then, is one example of how the notion of community of practice can be used in language socialization research – at a more macro-social level of analysis and over time. In contrast, the studies with a focus on indexicality we examined focused on just a few linguistic items and the kinds of norms, preferences and expectations about language use, social roles, and cultural knowledge associated with them. Both, however, share an interest in the social and cultural contexts and consequences of learning.

Recent critiques of CoP point out that it is a highly idealistic construct that assumes that 'no distinction is made between different types of participants except that between newcomers and old-timers, and the picture of apprenticeship offered is limited to that of newcomers' centripetal movement toward becoming expert participants . . .' and 'does not offer any critical analysis of unequal participatory opportunities' (Haneda 2006: 811). Haneda notes that CoP idealizes the role of legitimate peripheral participant (an important component of Lave & Wenger's 1991 theory) as a uniformly benign, undifferentiated, and apolitical one, which is at odds with many classroom learning contexts with diverse learners. In fact, Morita (2004) illustrated this point very well in her case study of six Japanese women studying at a Canadian university. She observed that the students' participation and learning within their respective CoPs was highly contingent both socially and temporally on the ways in which they were positioned by their interlocutors in their courses (see also Duff 2002; Wortham 2005; Morita & Kobayashi in press). My analysis to date of the Korean students' experiences certainly verifies concerns about overly simplistic understandings of community (i.e., CoP), membership, and mentoring (Duff 2006).

Duff (2002, 2003) made some of these same points with respect to multiple-community affiliation, with

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444807004508 Published online by Cambridge University Press

variable levels of investment in, or access and accommodation to, community resources, and the multiple ways in which learners may opt to or be able to participate in learning activities. However, my discussion of variable participation and community structures addressed language socialization theory and not CoP theory specifically. Watson-Gegeo & Nielsen (2003) and Bronson & Watson-Gegeo (in press) also argue that greater attention should be paid to a critical analysis of power relations and structures in CoPs. In addition, in her study of an online community in a graduate course in education, Potts (1995) noted how that particular CoP differed from those originally described by Lave & Wenger (1991) – because the community in this instance was not pre-established with easily identified 'oldtimers' and 'newcomers' since most were new to online learning and since the instructor himself, while setting up the parameters and structures for participation, was not the main discourse socializer. Rather, the community emerged out of the interactions of class members with each other and their personal investment in this mode of learning: 'The community evidenced in this study, characterized by common purpose, high levels of interactivity, and increasing social interaction, might be considered a mere extension of students' larger academic context. The students, however, perceived it as substantively different.' (Potts 2005: 155).

Finally, with respect to the diverse contemporary communities into which novices seek membership, Garrett & Baquedano-Lopez (2002) and Duff (2003) observed that in multilingual, multicultural diasporic and transnational populations, communities are necessarily quite permeable and migratory. An example of multilingual socialization into very different languages and cultural norms that draws on Lave & Wenger's (1991) notions of community and legitimate peripheral participation is Moore's (1999) study of SLS in Cameroon. French is the colonial language associated with formal schooling, but Wandala and various other languages are also spoken in the mountainous northern regions where she did her study. Membership in communities of practice in her study as well as in others' studies may be temporary or sporadic and learners may take up multiple identities as they traverse these communities, each with their respective norms, traditions, and practices. It would therefore be helpful to follow learners over time to see the various linguistic and sociocultural paths they take and their expertise in negotiating several different codes and communities.

To summarize this section, various SLS studies are currently examining CoP as a way of theorizing how novices are socialized into particular community activities and how, over time, they come to be more engaged and skilled participants in their new communities. The activities people have studied have included learning to give oral presentations or learning to post and participate in online commentaries about university course content. The community of practice approach, a fundamentally sociocultural construct informed by neo-Vygotskian theory, has been taken up by many scholars in informal and formal contexts of learning. However, some scholars have found the concept to be flawed in certain ways and perhaps overly optimistic or idealistic about how people gain membership and expertise in contemporary learning communities and sustain their involvement in the same communities over time. Finally, a challenge that many language socialization researchers face is how to focus on community-level processes and formation, and yet at the same time undertake fine-tuned, contextualized, and critical studies of micro-linguistic practices and changes over time (Kulick & Schieffelin 2004; Bronson & Watson-Gegeo in press).

6. Conclusion

Language socialization builds on aspects of sociocultural theory (including but not limited to Vygotskian SCT) and also draws on other traditions and disciplines, principally from anthropology, sociology, linguistics, education, and cultural psychology. Analyses may examine the socialization of affect, identity, stances, ideologies, particular language/literacy forms, interactional routines, and content knowledge, all through language. Whereas linguistic anthropologists have espoused ethnographic longitudinal studies examining interactional data within and across recurring sorts of speech events or activities (e.g., Garrett & Baquedano-Lopez 2002), other scholars often conduct a more micro-analytic conversation analysis or a more macro-level tracking of the reproduction or transformation of ideologies, languages and other behaviors. Still others may examine students' participation more globally within their evolving communities of practice.

In current and future accounts of SLS, the co-existence of participants' multiple communities and sociolinguistic norms, languages, registers or styles, hybrid activities, codes, and identities must be taken into account better. Whether the analyses are more oriented to linguistic studies of indexicality or to more sociological analyses of individuals' relationship to, and participation in, local (as well as remote) communities of practice, the challenge remains one of providing evidence for the cognitive, linguistic, social, and cultural learning that takes place within situated practices. We should also try to take into account learners' status and levels of participation within their chosen communities, the factors that prevent or enable greater integration and success (if that is the goal), and the consequences of that involvement (or lack of involvement). Thus, language educators and researchers must strive to understand better not only the micro- and macro-processes of language socialization but also how the linguistic

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444807004508 Published online by Cambridge University Press

socialization students engage in at present (as well as their prior experiences, if known) affects their future activities, opportunities, and identities.

Acknowledgements

I thank the organizers of the PacSLRF and Australian Association of Applied Linguistics for inviting me to speak about this topic. In addition, I thank the three anonymous reviews of this article for their useful suggestions. Support for the preparation of this article came from the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada, for which I am grateful.

References

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

Becker, H., B. Geer, E. C. Hughes & A. Strauss (1961). *Boys in white*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

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

Bronson, M. & K. Watson-Gegeo (in press). The critical moment: Language socialization and the (re)visioning of first and second language learning. In Duff & Hornberger (eds.).

Bruner, J. (1975). The ontogenesis of speech acts. *Journal of Child Language* 2, 1–19.

Bruner, J. (1977). Early social interaction and language acquisition. In H. R. Schaffer (ed.), *Studies in mother–infant interaction*. London: Academic Press, 271–289.

Chaiklin, S. & J. Lave (eds.) (1993). *Understanding practice: Perspectives on activity and context*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cook, H. (2007). The role of *desho*(*o*) in JFL learners' language socialization. Paper presented at the UCLA Center for Language, Interaction, and Culture 2007 Invitational Symposium on Language Socialization, Interaction, and Culture, 23 February, 2007.

Cook, H. (in press). Language socialization in Japanese. In Duff & Hornberger (eds.).

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

Duff, P. (A.) (1996). Different languages, different practices: Socialization of discourse competence in dual-language school classrooms in Hungary. In K. Bailey & D. Nunan (eds.), *Voices from the language classroom: Qualitative research in second language acquisition*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 407–433.

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

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

Duff, P. A. (2004). Intertextuality and hybrid discourses: The infusion of pop culture in educational discourse. *Linguistics and Education* 14, 231–176.

Duff, P. A. (2006). Problematizing language socialization across postsecondary contexts. Paper presented at the annual conference of the American Association for Applied Linguistics, Montreal, June 2006.

Duff, P. A. (in press a). Language socialization, participation and identity: Ethnographic approaches. In M. Martin-Jones, A-M. de Mejia & N. H. Hornberger (eds.), *Encyclopedia of language and education*, vol. 3: *Discourse and education*. Boston: Springer.

Duff, P. A. (in press b). Language socialization, higher education, and work. In Duff & Hornberger (eds.).

Duff, P. A. (2007). Problematizing academic discourse socialization. In H. Marriott, T. Moore & R. Spence-Brown (eds.), *Learning discourses and the discourses of learning*. Melbourne: Monash University ePress, 1.1–1.18.

Duff, P. A. & N. H. Hornberger (eds.) (in press). *Encyclopedia of language and education*, vol. 8: *Language socialization*. Boston: Springer.

Duranti, A. & C. Goodwin (eds.) (1992). *Rethinking context*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Eckert, P. (1999). 'Why be normal?': Language and identity practices in a community of nerd girls. *Language in Society* 28, 203–223.

Engeström, Y. E. (1987). *Learning by expanding: An activity-theoretical approach to developmental research*. Helsinki: Orienta-Konsultit.

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

Giddens, A. (1979). *Central problems in social theory*. Berkeley & Los Angeles: University of California Press.

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

Goodwin, C. & A. Duranti (eds.) (1992). Rethinking context: An introduction. In Duranti & Goodwin (eds.), 1–42.

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

Gumperz, J. (1992). Contextualization and understanding. In Duranti & Goodwin (eds.), 229–252.

Haneda, M. (2006). Classrooms as communities of practice: A reevaluation. *TESOL Quarterly* 40, 807–817.

Hanks, W. (1992). The indexical ground of deictic reference. In Duranti & Goodwin (eds.), 46–76.

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

Heath, S. B. (1983). *Ways with words*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

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

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

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

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

Lam, E. (in press). Language socialization in online communication. In Duff & Hornberger (eds.).

Lantolf, J. P. (ed.) (2000). *Sociocultural theory and second language learning*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Lantolf, J. P. & G. Appel (eds.) (1994). *Vygotskian approaches to second language acquisition*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Lantolf, J. P. & S. L. Thorne (2006). *Sociocultural theory and the genesis of second language development*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Lantolf, J. P. & S. L. Thorne (2007). Sociocultural theory and second language learning. In B. VanPatten & J. Williams (eds.), *Theories in second language acquisition*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum, 201–224.

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

Leontyev, A. N. (1981). *Problems of the development of mind*. Moscow: Progress Publishers.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444807004508 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Lo, A. (2006, June). Becoming 'Korean people': Socializing and challenging ethnonational identities at a Korean heritage language school. Paper presented at the American Association for Applied Linguistics, Montreal.
Moore, L. C. (1999). Language socialization research and French language education in Africa: A Cameroonian case study. *The Canadian Modern Language Review* 52.2, 329–350.
Morita, N. (2000). Discourse socialization through oral classroom activities in a TESL graduate program. *TESOL Quarterly* 34, 279–310.
Morita, N. (2004). Negotiating participation and identity in second language academic communities. *TESOL Quarterly* 38, 573–603.
Morita, N. & M. Kobayashi (in press). Academic discourse socialization in a second language. In Duff & Hornberger (eds.).
Ochs, E. (1986). Introduction. In Schieffelin & Ochs (eds.), 1–13.
Ochs, E. (1992). Indexing gender. In Duranti & Goodwin (eds.), 335–358.
Ochs, E. & B. B. Schieffelin (in press). Language socialization: An historical overview. In Duff & Hornberger (eds.).
Peirce, C. S. (1955). *Philosophical writings of Peirce* (ed. J. Buchler.), New York: Dover Publications.
Potts, D. (2005). Pedagogy, purpose, and the second language learner in on-line communities. *Canadian Modern Language Review* 62, 137–160.
Rogoff, B. (1990). *Apprenticeship in thinking: Cognitive development in social context*. New York: Oxford University Press.
Rogoff, B. (1995). Observing sociocultural activity on three planes: Participatory appropriation, guided participation, and apprenticeship. In J. V. Wertsch, P. D. Rio & A. Alvarez (eds.), *Sociocultural studies of mind*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 139–164.
Rymes, B. (in press). Language socialization and the linguistic anthropology of education. In Duff & Hornberger (eds.).
Schecter, S. R. & R. Bayley (1997). Language socialization practices and cultural identity: Case studies of Mexican-descent families in California and Texas. *TESOL Quarterly* 31, 513–542.
Schieffelin, B. B. (1990). *The give and take of everyday life*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Schieffelin, B. B. & E. Ochs (1986). *Language socialization across cultures*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Silverstein, M. (1976). Shifters, linguistic categories, and cultural description. In K. Basso & H. Selby (eds.), *Meaning in anthropology*. Albuquerque, NM: University of New Mexico Press, 11–56.
Vygotsky, L. (1978). *Mind in society*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
Watson-Gegeo, K. A. (2004). Mind, language, and epistemology: Toward a language socialization paradigm for SLA. *The Modern Language Journal* 88, 331–350.
Watson-Gegeo, K. (A.) & S. Nielsen (2003). Language socialization in SLA. In C. Doughty & M. Long (eds.), *The handbook of second language acquisition*. Malden, MA: Blackwell, 155–177.
Wenger, E. (1998). *Communities of practice: Learning, meaning, and identity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Wentworth, W. (1980). *Context and understanding: An inquiry into socialization theory*. New York: Elsevier North-Holland.
Wertsch, J. V. (1985). *Culture, communication and cognition: Vygotskian perspectives*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Wortham, S. (2005). Socialization beyond the speech event. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 15, 95–112.
Yim, Y. K. (2005). *Second language speakers' participation in computer-mediated discussions in graduate seminars*. Ph.D. dissertation, University of British Columbia.
Zappa-Hollman, S. (2007). Becoming socialized into diverse academic communities through oral presentations. *Canadian Modern Language Review* 63.4, 455–485.
Zuengler, J. & K. M. Cole (2004). Problematizing and pluralizing 'sociocultural theory'. Colloquium convened at the American Association of Applied Linguistics Annual Conference, Portland, Oregon, 1–4 May 2004.
Zuengler, J. & K. M. Cole (2005). Language socialization and L2 learning. In E. Hinkel (ed.), *Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum, 301–316.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444807004508 Published online by Cambridge University Press