John Benjamins Publishing Company

Crosslinguistic and crosscultural approaches to pragmatic development

Aylin C. Küntay, Keiko Nakamura and Beyza Ateş Şen
Koç University

Pragmatic development involves learning to use linguistic code and non-linguistic action in a well-integrated way in relation to an ongoing interaction. Given how different languages encode meaning distinctions differently and how different cultures might organize social interactions differently, comparative studies are crucially relevant for understanding pragmatic development. This chapter focuses on currently available crosslinguistic and crosscultural research about (1) nonverbal interaction, (2) referential communication, (3) speech acts and politeness, and (4) extended discourse such as conflicts. We also including a section on how children learning different languages are socialized to use language in varied ways by families, peers and schools. Future directions are suggested on the basis of this current research.

Although knowledge about linguistic rules can be described as abstract, this knowledge needs to be effectively linked to action and context in actual settings. Pragmatic development involves learning to use linguistic code and non-linguistic action in a well-integrated way in relation to an ongoing interaction. Given how different languages encode meaning distinctions differently and how different cultures organize social interactions to foreground relevant meanings, comparative studies are crucially relevant for understanding pragmatic development.

Crosslinguistic methodology has been mostly used to study morphosyntactic and semantic development (Stoll, 2009), but the comparative approach is promising for studying pragmatic development as well (Küntay, 2012). To develop our theories of language development and to understand how socializing of children to use language makes its impact on this learning, we need to take into account how differently context is represented and displayed in specific linguistic and cultural practices, and how contextual features affect children's learning of language.

In this review of crosslinguistic and crosscultural work in the area of pragmatic development, we focus on (1) nonverbal interaction, (2) referential

communication, (3) speech acts and politeness, and (4) extended discourse such as conflicts.[1] We end with a section on language socialization, focusing on work which illustrates how children growing up in different cultures, learning different languages are socialized to use language in varied ways.

Nonverbal interaction

Infants start to communicate nonverbally, before being able to use linguistic forms (see Stephens & Matthews, this volume). In preparation for linguistic communication, infants rely on various social-cognitive abilities that emerge in the first year of life, such as coordinating their focus in the outside world with that of a caregiver. For example, infants' ability to follow caregivers' gaze and gestures towards external objects predict the emergence of early vocabulary in English and Italian learners (Bates, Benigni, Bretherton, Camaioni, & Volterra, 1979; Carpenter, Nagell, & Tomasello, 1998; see Grassmann, this volume). Young children's own productions of nonverbal communicative devices (e.g., deictic gestures such as pointing at particular objects) come approximately three months before they produce the noun for that object (Iverson & Goldin-Meadow, 2005), and gesture-word combinations precede two-word utterances (Özçalışkan & Goldin-Meadow, 2005).

However, child-rearing practices also contribute. Since Bruner's (1975) influential studies of the social routines that make language learning possible, interactions that involve shared attention between children and caregivers have been proposed as ways to ground linguistic elements in external contexts (Clark, 2004). How joint attentional interactions, and especially use of gestures in these interactions, open the way for language development is explained by the observation that children's pointing gestures elicit labeling and other relevant linguistic data from their caregivers (Estigarribia & Clark, 2007). However, as Brown (2012) recently noted, we do not know how joint attention is interactionally organized for infants from different cultures; although we have evidence that early pointing is widespread across many different cultures (Liszkowski, Brown, Callaghan, Takada, & De Vos, 2012). In a recent crosscultural study, Liszkowski et al. (2012) provided infants and caregivers with the opportunity to interact in "the decorated room", which has various toys hung on the ceiling and the walls. The procedure yielded caregiver pointing in different countries with distinct cultural practices,

---

1.   Due to space limitations, we will only be able to cover several of the research areas which have benefited from crosscultural and crosslinguistic research. It is also important to note that we will focus mainly on children's language production of gestures, words and utterances, and less on their comprehension of communicative inputs.

and, crucially, infant pointing was initially exhibited at roughly similar ages (of 10 to 14 months of age) in seven countries including Papua New Guinea, Indonesia, Japan, Peru, Mexico, Canada, and Bali. However, Callaghan and colleagues (2011) found in a similar study conducted in three different countries, India, Peru, and Canada, that the frequency of pointing was not constant across different groups with distinct cultural practices, with Indian infants pointing less frequently than Canadian infants. Although the samples were both rural, the maternal education level was higher for the Canadian sample than the Indian sample, suggesting a link between education (and possibly caregiver frequency of verbal engagement and gesture usage) and frequency of infant gesture usage (Rowe & Goldin-Meadow, 2009; Matthews, Behne, Lieven & Tomasello, in press). There is clearly a need for more systematic within-culture studies of how socio-economic advantages are associated with more robust gesture use. While the onset of pointing could well be part of human biological endowment (though it remains to be seen whether there are cultures whose practices can alter the age of onset), the frequency of attention-manipulating behaviors may be related to aspects of child-rearing.

The intensity of caregiver interaction with children also shows variation across cultures. Brown (2012) observed Rossel caregivers in Papua New Guinea initiate interactions with their infants more than three times as often as Tzeltal-speaking caregivers in Mexico. However, in both societies there is evidence for gaze- and pointing-based regulation of attention, both by caregivers and their 9- to 15-month-old infants (Brown, 2012). Although infants' onset of pointing is similar in both communities (Liszkowski et al., 2012), pointing behaviors are less likely to prompt labels for referents by caregivers in Tzeltal (Brown, 2012). The link of these different patterns of interactive patterns to children's language use awaits further work.

There is conflicting evidence as to whether joint attention is essential for language development. Childers, Vaughan, and Burquest (2007) found in a rural Nigerian community that joint attention engagement of 1- and 3-year-olds predicted the development of both nouns and verbs. On the other hand, Mastin and Vogt (2011) studied infants at the ages of 1;1, 1;5, and 2;1 in rural and urban Mozambique. Patterns found for urban participants were similar to patterns found for Western populations. For the rural participants, however, a negative correlation was found between coordinated joint attention at 13 months and vocabulary at 17 months. This raises questions about whether joint attention is universally necessary for language development. In both the urban and rural sites, person to person engagement, rather than attention to a third object, was found to be positively associated with the children's vocabulary development.

General socio-cultural orientations of communities might matter in how caregivers choose to interact with their children. Caregivers' preference for dyadic,

face-to-face interactions and engagement with a third object is related to an independent socio-cultural orientation, while bodily contact and body stimulation are prevalent in cultures with an interdependent orientation (Keller et al., 2004). Physical configurations that involve bodily contact might make gaze checking and joint attentional interaction unlikely. Thus, new research should be open to alternative criteria for detecting joint engagement in different communities.

Most studies involving joint attention and nonlinguistic interaction involve dyads of children and mothers. Yet, parents do not always play with their children in singular channels of interactions. Chintang-learning children in Nepal, for example, often spend their time completely separated from adults' activities (Stoll et al., 2011), though this may be less true for children younger than 2 years of age. In many cultures, young children mostly spend time with multiple people at once.

There is evidence accumulating that not only dyadic, but multiparty, interactions provide children with usable language-learning experiences to overhear (Akhtar, Jipson, & Callanan, 2001; Akhtar, 2005) or opportunities to be prompted for their participation (De Leon, 2012; Schieffelin, 1990). Exposure to situations where infants overhear and watch others interact (Shneidman, Buresh, Shimpi, Knight-Schwarz, & Woodward, 2009) might furnish infants with different types of attentional skills and paths to learning language than in dyadic situations. Chavajay and Rogoff (1999) studied patterns of attention allocation to events in 14- to 20-month-old toddlers living with San Pedro Guatemalan families and middle-class families of European heritage. The Guatemalan toddlers were more likely to attend to several events simultaneously, while middle-class European toddlers were more likely to alternate their attention between events. The multiple channels of attention by the Guatemalan's toddlers were consistent with their caregivers' patterns of focus on multiple events in the household, as well as with the Guatemalan emphasis on the important role for observation in infant learning. De Leon (2012) also found that L-shaped seating patterns that allow three-person interactions are much more common in Mayan societies, where infants are socialized into language through routines of explicit verbs of saying, such as in "she says 'I am hungry'".

Future studies should determine how different socio-cultural orientations might shape the prevalent communicative goals of individuals surrounding the young learner. Whether different linguistic and social contexts drive the language learning process through different paths is crucial to address as well.

Development of referential communication

Referential communication refers to ways speakers bring physically and pictorially available referents or contextually absent entities to their addressees' attention (Yule, 1997), an ability proposed to be at the core of human languages (Hockett & Altmann, 1968). To carry out effective referential communication, children have to identify certain details of the communicative context such as the presence of the referent in the setting and the addressee's perceptual or discourse-based awareness of the referent (see Graf & Davies, this volume). Purely socio-cognitive skills are essential, such as visual perspective taking, monitoring of addressee's presence during an event, or remembering what has already been mentioned. However, management of topics by children is also determined by the common referential strategies of the relevant language and culture.

Regarding comparative work on referential communication, two typologically varying features of languages have attracted the most attention: the determiner system – whether languages have obligatory articles marking different degrees of cognitive status such as givenness and newness, and the argument realization system, namely, to what extent and under which conditions languages allow sentential components to be realized by pronouns and null forms rather than full nouns.

Children notice what is given both in terms of perceptual context and prior discourse from early on (see Grassmann, this volume). Relying on such awareness, children omit from their sentences arguments of a verb in languages such as Korean (Clancy, 1993), Inuktitut (Allen, 2000), and Turkish (Ateş, Demir, & Küntay, 2011; Küntay & Slobin, 2002). English and French-learners, on the other hand, learn to supply pronouns following reference by nouns by age 3 (Ervin-Tripp, 1977; Demir, So, Özyürek, & Goldin-Meadow, 2012; Salazar Orvig et al., 2010). For all types of languages, patterns of omissions take into account how informative sentence elements are for their addressees.

Using naturalistic discourse, Skarabela and Allen (2011) assessed the contribution of two discourse-pragmatic features on children's use of overt and omitted arguments of Inuktitut-learners between the ages of 2 and 3. Both newness of a referent (not mentioned in the previous 20 utterances) and inaccessibility to the joint attentional frame (the speaker and the hearer were not directing shared attention to a referent) predicted whether the children realized arguments in overt forms. However, joint attention played a stronger role than newness. Studies by Demir, So, Özyürek, and Goldin-Meadow (2012) and So, Demir and Goldin-Meadow (2010) examined English-, Chinese- and Turkish-speaking preschoolers' referential forms and gestures, finding that gestures bolstered accompanying speech in all languages especially when underspecified forms (pronouns and omitted arguments) were used.

In a similar study, Guerriero, Oshima-Takane, and Kuriyama (2006) observed English- and Japanese-speaking children's choices for arguments (null, pronominal, or lexical) depending on the new/given distinction in discourse at periods of increasing linguistic sophistication. Both English-speaking and Japanese-speaking children did not show sensitivity to discourse-pragmatic principles at the earliest stages of their linguistic development. However, English-speaking children began to use lexical forms for new information and language-specific way of using pronouns for given information by the age of 2;7. In contrast, Japanese-speaking children used more non-lexical arguments to address given information but also to indicate new information as well, following their caregivers' patterns. On the other hand, Ateş, Demir, and Küntay (2011) found a tendency for overly specific forms for previously mentioned referents in conversations between Turkish-speaking children (12- to 21-months) and their caregivers. Caregivers usually introduced new referents using nominal forms and the children repeated these explicit forms.

How adults introduce new information to children seems to differ in distinct communicative environments, affecting the degree of argument omission in addition to the effects of structural linguistic factors. Stoll and Bickel (2009) compared referential density across different languages. Referential density is defined as the ratio of overt NPs to all potential argument slots. Russian-speaking narrators have a higher referential density than Belhare-speaking narrators overall, for example. Belhare-speaking narrators only provide lexical referents when multiple referents interact and it is absolutely necessary to discriminate between two referents, while Russian-speaking narrators describe referents with full NPs. Stoll and Bickel (2009) attribute these differences to significant differences among speech communities in how much implicitness is expected.

Although most research on referential communication has involved the acquisition of the determiner system and noun-pronoun alternations (in languages such as English and French, see seminal work by Karmiloff-Smith, 1979), research has also accumulated in languages without an obligatory system of articles and with widespread argument omission. Crosslinguistic comparisons focus on how narrators distinctively mark newly introduced referents in addition to shifting to new characters while talking about visually presented (either picture- or video-based) stories. As discussed above, some languages indicate given and new referents through a local determiner system on the noun phrase (e.g., indefinite article "a clown" vs. definite article "the clown"); many languages, on the other hand, rely on multi-functional morphemes such as case marking, or a numeral, or clause location of the noun phrase to indicate different degrees of givenness.

Although there is a common presumption that monitoring common ground knowledge with an addressee requires basic social-cognitive skills, certain types of linguistic devices for this function do not always emerge early. For example, the non-obligatory indefinite numeral both in Finnish and Turkish (Dasinger &

Küntay, 1998), and the nominal particle in Japanese *ga* appear later than English indefinite articles (Nakamura, 1993), when children introduce new characters into their stories. In Hickmann, Hendriks, Roland, and Liang (1996), child learners of languages with an obligatory article system (English, French, German) and Mandarin Chinese with no articles did not use indefinite forms systematically for character introductions before age 7 years. However, word-order based marking of indefiniteness in Chinese reached adult-like patterns later than marking with articles in English, French, and German.

In brief, if definite/indefinite markers are obligatory in a language, children learn their function earlier (see Rosendaal & Baker, 2008, for a study of French, English and Dutch). In languages that do not have an obligatory article system but use global markings through word order (e.g., Chinese, Japanese, Turkish), case distinctions and optional lexical items (e.g., Walpiri, Turkish, Finnish), acquisition of (in)definiteness is more protracted. However, in all languages, the relatively given information of the given-new continuum is conveyed with weaker forms than new information (Chafe, 1976; Givon, 1983; Gundel, Hedberg, & Zacharski, 1993). In addition, the type of construction that a nominal is embedded in determines whether child speakers provide indefinite marking in different languages such as Turkish and English (Küntay & Koçbaş, 2009; Pine & Lieven, 1997). In both English and Turkish, the indefiniteness marking of the noun is associated strongly with presentational or other intransitive constructions serving the specialized function of character introduction (Lambrecht, 1994).

There is also some crosslinguistic work on the acquisition of deictic pronouns such as *this* and *there* (Levinson, 2004). The referential meaning of deictic forms is not determined by the semantic representations of the forms but by the specific context in which deictics are uttered. Although demonstratives such as *this* or *here* are among the earliest words used by children, their usage is not always appropriate with respect to adult-based distinctions that they need to mark (Clark & Sengul, 1978; Küntay & Özyürek, 2006; Tanz, 1980). English learners take several years to learn the "distance principle" as a semantic axis to govern the choice of a specific demonstrative. More recently, linguistic systems that encode non-spatial semantic distinctions have come to the attention of linguistic typologists (Diessel, 2006). Although work on the acquisition of such systems is rare (Küntay, 2012), Küntay and Özyürek (2006) found that the three-way demonstrative system (*bu*, *şu*, and *o*) of Turkish is not used appropriately by 4- and 6-year-olds. Although distance was appropriately taken into account in the children's distinctive use of pronouns, the function of *şu* as a way to invite the fresh attention of the addressee to a referent was not used in adult-like fashion. These results could easily be tested in a language such as Japanese, which has a similar system to Turkish, encoding attention in addition to spatial distance (Özyürek & Kita, 2000).

Politeness and speech acts

Politeness. Politeness is showing awareness of another person's public self-image, or *face*, for example, by avoiding imposition on others or showing solidarity with others (Brown & Levinson, 1987). Conventions and expectations about politeness vary widely across cultures. Crosscultural research on the acquisition of politeness has shown how children acquire verbal and nonverbal politeness routines at a very early age, but while some distinctions are acquired early on, mastery of more complex politeness forms such as honorifics takes place over many years.

Research on the acquisition of politeness started with English-speaking children, focusing on politeness routines such as *thank you, please,* and *I'm sorry* (e.g., Gleason & Weintraub, 1976; Grief & Gleason, 1980). Similarly, children in other cultures are socialized in politeness routines at an early age (Bates & Silvern, 1977 with Italian children). For example, Kaluli-speaking children are taught to use appropriate forms of address (Schieffelin, 1990), Kwara'ae-speaking children are prompted to use polite language in their greetings, requests, and answering of questions (Watson-Gegeo & Gegeo, 1986), Cakchiquel-speaking children in Guatemala are taught an elaborate end-of-the-meal routine (Wilhite, 1983), and Japanese-speaking preverbal children are taught *bowing* (Nakamura, 2002b). While early use of politeness routines may take place without children realizing they are a form of politeness, they are invaluable in directing the children's attention to pragmatically-appropriate linguistic behavior.

In American parent-child interactions, parents often use explicit linguistic socialization in the form of routinized prompts such as *What did you say?* and *What's the magic word?* to elicit politeness from their children (Gleason, Perlmann, & Grief, 1984). Japanese-speaking mothers use modeling, direct instruction, and play routines to socialize their preverbal children in the use of polite language, involving both referent and addressee honorifics (Nakamura, 2002b).

Regarding production of politeness forms, numerous studies have been conducted on Japanese, a language well-known for its complex politeness system. Clancy (1985) reported that the acquisition of –*masu* polite forms is well-established by age 3 and children are able to make a distinction between plain forms and formal forms in verbal inflections. Cook (1996) and Fukuda (2005) also found that by the age of 3, children were able to use both forms at both home and school. These studies show that young children have early tacit socio-cultural knowledge of the verb forms in different contexts. Longitudinal research by Nakamura (1996, 2006) has also shown that by age three, Japanese-speaking children are already socialized in the use of greetings and polite expressions and *teineigo* 'formal language.' Although Clancy (1985) noted that spontaneous usage of *sonkeigo* 'honorific' and *kenjoogo* 'humble language' may not happen until

much later, pretend play situations show that even young children are aware of the existence of complex honorific and humble forms and will try to use them in appropriate situations, although not always correctly (Nakamura, 1996, 2006). Furthermore, they become increasingly adept at varying linguistic politeness forms according to factors such as speaker-hearer characteristics (e.g., age, degree of familiarity), context (e.g., level of formality), and topic of conversation. Mastery of honorific and humble forms requires both the ability to construct complex linguistic forms as well as a sophisticated understanding of interpersonal relations, such as in-groupness/out-groupness and vertical relations (e.g., superior-subordinate), which explains why many Japanese-speaking adults claim they have difficulty using the forms correctly.

Speech acts. A substantial portion of the research on politeness acquisition has focused on one speech act in particular, namely children's directives (e.g., requests, commands, orders). Some of these studies have examined parental input, such as Field's (2001) study on Navajo triadic directives. Others have focused on the comprehension of directives, such as Bernicot and Legros' study (1987) of French-speaking children. In addition to studies on English-speaking children (e.g., Ervin-Tripp & Gordon, 1986; James, 1978; Sealey, 1999), research on the production of directives has been conducted on children learning French (Marcos & Bernicot, 1994; Ryckebusch & Marcos, 2004), Greek (Georgalidou, 2008), Japanese (Nakamura, 1999), Swedish (Aronsson & Thorell, 1999), and Norwegian and Hungarian (Hollos & Beeman, 1978). Despite the fact that children may be learning very different directive forms depending on their language, crosslinguistic studies show that development of directives happens relatively early, and that children are sensitive to contextual factors such as activity type and age of interlocutor and vary the level of politeness accordingly.

Crosscultural research on children's acquisition of other speech acts (see Cameron-Faulkner, this volume) is promising for enhancing our understanding of pragmatic development and for helping us to further understand children's acquisition of politeness. Unfortunately, previous research has mainly focused on middle-class, English-speaking children and their use of speech acts such as apologies (Ely & Gleason, 2006), greetings (Grief & Gleason, 1980), promises (e.g., Astington, 1988), requests (e.g., Ervin-Tripp & Gordon, 1986), and expressions of gratitude (Becker & Smenner, 1986; Grief & Gleason, 1980). Surprisingly, with the exception of research on children's directives as discussed earlier, there have been few studies on children's speech acts in different languages and cultures, such as Ryckebusch and Marcos' (2004) study on the use of speech acts by French-speaking toddlers in different play contexts and Kampf and Blum-Kulka's (2007) study on the rich range of apology strategies used by Israeli preschoolers in peer talk. In addition, Long's (2010) study on the use of apology expressions

in Japanese gratitude situations in elementary and middle school students shows that awareness of the use of the complex politeness forms begins as early as age 6 and approximates that of adults between ages 13 and 16. It is obvious that there is much need for crosslinguistic and crosscultural research on this topic, which would be invaluable for understanding children's development of pragmatic knowledge and sociocognitive understanding.

Extended discourse

Regarding the literature on child discourse, considerable attention has been paid to conflict talk and narrative discourse, with extensive comparative work done in both areas. We will cover only conflict talk, given that there is a chapter in this volume on narrative discourse (see Carmiol & Sparks, this volume) that includes crosscultural research as well.

Conflict talk. Conflicts require mastery of multiple discourse skills, such as negating, challenging, insulting, and asserting (e.g., Brenneis & Lein, 1977; Eisenberg & Garvey, 1981; Goodwin, 1982; Killen & Naigles, 1995; Maynard, 1985; Sheldon, 1992, 1996). While adults show a dispreference for conflict, children often engage in conflict as a preferred activity (Goodwin, 1983). In a comparative study of U.S. and Italian preschool conflicts, Corsaro and Rizzo (1990) reported that there were more disputes in the Italian context and the Italian children enjoyed *discussione* arguments. Boggs (1978) described contradicting routines among part-Hawaiian children, while Katriel (1985) examined the *brogez,* a ritualized agonistic state with suspension of ordinary communication and taking 'time out' which occurs in Israeli children's conflicts. Nakamura (2002a) focused on Japanese-speaking boys' conflict talk during video game play, in which they used strong language (e.g., masculine forms) to establish dominance. Research on African-American children has also described conflict situations with strategic management of various actions, such as insults, threats, accusations, and commands, as well as skillful argumentation through which children construct social identities, cultivate friendships, and organize the social order of their peer culture (e.g., Corsaro, 1994; Goodwin, 1982, 1983, 1990). Köymen and Küntay (2013) have recently described how Turkish 4- and 5-year-olds use the oppositional discourse markers *ya* and *ki* in peer conversations to index different degrees of alignment or disalignment to their interlocutor. Such studies shed light on the ease with which children acquire culturally-appropriate discourse devices that enable them to participate in different social contexts.

A substantial proportion of the conflict talk literature has focused on gender differences in children's dispute strategies. The earlier research on U.S.

middle-class children reported that boys tended to use direct conflict tactics such as bald refusals, while girls were found to use a more mitigated conflict style, using a "double-voice discourse," such as providing justifications for refusing and the "yes, but" strategy of prefacing refusal with token agreement (Sheldon, 1992, 1996). However, studies on children's conflict talk in other cultures have found that girls also engage in assertive speech. Goodwin (1990, 1998, 2002) in her work with African American and Latina working class girls in the U.S. found that the girls did not use indirectness or mitigation for managing conflict; instead, they used very direct oppositional strategies. For example, she described a gossip-dispute activity called "he-said-she-said" used among African-American preadolescent girls when engaging in social exclusion (Goodwin, 1990). In her work with Swedish preadolescent girls, Evaldsson (2007) reported use of collaborative judgmental work (e.g., complaints, criticism, accusations) to justify social exclusion. Similarly, Farris (2000) found that preschool girls in Taiwan used a masculine 'aggravated' style of talk in cross-sex conflict and Kyratzis and Guo (1996) found that Chinese-speaking preschool girls used highly assertive forms in conflict with boys, using direct and aggravated commands, criticizing, scolding, and mocking. Furthermore, Kyratzis and Guo (2001) in a comparative study of children from the U.S. and China found that Chinese girls and American boys used the most direct conflict strategies. These results show that gendered styles of talk differ widely between cultures and subcultures, and rather than treating gender as a universal category, point to the crucial importance of crosslinguistic comparisons.

Language socialization

Crosslinguistic and crosscultural studies have been invaluable in research on language socialization (see Duff & Hornberger's, 2008 volume on language socialization). In this section, we will see how pragmatic development depends heavily on language socialization, such as parental, peer, and classroom socialization. Different interlocutors may provide different forms of socialization (e.g., modeling, direct instruction) for different aspects of language (e.g., politeness, narratives) for children to learn culturally-appropriate forms of interaction.

The early research started with linguistic anthropologists, who conducted extensive work on children and their caregivers, such as Heath (1983) in the Piedmont Carolinas, Ochs (1988) in Samoa, and Schieffelin (1990) with the Kaluli in Papua New Guinea. In particular, much of the research on language socialization has focused on the socialization of pragmatic skills (see Li, 2008), through which children learn to acquire communicative competence within different cultural and linguistic contexts. Differences in child-rearing values, expectations, and

goals clearly lead parents and caregivers to different patterns of interaction and language use with their children.

Parental Socialization. Since the early studies of pragmatic socialization of particular speech forms, such as greetings and politeness routines of English-speaking children (e.g., Gleason, Perlmann, & Grief, 1984), there have been numerous crosscultural studies on language socialization, such as Bornstein et al.'s (1992) study on maternal speech to infants in Argentina, France, Japan and the U.S., and Toda, Fogel and Kawai's (1990) study on maternal speech to infants in the U.S. and Japan, and Crago and colleagues's work (Crago, 1992; Crago, Annahatak, & Ningiuruvik, 1993) with Inuktitut-speaking caregivers in Canada. Such studies have found both similarities pointing to the universality of maternal speech to infants as well as differences reflecting cultural preferences, leading to the socialization of culturally appropriate communication. For example, comparative studies of mother-child interaction between the U.S. and Japan have shown that American mothers focus more on verbal interaction and are more information-oriented, while Japanese mothers tend to be more affect-oriented, using indirect speech styles (e.g., Clancy, 1986; Fernald & Morikawa, 1993; Morikawa, Shand, & Kosawa, 1988; Toda, Fogel, & Kawai, 1990).

While some adults with different cultural practices believe that children are intentional and social beings, leading to a child-centered focus in caregiver-child interactions, other cultures, such as traditional Samoan culture, may not treat children as socially responsible beings (Ochs, 1982; Schieffelin & Ochs, 1986). Such differences in beliefs and expectations lead to differences in parent-child interactions. Studies have shown that in many cultures, mothers tend to be eager to socialize their children to be active conversational participants (e.g., Clancy, 1986; Fernald & Morikawa, 1993). For example, the Basotho in Lesotho (Demuth, 1986), the Kaluli in Papua New Guinea (Schieffelin, 1979), and the Kwara-ae in the Solomon Islands (Watson-Gegeo & Gegeo, 1986), all have been observed using prompting routines to get children engaged in talk, eliciting responses to questions, encouraging politeness and correcting errors. Mayan Zinacantec caregivers (De Leon, 2012) use a quoting strategy ("I want to go to sleep" she says) on behalf of the child to render her as a participant in triadic interactions. Even mothers of preverbal children may respond to non-word vocalizations in a manner seeking content-oriented communication, as if they were meaningful utterances (see Stephens and Matthews, this volume), as seen in Japanese mother-child dyads (Otomo, 2001; Takada, 2012).

The majority of studies on language socialization in the home have focused on mother-child interactions. Since there are many different types of family roles (e.g., cultures in which siblings play a key caretaker role, cultures in which fathers and mothers play distinct roles), it would be interesting to see more studies

examining language socialization provided by different family members and care-takers. For example, studies comparing mothers and fathers have also found similarities and differences in interactional and communicative style. In some cultures, mothers tend to dominate family conversations (e.g., Nordic families studied by Tryggvason, 2006), while in other cultures, fathers take the floor more often (e.g., Jewish-American families, Blum-Kulka, 1997). Regarding patterns of language use, American fathers have been reported to use more directives in their interactions with children, while mothers use more indirect forms (Bellinger & Gleason, 1982). Different patterns of language use (e.g., prohibitives, diminutives, references to past events) depending on the gender of the parent and child have also been reported, illustrating how language socialization also provides boys and girls with models of how women and men talk (e.g., Ely, Gleason, & McCabe, 1996; Gleason, Ely, Perlmann, & Narasimhan, 1996; Gleason, Perlmann, Ely, & Evans, 1994). Through such patterns of language usage, parents socialize their children in specific cultural and gender-based ways. Studies such as that by Andersen (1996) show that children pay attention to various forms of parental input and will display their register knowledge of maternal and paternal speech in 'controlled improvisation' situations, where children were asked to act out the roles of mother, father, teacher, etc. using puppets.

Regarding methodology, many language socialization studies have focused on dinner talk as a rich source of data. Intergenerational mealtime conversations are crucial everyday contexts for the socialization of children into culturally specific ways of talking, as family members share experiences, discuss people and events, and regulate each other's behavior. Researchers have studied, for example, monolingual American, Estonian, Finnish, Israeli, Italian, Norwegian, and Swedish mealtime conversations (e.g., Blum-Kulka, 1997; Ochs, Pontecorvo, & Fasulo, 1996; Tryggvason, 2004, 2006; Tulviste, Mizera, De Geer, & Tryggvason, 2002), as well as those from bilingual and trilingual families (e.g., Quay, 2008). Such studies have contributed to our understanding of the cultural rules regulating discourse, such as the amount of talk or use of silence, type of talk, length of pauses, topic organization, turn-taking (see Tice, this volume), use of regulatory comments, and use of metalinguistic and metapragmatic comments (Aukrust, 2004; Aukrust & Snow, 1998; Blum-Kulka, 1990, 1997; Brumark, 2010; De Geer, Tulviste, Mizera, & Tryggvason, 2002; Tryggvason, 2004, 2006; Tulviste et al., 2002; Tulviste, Mizera, & De Geer, 2004). Meals also provide children with invaluable exposure to different speech genres, such as narratives and explanations (Aukrust & Snow, 1998; Blum-Kulka, 1993).

Peer socialization. Although most children acquire the basic aspects of communicative competence in early interactions with adults, relationships with peers become increasingly important. Peer interactions provide children with

opportunities to engage in collaborative, symmetrical interactions, often involving different kinds of talk (e.g., verbal play, teasing, disputes; Dunn, 1988; Ely & McCabe, 1993). Interest in peer talk began in the late 1970s with Garvey's work on peer play (1975) and Ervin-Tripp and Mitchell-Kernan's *Child Discourse* (1977) (see Blum-Kulka and Snow, 2004, for a review of the role of peer talk in children's pragmatic development). Studies on different cultures have revealed how children's participation in peer culture is important for their acquisition of language-specific communication strategies, such as Hawaiian talk-story (Boggs, 1990; Watson-Gegeo & Boggs, 1977), dispute strategies in African-American children (e.g., Goodwin, 1990), verbal dueling among Turkish-speaking boys (Dundes, Leach, & Özkök, 1972), the Italian verbal routines of *discussione* arguments with claims, counterclaims, statement of beliefs, and arguments (Corsaro & Rizzo, 1988, 1990), and rounds of narratives in the Turkish preschool setting (Küntay & Şenay, 2003).

One area in peer talk research which has been particularly active is gender. Many of the early studies on children's peer talk emphasized similarities to adult talk, namely that girls' talk is cooperative and supportive, while boys' talk is aggressive and confrontational. However, studies in different ethnic and cultural contexts have demonstrated how girls' talk may not necessarily be non-confrontational (see above section on conflict talk). On a different note, while many of the earlier studies on peer talk focused on young children, recently more researchers have shown interest in preadolescent and adolescent peer talk. Adolescence is a critical period for pragmatic development, with children spending more time with their peers, experiencing the transition from child language to adult language and being expected to speak in a more pragmatically-appropriate manner. Yet at the same time, adolescents develop their own patterns of language use based on peer culture. Studies of pre-adolescent and adolescent peer talk in English-speaking children have focused on a wide variety of language skills, such as collaborative narration (Ardington, 2006; Leung, 2009), name-calling, teasing (Eder, 1993), and gossip (e.g., Eckert, 1990; Eder, 1998). Recently, more studies have been conducted on children growing up in different cultures, enriching our understanding of different cultural patterns of peer talk. Kyratzis and Tarim (2010) found that middle-class Turkish-speaking girls socialize one another to speak in ways that enact egalitarian forms (e.g., forms of directives such as tag questions and joint directives) of social organization among group members while using alternative, hierarchical forms in other contexts. Regarding boys' talk, Evaldsson (2002) found that Swedish preadolescent boys use gossip, an activity typically associated with females, to dominate the floor, solicit support, and degrade their peers, while Nakamura (2001, 2002a) found that boys' peer talk was important for the acquisition of

'male' speech forms by Japanese-speaking children. As research on peer talk has mainly focused on girls' talk, clearly more research needs to be done on boys' talk. Crosscultural research on peer talk can help us understand culture-based patterns of language use, such as children's acquisition of gender-based language (e.g., gender-exclusive and gender-preferred forms). Finally, another area which needs more research is cross-sex talk, on which there are relatively few studies (e.g., Farris, 2000, Kyratzis & Guo, 2001).

Language socialization at school. In addition to the home, school is an important source of language socialization, both direct and indirect. Earlier research on school socialization focused on how children socialized into the narrative style of their own communities may find that, upon entering school, they have to acquire the topic-centered, rather than the topic-associating, narrative style of middle-class white communities, discussing the difficulties of transition from the home to the school (Michaels, 1981, 1991; Michaels & Cazden, 1986).

Other studies have focused on how children acquire culture-specific pragmatic skills and knowledge through interactional routines in the classroom. For example, Burdelski (2010) examined children's socialization into politeness routines at a Japanese preschool through interaction with teachers and peers while Georgalidou (2008) found that Greek-learning children rarely use conventional politeness markers in interactions with their nursery school teachers, instead relying on strategies that incorporate indirectness, such as declaratives and interrogatives. Cook (1999) examined how Japanese-speaking children in the classroom acquire the skill of attentive listening, which is a significant part of Japanese communicative competence. Aukrust (2001), in a comparative study of Norwegian and American preschools, found differences in *metapragmatic* discourse (talk about talk), with American school conversations including more talk about discourse management, and Norwegian conversation more reported speech, pointing to differences in cultural tendencies.

As seen above, it is clear that language socialization, whether it may happen in the home or school, or through caregivers, peers, or teachers, plays a key role in acquisition of pragmatic skills, enabling children to communicate in a culturally-appropriate manner.

Conclusion

As we have seen through this chapter, crosslinguistic and crosscultural studies have contributed much to our current understanding of pragmatic development. Many research areas, such as nonverbal interaction, referential communication, politeness, extended discourse, and language socialization, have been enriched

by findings from children acquiring different languages in different cultures and contexts. In many cases, we have found that things we once assumed to be universal were culture-specific or language-specific. We are just beginning to answer many crucial questions, such as: What pragmatic abilities are universal/language-specific? What aspects of pragmatic development are innate? What is the direction of influence? Does socialization precede language? Or does language precede socialization? What is the role of implicit/explicit teaching?

As seen in the extent of research covered in this chapter, the research paradigm for language socialization is well-established for crosscultural comparisons. However, there are numerous areas which could benefit from crosslinguistic and crosscultural studies in the future, such as speech acts and politeness, discourse markers, and deployment of attention for language development in non-dyadic contexts. These areas are in need of experimental methods or semi-naturalistic observations specifically developed for culture- and language-comparative purposes in addition to language socialization work.

References

Akhtar, N. (2005). The robustness of learning through overhearing. *Developmental Science*, 8(2), 199–209. DOI: 10.1111/j.1467-7687.2005.00406.x

Akhtar, N., Jipson, J., & Callanan, M. A. (2001). Learning words through overhearing. *Child Development*, 72(2), 416–430. DOI: 10.1111/1467-8624.00287

Allen, S. E. M. (2000). A discourse-pragmatic explanation for argument representation in child Inuktitut. *Linguistics*, 38(3), 483–521. DOI: 10.1515/ling.38.3.483

Andersen, E. (1996). A cross-cultural study of children's register knowledge. In D. Slobin, J. Gerhardt, A. Kyratzis, & J. Guo (Eds.), *Social Interaction, Social Context, and Language: Festschrift for Susan Ervin-Tripp* (pp. 125–142), Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Ardington, A. M. (2006). Playfully negotiated activity in girls' talk, *Journal of Pragmatics*, 38(1), 73–95. DOI: 10.1016/j.pragma.2005.06.005

Aronsson, K., & Thorell, M. (1999). Family politics in children's play directives. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 31(1), 25–47. DOI: 10.1016/S0378-2166(98)00050-2

Astington, J. W. (1988). Children's production of commissive speech acts. *Journal of Child Language*, 15(2), 411–423. DOI: 10.1017/S0305000900012423

Ateş, A. B., Demir, Ö. E., & Küntay, A. (2011, April). Effects of discourse-pragmatic factors on verbal and gestural reference of Turkish toddlers and primary caregivers. Poster presented at the *Society for Research in Child Development (SRCD) Biennial Meeting*, Montreal, Canada.

Aukrust, V. (2001). Talk-focused talk in preschools-culturally formed socialization for talk? *First Language*, 21(61), 57–82. DOI: 10.1177/014272370102106103

Aukrust, V. (2004). Talk about talk with young children: Pragmatic socialization in two communities in Norway and the US. *Journal of Child Language*, 31(1), 177–201. DOI: 10.1017/S0305000903005907

Aukrust, V., & Snow, C. (1998). Narratives and explanations during mealtime conversations in Norway and the U.S. *Language in Society,* 22, 221–246.

Bates, E., Benigni, L., Bretherton, I., Camaioni, L., & Volterra, V. (1979). *The Emergence of Symbols: Cognition and Communication in Infancy*. New York, NY: Academic Press.

Bates, E., & Silvern, L. (1977). Social adjustment and politeness in preschoolers. *Journal of Communication*, 27(2), 104–111. DOI: 10.1111/j.1460-2466.1977.tb01834.x

Becker, J. A., & Smenner, P. C. (1986). The spontaneous use of 'thank you' by preschoolers as a function of sex, socioeconomic status, and listener status. *Language in Society*, 15(4), 537–546. DOI: 10.1017/S0047404500012008

Bellinger, D., & Gleason, J. B. (1982). Sex differences in parental directives to young children. *Sex Roles*, 8(11), 1123–1139. DOI: 10.1007/BF00290968

Bernicot, J., & Legros, S. (1987). Direct and indirect directives: What do children understand? *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology*, 43(3), 346–358. DOI: 10.1016/0022-0965 (87)90012-9

Blum-Kulka, S. (1990). You don't touch lettuce with your fingers: Parental politeness in family discourse. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 14(2), 259–88. DOI: 10.1016/0378-2166(90)90083-P

Blum-Kulka, S. (1993). "You gotta know how to tell a story": Telling, tales, and tellers in American and Israeli narratives events at dinner. *Language in Society*, 22(3), 361–402. DOI: 10.1017/S0047404500017280

Blum-Kulka, S. (1997). *Dinner Talk: Cultural Patterns of Sociability and Socialization in Family Discourse*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Blum-Kulka, S., & Snow, C. (2004). Introduction: The potential of peer talk. *Discourse Studies*, 6(3), 291–306. DOI: 10.1177/1461445604044290

Boggs, S. T. (1978). The development of verbal disputing in part-Hawaiian children. *Language in Society*, 7(3), 325–344. DOI: 10.1017/S0047404500005753

Boggs, S. T. (1990). The role of routines in the evolution of children's peer talk. In B. Dorval (Ed.), *Conversational Organization and its Development* (pp. 101–31). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Bornstein, M., Tal, J., Rahn, C., Galperín, C., Lamour, M., Ogino, M., Pêcheux, M., Toda, S., Azuma, H., & Tamis-LeMonda, C. (1992). Functional analysis of the contents of maternal speech to infants of 5 and 13 months in four cultures: Argentina, France, Japan, and the United States. *Developmental Psychology*, 28(4), 593–603. DOI: 10.1037/0012-1649.28.4.593

Brenneis, D., & Lein, L. (1977). "You fruithead": A sociolinguistic approach to children's dispute settlement. In S. Ervin-Tripp & C. Mitchell-Kernan (Eds.), *Child Discourse* (pp. 49–65), New York, NY: Academic Press.

Brown, P. (2012). Language socialization and the cultural organization of attention. In A. Duranti, E. Ochs, & Schieffelin, B. B. (Eds.), *Handbook of Language Socialization*. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley-Blackwell.

Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (1987). *Politeness*. Cambridge: CUP.

Brumark, A. (2010). Behavior regulation at the family dinner table: The use of and response to direct and indirect behavior regulation in ten Swedish families. *Journal of Child Language*, 37(5), 1065–1088. DOI: 10.1017/S0305000909990201

Bruner, J. S. (1975). From communication to language: A psychological perspective. *Cognition*, 3(3), 255–287. DOI: 10.1016/0010-0277(74)90012-2

Burdelski, M. (2010). Socializing politeness routines: Action, other-orientation, and embodiment in a Japanese preschool. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 42(6), 1606–1621. DOI: 10.1016/j.pragma.2009.11.007

Callaghan, T., Moll, H., Rakoczy, H., Warneken, F., Liszkowski, U., Behne, T., & Tomasello, M. (2011). *Early Social Cognition in Three Cultural Contexts*. Boston, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.

Carpenter, M., Nagell, K., & Tomasello, M. (1998). Social cognition, joint attention, and communicative competence from 9 to 15 months of age. *Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development*, 63(4), 1–174. DOI: 10.2307/1166214

Chafe, W. L. (1976). Givenness, contrastiveness, definiteness, subjects, topics, and point of view. In C. N. Li (Ed.), *Subject and Topic* (pp. 25–55). New York, NY: Academic Press.

Chavajay, P., & Rogoff, B. (1999). Cultural variation in management of attention by children and their caregivers. *Developmental Psychology*, 35(4), 1079–1090. DOI: 10.1037/0012-1649.35.4.1079

Childers, J. B., Vaughan, J., & Burquest, D. A. (2007). Joint Attention and word learning in Ngas-speaking toddles in Nigeria. *Journal of Child Language*, 33(2), 199–225. DOI: 10.1017/S0305000906007835

Clancy, P. M. (1985). The acquisition of Japanese. In D. I. Slobin (Ed.), *The Crosslinguistic Study of Language Acquisition*, Volume 1: The Data (pp. 373–524). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Clancy, P. (1986). The acquisition of communicative style in Japanese. In B. Schieffelin & E. Ochs (Eds.), *Language Socialization across Cultures* (pp. 213–250). Cambridge: CUP.

Clancy, P. (1993). Preferred argument structure in Korean acquisition. In E. Clark (Ed.), *Proceedings of the 25th Stanford Child Language Forum*. Stanford, CA: CSLI.

Clark, E. (2004). Pragmatics and language acquisition. In L. R. Horn & G. Ward (Eds.), *The Handbook of Pragmatics*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Clark, E., & Sengul, C. J. (1978). Strategies in the acquisition of deixis. *Journal of Child Language*, 5(3), 457–475. DOI: 10.1017/S0305000900002099

Cook, H. (1996). Japanese language socialization: Indexing the modes of self. *Discourse Processes*, 22(2), 171–198. DOI: 10.1080/01638539609544971

Cook, H. (1999). Language socialization in Japanese elementary schools: Attentive listening and reaction turns, *Journal of Pragmatics*, 31(11), 1443–1465. DOI: 10.1016/S0378-2166(98)00110-6

Corsaro, W. (1994). Discussion, debate, and friendship processes: Peer discourse in U.S. and Italian nursery schools. *Sociology of Education*, 67(1), 1–26. DOI: 10.2307/2112747

Corsaro, W., & Rizzo, T. (1988). Discussione and friendship: Socialization processes in the peer culture of Italian nursery school children. *American Sociological Review*, 53(6), 879–894. DOI: 10.2307/2095897

Corsaro, W., & Rizzo, T. (1990). Disputes in the peer culture of American and Italian nursery school children. In A. Grimshaw (Ed.), *Conflict Talk* (pp. 21–67). Cambridge: CUP.

Crago, M. B. (1992). Communicative interaction and second language acquisition: An Inuit example. *TESOL Quarterly*, 26(3), 487–505. DOI: 10.2307/3587175

Crago, M. B., Annahatak, B., & Ningiuruvik, L. (1993). Changing patterns of language socialization in Inuit homes. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly*, 24(3), 205–223. DOI: 10.1525/aeq.1993.24.3.05x0968f

Dasinger, L., & Küntay, A. (1998). Introducing referents in elicited discourse: Finnish vs. Turkish. In A. Aksu-Koç, E. Erguvanli-Taylan, A. Sumru Özsoy, & A. Küntay (Eds.), *Perspectives in Language Acquisition: Selected Papers from the International Congress for the Study of Child Language* (July 14–19, 1996). Istanbul: Boğaçi University Printhouse.

De Geer, B., Tulviste, T., Mizera, L., & Tryggvason, M. (2002). Socialization in communication: Pragmatic socialization during dinnertime in Estonian, Finnish and Swedish families, *Journal of Pragmatics*, 34(12), 1757–1786. DOI: 10.1016/S0378-2166(01)00059-5

De Leon, L. (2012). Language socialization and multiparty participation frameworks. In A. Duranti, E. Ochs, & B. Schieffelin (Eds.), *The Handbook of Language Socialization*. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley-Blackwell.

Demir, O. E., So, W.-C., Özyürek, A., & Goldin-Meadow, S. (2012). Turkish- and English-speaking children display sensitivity to perceptual context in the referring expressions they produce in speech and gesture. *Language and Cognitive Processes*, 27(6), 844–867. DOI: 10.1080/01690965.2011.589273

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: CUP.

Diessel, H. (2006). Demonstratives, joint attention, and the emergence of grammar. *Cognitive Linguistics*, 17(4), 463–489. DOI: 10.1515/COG.2006.015

Duff, P. A., & Hornberger, N. H. (Eds.) (2008). *Encyclopedia of Language and Education*, Volume 8, Language Socialization. New York, NY: Springer.

Dundes, A., Leach, J. W., & Özkök, B. (1972). The strategy of Turkish boys' verbal dueling rhymes. In J. J. Gumperz & D. Hymes (Eds.), *Directions in Sociolinguistics: The Ethnography of Communication* (pp. 130–160). New York, NY: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Dunn, J. (1988). *The Beginnings of Social Understanding*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Eckert, P. (1990). Cooperative competition in adolescent "girl talk". *Discourse Processes,* 13(1), 91–122. DOI: 10.1080/01638539009544748

Eder, C. (1993). Go get ya a French!: Romantic and sexual teasing among adolescent girls. In D. Tannen (Ed.), *Gender and Conversational Interaction* (pp. 17–30). Oxford: OUP.

Eder, C. (1998). Developing adolescent peer culture through collaborative narration. In S. M. Hoyle & C. T. Adger (Eds.), *Kids Talk: Strategic Language Use in Later Childhood* (pp. 82–94). Oxford: OUP.

Eisenberg, A. R., & Garvey, C. (1981). Children's use of verbal strategies in resolving conflicts. *Discourse Processes*, 4(2), 149–170. DOI: 10.1080/01638538109544512

Ely, R., & Gleason, J. B. (2006). I'm sorry I said that: Apologies in young children's discourse. *Journal of Child Language*, 33(3), 599–620. DOI: 10.1017/S0305000906007446

Ely, R., Gleason, J., & McCabe, A. (1996). "Why didn't you talk to your Mommy, Honey?": Parents' and children's talk about talk. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 29(1), 7–25. DOI: 10.1207/s15327973rlsi2901_2

Ely, R., & McCabe, A. (1993). Remembered voices. *Journal of Child Language*, 20, 671–696. DOI: 10.1017/S0305000900008539

Ervin-Tripp, S. (1977). Wait for me, Roller-Skate! In S. Ervin-Tripp & C. Mitchell-Kernan (Eds.), *Child Discourse* (pp. 165–188). New York, NY: Academic Press.

Ervin-Tripp, S., & Gordon, D. P. (1986). The development of requests. In R. L. Schiefelbusch (Ed.), *Communicative Competence: Acquisition and Intervention* (pp. 295–312). Beverly Hills, CA: College Hills Press.

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

Estigarribia, B., & Clark, E. V. (2007). Getting and maintaining attention in talk to young children. *Journal of Child Language*, 34(4), 799–814. DOI: 10.1017/S0305000907008161

Evaldsson, A. (2002). Boys' gossip telling: Staging identities and indexing (unacceptable) masculine behavior, *Text*, 22(2), 199–225. DOI: 10.1515/text.2002.008

Evaldsson, A. (2007). Accounting for friendship: Moral ordering and category membership in preadolescent girls' relational talk. *Research in Language and Social Interaction*, 40(4), 377–404. DOI: 10.1080/08351810701471377

Farris, C. (2000). Cross-sex peer conflict and the discursive production of gender in a Chinese preschool in Taiwan. *Journal of Pragmatics,* 32(5), 539–69. DOI: 10.1016/S0378-2166(99)00064-8

Fernald, A., & Morikawa, H. (1993). Common themes and cultural variations in Japanese and American mothers' speech to infants. *Child Development*, 64(3), 637–656. DOI: 10.2307/1131208

Field, M. (2001). Triadic directives in Navajo language socialization. *Language in Society*, 30(2), 249–263. DOI: 10.1017/S0047404501002044

Fukuda, C. (2005). Children's use of the masu form in play scenes. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 37(7), 1037–1058. DOI: 10.1016/j.pragma.2004.12.005

Garvey, C. (1975). Requests and responses in children's speech. *Journal of Child Language*, 2(1), 41–63. DOI: 10.1017/S030500090000088X

Georgalidou, M. (2008). The contextual parameters of linguistic choice: Greek children's preferences for the formation of directive speech acts. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 40(1), 72–94. DOI: 10.1016/j.pragma.2007.08.009

Givon, T. (1983). Topic continuity in discourse: The functional domain of switch-reference. In J. Haiman & P. Munro (Eds.), *Switch Reference and Universal Grammar*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Gleason, J. B., Ely, R., Perlmann, R. Y., & Narasimhan, B. (1996). Patterns of prohibition in parent-child discourse, In D. I. Slobin, J. Gerhardt, A. Kyratzis, & J. Guo (Eds.), *Social Interaction, Social Context, and Language: Essays in Honor of Susan Ervin-Tripp* (pp. 205–217), Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Gleason, J. B., Perlmann, R. Y., Ely, R., & Evans, D. W. (1994). The babytalk register: Parents' use of diminutives. In J. Sokolov & C. Snow (Eds.), *Handbook of Research in Language using CHILDES* (pp. 50–76). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Gleason, J., Perlmann, R., & Grief, E. (1984). What's the magic word: Learning language through politeness routines. *Discourse Processes*, 7(4), 493–503. DOI: 10.1080/01638538409544603

Gleason, J., & Weintraub, S. (1976). The acquisition of routines in child language. *Language in Society*, 5(2), 129–66. DOI: 10.1017/S0047404500006977

Goodwin, M. H. (1982). Processes of dispute management among urban black children. *American Ethnologist*, 9(1), 76–96. DOI: 10.1525/ae.1982.9.1.02a00050

Goodwin, M. H. (1983). Aggravated correction and disagreement in children's conversations. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 7(6), 657–677. DOI: 10.1016/0378-2166(83)90089-9

Goodwin, M. H. (1990). *He-said-she-said: Talk as Social Organization among Black children*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.

Goodwin, M. H. (1998). Games of stance: Conflict and footing in hopscotch. In S. Hoyle & C. T. Adger (Eds.), *Kids Talk: Language Practices of Older Children* (pp. 23–46). Oxford: OUP.

Goodwin, M. H. (2002). Building power asymmetries in girls' interactions. *Discourse & Society*, 13(6), 715–730. DOI: 10.1177/0957926502013006752

Grief, E., & Gleason, J. (1980). Hi, thanks, and goodbye: More routine information. *Language in Society*, 9(2), 159–66. DOI: 10.1017/S0047404500008034

Guerriero, A. M. S., Oshima-Takane, Y., & Kuriyama Y. (2006). The development of referential choice in English and Japanese: A discourse-pragmatic perspective. *Journal of Child Language*, 33(4), 823–857. DOI: 10.1017/S030500090600763X

Gundel, J. K., Hedberg, N., & Zacharski, R. (1993). Cognitive status and the form of referring expressions in discourse. *Language*, 69(2), 274–307. DOI: 10.2307/416535

Heath, S. (1983). *Ways with Words: Language, Life, and Work in Communities and Classrooms*. Cambridge: CUP.

Hickmann, M., Hendriks, H., Roland, F., & Liang, J. (1996). The marking of new information in children's narratives: A comparison of English, French, German and Mandarin Chinese. *Journal of Child Language*, 23(3), 591–619. DOI: 10.1017/S0305000900008965

Hockett, C. F., & Altmann, S. A. (1968). A note on design features. In T. A. Sebeok (Ed.), *Animal Communication*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.

Hollos, M., & Beeman, W. (1978). The development of directives among Norwegian and Hungarian children: An example of communicative style in culture. *Language in Society*, 7(3), 345–355. DOI: 10.1017/S0047404500005765

Iverson, J. M., & Goldin-Meadow S. (2005). Gesture paves the way for language development. *Psychological Science*, 16(5), 367–371. DOI: 10.1111/j.0956-7976.2005.01542.x

James, S. (1978). Effect of listener age and situation on the politeness of children's directives. *Journal of Psycholinguistic Research*, 7(4), 307–317. DOI: 10.1007/BF01068112

Kampf, Z., & Blum-Kulka, S. (2007). Do children apologize to each other? Apology events in young Israeli peer discourse. *Journal of Politeness Research*, 3(1), 11–37.

Karmiloff-Smith, A. (1979). *A Functional Approach to Child Language: A Study of Determiner and Reference*. Cambridge: CUP.

Katriel, T. (1985). Brogez: Ritual and strategy in Israeli children's conflicts. *Language in Society*, 14(4), 467–490. DOI: 10.1017/S0047404500011477

Keller, H., Lohaus, A., Kuensemueller, P., Abels, M., Yovsi, R., Voelker, S., Jensen, H., Papaligoura, Z., Rosabal-Coto, M., Kulks, D., & Mohite, P. (2004). The bio-culture of parenting: Evidence from five cultural communities. *Parenting: Science and Practice*, 4, 25–50. DOI: 10.1207/s15327922par0401_2

Killen, M., & Naigles, L. R. (1995). Preschool children pay attention to their addressees: Effects of gender composition on peer disputes. *Discourse Processes*, 19(3), 329–346. DOI: 10.1080/01638539509544921

Köymen, B., & Küntay, A. C. (2013). Turkish children's conversational oppositions: Usage of two discourse markers. *Discourse Processes*, 50:6, 388–406.

Küntay, A. C. (2012). Crosslinguistic research. In E. Hoff (Ed.), *The Blackwell Guide to Research Methods in Child Language* (pp. 287–299). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley-Blackwell. DOI: 10.1002/9781444344035.ch19

Küntay, A. C., & Koçbaş, D. (2009). Effects of lexical items and construction types in English and Turkish character introductions in elicited narrative. In J. Guo, E. Lieven, N. Budwig, S. Ervin-Tripp, K. Nakamura, & Ş. Özçalişkan (Eds.), *Cross-linguistic Approaches to the Psychology of Language: Research in the Tradition of Dan Isaac Slobin* (pp. 81–92). New York, NY: Psychology Press.

Küntay, A. C., & Özyürek, A. (2006). Learning to use demonstratives in conversation: What do Language specific strategies in Turkish reveal? *Journal of Child Language*, 33(2), 303–320. DOI: 10.1017/S0305000906007380

Küntay, A. C., & Şenay, I. (2003). Narratives beget narratives: Rounds of stories in Turkish preschool conversations. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 35(4), 559–587. DOI: 10.1016/S0378-2166(02)00129-7

Küntay, A. C., & Slobin, D. I. (2002). Putting interaction back into child language: Examples from Turkish. *Psychology of Language and Communication*, 6, 5–14.

Kyratzis, A., & Guo, J. (1996). "Separate worlds" for girls and boys? Views from U.S. and Chinese mixed-sex friendship groups. In D. I. Slobin, J. Gerhardt, A. Kyratzis, & J. Guo (Eds.), *Social Interaction, Social Context, and Language: Essays in Honor of Susan Ervin Tripp* (pp. 555–578). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Kyratzis, A., & Guo, J. (2001). Preschool girls' and boys' verbal conflict strategies in the United States and China. *Research on Language & Social Interaction*, 34(1), 45–74. DOI: 10.1207/S15327973RLSI3401_3

Kyratsis, A., & Tarim, Ş. D. (2010). Using directives to construct egalitarian or hierarchical social organization: Turkish middle-class preschool girls' socialization about gender, affect, and context in peer group conversations. *First Language*, 30(3–4), 473–492. DOI: 10.1177/0142723710370547

Lambrecht, K. (1994). *Information Structure and Sentence Form: Topic, Focus, and the Mental Representation of Discourse Referents*. Cambridge: CUP. DOI: 10.1017/CBO9780511620607

Leung, C. B. (2009). Collaborative narration in preadolescent girl talk: A Saturday luncheon conversation among three friends. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 41(7), 1341–1357. DOI: 10.1016/j.pragma.2009.02.011

Levinson, S. C. (2004). Deixis and pragmatic. In L. Horn & G. Ward (Eds.), *The Handbook of Pragmatics* (pp. 97–121). Oxford: Blackwell.

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

Liszkowski, U., Brown, P., Callaghan, T., Takada, A., & De Vos, C. (2012). A prelinguistic gestural universal of human communication. *Cognitive Science*, 36(4), 698–713. DOI: 10.1111/j.1551-6709.2011.01228.x

Long, C. (2010). Apology in Japanese gratitude situations: The negotiation of interlocutor role-relations. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 42(4), 1060–1075. DOI: 10.1016/j.pragma.2009.09.005

Marcos, H., & Bernicot, J. (1994). Addressee co-operation and request reformulation in young children. *Journal of Child Language*, 21(3), 677–92. DOI: 10.1017/S0305000900009508

Mastin J. D., & Vogt, P. (2011). Joint engagement and vocabulary development: A longitudinal, observational study of Mozambican infants from 1;1 to 2;1. Paper presented at the 12th International Conference for the Study of Child Language, Montreal, July 19–23, 2011.

Matthews, D., Behne, T., Lieven, E., & Tomasello, M. (2012). Origins of the human pointing gesture: A training study. *Developmental Science*, 15(6), 817–829.

Maynard, D. (1985). On the functions of social conflict among children. *American Sociological Review*, 50(2), 207–223. DOI: 10.2307/2095410

Michaels, S. (1981). Children's narrative styles and differential access to literacy. *Language in Society*, 10(3), 423–442. DOI: 10.1017/S0047404500008861

Michaels, S. (1991). The dismantling of narrative. In A. McCabe & C. Peterson (Eds.), *Developing Narrative Structure* (pp. 303–351). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Michaels, S. & Cazden, C. (1986). Teacher-child collaboration as oral preparation for literacy. In B. B. Schieffelin (Ed.), *Acquisition of Literacy: Ethnographic Perspectives* (pp. 132–154). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Morikawa, H., Shand, N. & Kosawa, Y. (1988). Maternal speech to prelingual infants in Japan and the United States: Relationships among functions, forms and referents. *Journal of Child Language*, 15(2), 237–256. DOI: 10.1017/S0305000900012356

Nakamura, K. (1993). Referential structure in Japanese children's narratives. In *Japanese/Korean Linguistics 3*, (pp. 84–99). Stanford, CA: CSLI.

Nakamura, K. (1996). The use of polite language by Japanese preschool children. In D. Slobin, J. Gerhardt, A. Kyratzis, & J. Guo (Eds.), *Social Interaction, Social Context, and Language: A Festschrift for Susan Ervin-Tripp* (pp. 235–250). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Nakamura, K. (July 1999). The Development of Requests in Young Japanese Children, paper presented at the 8th International Congress for the Study of Child Language, San Sebastian-Donostia, Spain.

Nakamura, K. (2001). Peers and language: The acquisition of "male" speech forms and conversational style by Japanese boys. In M. Almgren, A. Barreña, M. Ezeizabarrena, I. Idiazabal, & Brian MacWhinney (Eds.), *Research on Child Language Acquisition: Proceedings of the 8th Conference of the International Association for the Study of Child* Language (pp. 504–520). Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Press.

Nakamura, K. (2002a). "Japanese boys' conflict talk during video game play". Paper presented at the 8th International Congress for the Study of Child Language/ Society for Research on Child Language Disorders, Madison, WI.

Nakamura, K. (2002b). Polite language usage in mother-infant interactions: A look at language socialization. In Y. Shirai, H. Kobayashi, S. Miyata, K. Nakamura, T. Ogura, & H. Sirai (Eds.), *Studies in Language Sciences* II (pp. 175–191). Tokyo: Kurosio.

Nakamura, K. (2006). The acquisition of linguistic politeness in Japanese. In M. Nakayama, R. Mazuka, & Y. Shirai (Eds.), *Handbook of Japanese Psycholinguistics* (pp. 110–115). Cambridge: CUP.

Ochs, E. (1982). Talking to children in Western Samoa. *Language in Society*, 11, 77–104. DOI: 10.1017/S0047404500009040

Ochs, E. (1988). *Culture and Language Development: Language Acquisition and Language Socialization in a Samoan Village*. Cambridge: CUP.

Ochs, E., Pontecorvo, C., & Fasulo, A. (1996). Socializing taste. *Ethnos*, 61(1–2), 7–46. DOI: 10.1080/00141844.1996.9981526

Otomo, K. (2001). Maternal responses to word approximations in Japanese children's transition to language. *Journal of Child Language*, 28(1), 29–57. DOI: 10.1017/S0305000900004578

Özçalişkan, Ş., & Goldin-Meadow, S. (2005). Do parents lead their children by the hand? *Journal of Child Language*, 32(3), 481–505. DOI: 10.1017/S0305000905007002

Özyürek, A. & Kita, S. (2000). Attention manipulation in the situational use of Turkish and Japanese demonstratives. Paper presented at the Linguistic Society of America Conference, Chicago.

Pine, J. M., & Lieven, E. V. (1997). Slot and frame patterns and the development of the determiner category. *Applied Psycholinguistics*, 18(2), 123–138. DOI: 10.1017/S0142716400009930

Quay, S. (2008). Dinner conversation with a trilingual two-year-old: Language socialization in a multilingual context. *First Language*, 28(5), 5–33. DOI: 10.1177/0142723707083557

Rozendaal, M. I., & Baker, A. E. (2008). A cross-linguistic investigation of the acquisition of the pragmatics of indefinite and definite reference in two-year-olds. *Journal of Child Language*, 35(4), 773–807.

Rowe, M., & Goldin-Meadow, S. (2009). Differences in early gesture explain SES disparities in child vocabulary size at school entry. *Science*, 323(5916), 951–953. DOI: 10.1126/science.1167025

Ryckebusch, C., & Marcos, H. (2004). Speech acts, social context and parent-toddler play between the ages of 1;5 and 2;3. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 36(5), 883–897. DOI: 10.1016/j.pragma.2003.10.019

Salazar Orvig, A., Marcos, H., Morgenstern, A., Hassan, R., Leber-Marin, J., & Pares, J. (2010). Dialogical beginnings of anaphora: The use of third person pronouns before the age of 3. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 42(7), 1842–1865. DOI: 10.1016/j.pragma.2009.09.020

Schieffelin, B. B. (1979). Getting it together: An ethnographic approach to the study of communicative competence. In B. B. Schieffelin & E. Ochs (Eds.), *Developmental Pragmatics* (pp. 73–108). New York, NY: Academic Press.

Schieffelin, B. B. (1990). *The Give and Take of Everyday Life: Language Socialization of Kaluli Children*. Cambridge: CUP.

Schieffelin, B. B. & Ochs, E. (1986). *Language Socialization across Cultures*. Cambridge: CUP.

Sealey, A. (1999). 'Don't be cheeky': Requests, directives and being a child, *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 3(1), 24–40. DOI: 10.1111/1467-9481.00061

Sheldon, A. (1992). Conflict talk: Sociolinguistic challenges to self-assertion and how young girls meet them. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly*, 38(1), 95–117.

Sheldon, A. (1996). You can be the baby brother, but you aren't born yet: Preschool girls' negotiation for power and access in pretend play. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 29(1), 57–80. DOI: 10.1207/s15327973rlsi2901_4

Shneidman, L. A., Buresh, J. S., Shimpi, P. M., Knight-Schwarz, J., & Woodward, A. L. (2009). Social experience, social attention and word learning in an overhearing paradigm. *Language Learning and Development*, 5(4), 1–16. DOI: 10.1080/15475440903001115

Skarabela, B. & Allen, S. E. M. (2011). How newness and joint attention work together in child Inuktitut: Assessing discourse-pragmatic models of early argument realization. In K. Franich, K. Iserman, & L. Keil, *Proceedings of the 34th Annual Boston University Conference on Language Development* (pp. 385–396). Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Press.

So, W. C., Demir, Ö. E., & Goldin-Meadow, S. (2010). When speech is ambiguous, gesture steps in: Sensitivity to discourse-pragmatic principles in early childhood. *Applied Psycholinguistics*, 31(1), 209–224. DOI: 10.1017/S0142716409990221

Stoll, S. (2009). Crosslinguistic approaches to language acquisition. In E. Bavin (Ed.), *The Handbook of Child Language* (pp. 89–104). Cambridge: CUP.

Stoll, S., & Bickel, B. (2009). How deep are differences in referential density? In J. Guo, E. Lieven, S. Ervin-Tripp, N. Budwig, Ş. Özçalikan & K. Nakamura (Eds.), *Crosslinguistic Approaches to the Psychology of Language: Research in the Tradition of Dan Isaac Slobin* (pp. 543–555). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Stoll, S., Bickel, B., Lieven, E., Banjade, G., Bhatta, T. N., Gaenszle, M., Paudyal, N. P., Pettigrew, J., Rai, I. P., & Rai, N. K. (2011). Nouns and verbs in Chintang: Children's usage and surrounding adult speech. *Journal of Child Language* 39(2), 1–38.

Takada, A. (2012). Pre-verbal infant-caregiver interaction. In A. Duranti, E. Ochs, & B. Schieffelin (Eds.), *The Handbook of Language Socialization*. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley-Blackwell.

Tanz, C. (1980). *Studies in the Acquisition of Deictic Terms*. Cambridge: CUP.

Toda, S., Fogel, A., & Kawai, M. (1990). Maternal speech to three-month-old infants in the United States and Japan. *Journal of Child Language*, 17(2), 279–94. DOI: 10.1017/ S0305000900013775

Tryggvason, M. (2004). Comparison of topic organization in Finnish, Swedish-Finnish, and Swedish family discourse. *Discourse Processes*, 37(3), 225–248. DOI: 10.1207/ s15326950dp3703_3

Tryggvason, M. (2006). Communicative behavior in family conversation: Comparison of amount of talk in Finnish, Swedish Finnish, and Swedish families. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 38(11), 1795–1810. DOI: 10.1016/j.pragma.2006.02.001

Tulviste, T., Mizera, L., & De Geer, B. (2004). Expressing communicative intents in Estonian, Finnish, and Swedish mother-adolescent interactions. *Journal of Child Language*, 31(4), 801–809. DOI: 10.1017/S0305000904006488

Tulviste, T., Mizera, L., De Geer, B., & Tryggvason, M. T. (2002). Regulatory comments as tools of family socialization: A comparison of Estonian, Swedish and Finnish mealtime interaction. *Language in Society*, 31(5), 655–677. DOI: 10.1017/S0047404502315045

Watson-Gegeo, K. A., & Boggs, S. T. (1977). From verbal play to talk story: The role of routines in speech events among Hawaiian children. In S. Ervin-Tripp & C. Mitchell Kernan (Eds.), *Child Discourse* (pp. 67–90). New York, NY: Academic Press.

Watson-Gegeo, K. A., & Gegeo, D. W. (1986). Calling-out and repeating routines in Kwara'ae children's language socialization. In B. B. Schieffelin & E. Ochs (Eds.), *Language Socialization across Cultures* (pp. 17–50). Cambridge: CUP.

Wilhite, M. (1983). Children's acquisition of language routines: The end-of-the-meal routine in Cakchiquel. *Language in Society*, 12(1), 47–64. DOI: 10.1017/S0047404500009581

Yule, G. (1997). *Referential Communication Tasks*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.