

INPUT & INTERACTION IN THE ACQUISITION OF L1 PRAGMATIC ROUTINES: IMPLICATIONS FOR SLA¹

MARGARET A. DUFON
University of Hawai'i

While there has been extensive study of both child L1 and adult L2 acquisition of pragmatics, the L1 and L2 studies have largely followed different paths. L1 research has focused on developmental steps, cognitive processes, socio-cultural variables, and the nature of the input and interaction. L2 studies have focused on the roles of socio-cultural variables and cross-linguistic influence in the acquisition of politeness forms. The purpose of this paper is to discuss the L1 literature on the acquisition of pragmatics, specifically linguistic politeness within the context of interactional routines. Routines are discussed in terms of 1) the nature of the input, that is, the inherent characteristics of the routines which facilitate or impede their being acquired, 2) the cognitive variables of noticing and understanding, 3) the social variables related to the child's role and status in the society, the structure of caregiving, and beliefs about language acquisition, and 4) the interactional variables. The implications of these findings for the study of L2 acquisition of pragmatics are discussed with respect to the inherent characteristics of routines, the roles of values and beliefs, the negotiation of meaning, and the role of learner feedback in the acquisition process. Finally some comments are made on research methodology.

INTRODUCTION

In order to become communicatively competent in a language, learners must acquire pragmatic competence as well as grammatical competence. One important aspect of pragmatic competence is the ability to comprehend and use linguistic politeness forms appropriately in any given social context. Therefore, the acquisition of politeness involves acquiring both linguistic and social knowledge. This intersection of social and linguistic knowledge includes both sociopragmatic knowledge—knowing which speech acts are and are not appropriate in a given context—and pragmalinguistic knowledge—knowing which linguistic forms are the most appropriate for

¹The research for this study was funded by the East West Center, Honolulu, Hawaii. I would like to thank Gabriele Kasper for her helpful comments and suggestions on earlier drafts of this paper.

realizing a speech act in a given context (cf. Leech, 1983; Olshtain & Weinbach, 1987; Thomas, 1983).

The politeness of an utterance is not located in the form itself, but in its use in a given context. Therefore it is imperative that children and foreign language learners learn the contextual variables associated with the appropriate use of a form. These contextual variables include enduring features of the relationship (e.g., power, status or role, distance, rules and rights, and permanent possessions) shorter-term conditions (e.g., rights and obligations in temporary roles, intrusion on the addressee's attention, and disruption of the addressee's activity), and attitudinal factors (e.g., friendliness, insistence, and playfulness) (Ervin-Tripp & Gordon, 1986). Given the complex relationship among these variables, the task of learning to understand and use politeness forms appropriately is indeed a difficult one. Unlike the grammar of the language, which is acquired by all members of a speech community in early childhood, the acquisition of pragmatics extends into adulthood, and the ultimate level of attainment varies considerably from speaker to speaker (Kasper & Schmidt, 1992). For adult learners of a second or foreign language, this task is particularly difficult.

The acquisition of linguistic politeness by both child L1 and adult L2² learners has been studied extensively, however, the L1 and L2 studies have largely followed different paths. L1 research has focused on developmental steps, cognitive processes, socio-cultural variables, and the nature of the input in a wide variety of languages (e.g., Demuth, 1986; Ervin-Tripp & Gordon, 1986; Ochs, 1988, 1993; Watson-Gegeo & Gegeo, 1986; Wilhite, 1983). L2 research, on the other hand, has focused on the roles of socio-cultural variables and cross-linguistic influence in the acquisition of politeness forms (e.g., Beebe, Takahashi, & Ullis-Weltz 1989; Kasper, 1989, 1992; Olshtain, 1983) with considerably less work addressing how pragmatic abilities are acquired (Schmidt, 1993).

The purpose of this paper is to discuss the L1 literature on pragmatic development as it relates to variables of potential importance to the acquisition of one type of pragmatic ability—linguistic politeness—by L2 learners. In doing so, I will focus on the nature of the input and interaction in routines and their relationship to cognitive and socio-cultural variables. The

²Unless otherwise noted, L2 in this paper will refer to adult L2 learners.

theoretical position from which I will begin is an interactionist one,³ that is, both innate and environmental factors (including social and cultural ones) are believed to influence, and perhaps determine, cognitive activities such as noticing and memory (cf. Holland & Quinn, 1987; Markus & Kitayama, 1991), and language acquisition. Cross-cultural differences in values and beliefs can influence the nature of the input and the interaction between children and caregivers, which in turn result in differences in what, when, and how politeness norms and politeness forms are acquired. Therefore children and language learners should be considered both as organisms and as social beings, and research addressing the acquisition of sociopragmatic and pragmalinguistic knowledge should ideally be culturally contextualized (Ochs, 1988).

Because of cultural differences, it is not likely that many specific behaviors related to language acquisition will be found to be universal, but rather that with respect to any one aspect of acquisition, a small number of patterns will probably be found across languages. If there is any universality to be found, it will probably be at more abstract levels of analysis.

One universal is the ability to produce more polite and linguistically complex forms as age increases (Axia et al., 1987; Boggs, 1985; Gleason, Perlmann, & Greif, 1984; Hollos & Beeman, 1978; Nippold, Leonard, & Anastopoulos, 1982; Schieffelin, 1990; Snow et al., 1990). For example, in requests made by American English-speaking children, improved syntactic ability results in an increase in the proportion of interrogative forms, which are more polite, and a decrease in the proportion of imperative forms, which are less polite. Shifts from speaker as grammatical subject to listener as grammatical subject (such as the shift from "Can I please have some candy" to "Can you please give me some candy?") also occur as age increases (Nippold et al., 1982). Furthermore, there is an increase in the number of hedges (Ervin-Tripp et al., 1990) and justifications (Axia et al., 1987), the ability to request on behalf of another (Schieffelin, 1990), the ability to reformulate a request which was not successful on the first try (Axia & Baroni, 1985; Ervin-Tripp & Gordon, 1986; Ervin-Tripp et al., 1990; Schieffelin, 1990), and to adjust their register appropriately for the addressee and other contextual variables.⁴ This relationship between age and the increasing ability to relate

³For a more complete discussion of the rationale for this position, see Larsen-Freeman & Long (1991).

forms, functions, and contextual variables has been reported for a number of diverse cultures including American (Becker & Smenner, 1986; Camras, Pisto & Brown, 1985; Ervin-Tripp, 1977; Ervin-Tripp et al., 1990; Ervin-Tripp & Gordon, 1986; James, 1978), German (Waller, 1984), Hungarian and Norwegian (Hollos & Beeman, 1978) Italian (Axia & Baroni, 1985; Axia et al., 1987; Perilli Ponterotto, & Maniere, 1984), Kaluli (Schieffelin, 1990), and Mexican-American Spanish (Eisenberg, 1982). The changes in syntax and lexical choice referred to above reflect an increased ability to take the perspective of another in manipulating the language in order to achieve a desired perlocutionary effect (Ervin-Tripp & Gordon, 1986). This increased linguistic complexity and the facility with which linguistic forms are manipulated is probably universal. The precise ways in which this is accomplished varies cross-culturally and cross-linguistically.

Another way in which cultures vary is in the nature of the input caregivers provide to children. Some cultures (e.g., white middle class American) extensively modify input to young children while others (e.g., Heath's African-American working class) do not. Of those that modify the input, some (e.g., white middle class American) do it by simplifying it so as to make it more comprehensible to the young child whose cognitive capabilities are still somewhat limited; others (e.g., standard Javanese) do it by making the input more complex so as to teach pragmatically appropriate respectful forms (Smith-Hefner, 1988a). These differences in the input result in different patterns of processing it by young children acquiring the language. Simplified input, such as that typically given in white middle class American culture, allows children to use an analytical (Peters, 1983) or referential (Nelson, 1973) strategy to extract single words to name people and objects. Unsimplified input, such as that provided to African-American working class children, seems to force the children to adopt a gestalt (Peters, 1983) or expressive strategy (Nelson, 1973), whereby intonationally salient and delimited chunks of language that are several morphemes long are extracted and produced to express feelings, needs, and social interactions (cf. Heath, 1983). Both paths to acquisition work equally well. Neither approach is

⁴These variables include the relationship of the interlocutors in terms of status, age etc., the imposition or cost of a request depending on its intrusiveness, the effort involved in complying, whether the request involves an expected behavior or a special favor, and the emotional state of the requestor.

necessary, as the other will also suffice. What both have in common, however, is that they provide comprehensible input to the developing child. As with this example, our task is to identify patterns in behavior associated with the process of language acquisition that exist in a variety of cultures and to search for universals that exist at a more abstract level rather than in specific behaviors.

The data presented and discussed here are taken from a variety of L1 language groups including three dialects of American English—white middle class (e.g., Becker, 1990; Becker & Smenner, 1986; Ervin-Tripp, 1977; Ervin-Tripp, Guo & Lampert, 1990; Greif & Gleason, 1980; Snow, Perlmann, Gleason & Hooshyar, 1990), African-American working class in the southeastern United States⁵ (Heath, 1983; 1986), and Hawaii Creole English, as spoken by Hawaiians and part Hawaiians (Boggs, 1985); American Sign Language (Newport & Meier, 1985); Basotho (Demuth, 1986); British English (Axia, McGurk, & Glachan, 1987); Brunei Malay (Craig & Kimball, 1987); Cakchiquel (Wilhite, 1983); German (Waller, 1984); Hebrew (Berman, 1985); Hungarian (Hollos, 1977; Hollos & Beeman, 1978); Italian (Axia & Baroni, 1985; Axia, McGurk, & Glachan, 1987; Perilli et al., 1984); Japanese (Cook, 1990; Clancy, 1985, 1986); two dialects of Javanese—standard Javanese⁶ and Tengger dialect (Smith-Hefner, 1988a, 1988b); Kaluli (Schieffelin, 1985, 1990); Kipsigis (Harkness, 1977; Harkness & Super, 1977); Kwara'ae (Watson-Gegeo & Gegeo, 1986); Mexican-American Spanish (Eisenberg, 1982, 1986); Norwegian (Hollos & Beeman, 1978); Romani (Reger & Gleason, 1991); Samoan (Ochs, 1988, 1993); Swiss French (Ervin-Tripp, Strage, Lampert, & Bell, 1987); Turkish (Aksu-Koá & Slobin, 1985); and Walpiri (Bavin, 1991).

Using the information provided in these studies, I will examine how routines promote the acquisition of pragmatic competence by increasing the likelihood that the relevant features (forms, functions, and contextual variables) will be noticed and understood by the child. This will be done by examining both the nature of the input and the interaction in routines. Cultural variables including beliefs about the child's role and status in the

⁵Elsewhere, this group will simply be referred to as African-American working class; however it should be kept in mind, as Heath (1983) points out, that the linguistic characteristics of this group may differ from that of urban working class African-Americans or working class African Americans from other regions of the country.

⁶Hereafter, standard Javanese will be referred to simply as Javanese.

society, the structure of caregiving, and beliefs about language acquisition as well as the role the child plays by providing feedback will be considered as these affect the nature of the interaction, which in turn affects the strategies the child must adopt in order to gain and maintain status as a participant in the interactions. Direct and indirect approaches to teaching politeness forms, functions, and contextual variables will be described in terms of their forms, the contexts in which they occur, and their contribution to the acquisition process. Finally, the implications of these L1 studies for L2 acquisition will be discussed.

L1 STUDIES ON INTERACTIONAL ROUTINES

Cognitive Variables

In many if not all cultures, linguistic politeness is largely acquired within the context of interactional routines. "An interactional routine is a sequences of exchanges in which one speaker's utterance, accompanied by appropriate nonverbal behavior, calls forth one of a limited set of responses by one or more other participants" (Peters and Boggs, 1986:81). Certain characteristics of the input and interaction in these routines are believed to promote the acquisition of language and social behaviors which are not acquired by exposure to the language alone (cf. e.g., Sachs, Bard & Johnson, 1981). Cultures differ in the ways they interact with children in routines.

One way in which they differ is in the age at which caregivers begin interacting with their children by talking to them. For example, in Javanese culture, parents typically begin talking to their children as soon as the baby becomes active in the womb (M. Hikam, personal communication). The American white middle class begins talking to them within the first 24 hours after birth (Ochs, 1993). Samoans begin talking to their children somewhere between 4 and 6 months of age when children become more mobile and require directives to keep them out of mischief; prior to that time, they are talked about, but not to (Ochs, 1988).

Typically, children learn part of a routine, then the entire routine, and finally are able to link and interweave routines together to perform more complex interactions. As development progresses, they become more flexible in the devices they employ for negotiating through a routine, and the routines

often become less formulaic. Children also become more flexible in the roles they take. Whereas they are initially assigned a role, they eventually learn to take on other roles as well (Peters & Boggs, 1986; Watson-Gegeo & Gegeo, 1986).

Routines are believed to promote pragmatic development by increasing the likelihood that forms, functions, and contextual features will be noticed and understood. Noticing (i.e., the conscious registration of the simple occurrence of an event) and understanding (the recognition of a general principle, rule, or pattern) (Schmidt, 1993) have been identified as necessary variables in the language acquisition process (Long, 1992).

Noticing may be a necessary first step in the acquisition process, as there appears to be a close connection between what gets noticed in the input and what is learned. What gets noticed is influenced by a number of factors including frequency, perceptual salience, linguistic complexity, skill level, expectations, and task demands (Schmidt & Frota, 1986; Schmidt, 1993). Through the use of interactional routines, caregivers can manipulate these factors thereby increasing the probability that social and linguistic behaviors will be noticed, and subsequently acquired. For example, in Kwara'ae calling out and repeating routines, children typically repeat the portion that the adult has stressed correctly. When the child errs, adults often shift the stress to the portion the child has said incorrectly,⁷ thus helping the child to notice and correct the error (Watson-Gegeo & Gegeo, 1986).

Noticing in and of itself is not sufficient for language development to occur. Forms and functions must not only be noticed but also understood in the contexts in which they occur, that is, the input must be comprehensible. Routines aid in this process by serving as building blocks to language learners when they have few linguistic resources available to them for understanding meaning (Peters & Boggs, 1986). Because routines are typically repetitive, formulaic, and tend to be associated with certain behaviors, their meaning can be understood with relative ease, and their occurrence can be predicted.⁸

⁷In Watson-Gegeo and Gegeo (1986), it is written that caretakers stress the correct part of the child's utterance in their repetition of it; however Watson-Gegeo (personal communication) informed me that that was a misprint, and that it should have said that the incorrect part is stressed in the repetition.

⁸Heath (1983:83) notes that in African-American working class communities, the response to formulaic utterances is not predictable. "If a child says 'bye-bye,' an adult may respond by a wave and 'bye-bye,' or he may grab the child roughly and say, 'You trying to make me go

This predictability reduces the need for explicitness (Gleason, Perlmann, & Greif, 1984). In addition, because of the high level of contextual support in routines, children may be able to comply with indirect requests by using practical reasoning to figure out what is needed. As development progresses, there is proportionately greater reliance on linguistic information in this decoding process and proportionately less dependence on contextual cues, although sensitivity to contextual cues remains an important aspect of pragmatic development (Ervin-Tripp & Gordon, 1986). This linguistic development is facilitated by the use of direct and indirect teaching techniques in interactional routines as will be discussed later in this paper. Through these routines, the learner can progress from only comprehending more explicit forms to comprehending less explicit forms as well (Gleason et al., 1984).

Nature of the Input

What gets noticed and understood by the child depends on both the inherent characteristics of the input and on the nature of the interaction between the caregivers and the child. Three inherent characteristics of routines which facilitate the acquisition of politeness will be discussed here: a match between the child's inner state and the linguistic form, flags, and a salient and consistent match between the verbal cue and the expected response.

Match between inner state and the linguistic form: When the linguistic form of the routine correlates with the child's inner state, it will be easier to acquire than when it does not. For example, a child who requests something (e.g., with the form "I want ____") is presumably in a state of wanting that thing whereas a child who says "thank you" is not necessarily in a state of thankfulness (Gleason et al., 1984).

Flags: Politeness markers like please and thank you occur in formulaic routines, and serve as flags which help children to notice and recognize the

home, boy?" I would contend that although the precise response may not be predictable with 100% accuracy, there would still be a limited range of predictable responses with different probabilities of occurrence in a given context. Thus, there would still be some predictability associated with formulaic routines.

social situations that call for their use (e.g., please with requesting, thank you after receiving something) (Gleason et al., 1984). These flags help children acquire sociopragmatic knowledge (because of the association of a routine with a particular politeness formula) even though their syntactic competence is still very limited. For example, in making a request, young children may not yet be capable of using complex syntax (e.g., interrogatives and conditionals, cf. Færch & Kasper, 1989), but they can use simple politeness markers such as please to soften the request. Once they identify the routine as a requesting routine, they know they should use please. Gradually, they acquire pragmalinguistic knowledge and associate different linguistic forms for requesting with different sets of contextual variables in different episodes of the routine. In this way, they come to know which forms convey the desired referential and relational meanings in a given instance (Gleason et al., 1984). As the child becomes more pragmatically and linguistically competent, the routines become less formulaic and more varied until they become less recognizable as routines (Peters & Boggs, 1986).

Not all cultures have politeness markers similar to please and thank you. In Kaluli culture, words equivalent to these have only recently been introduced by Christian missionaries, and are used by Kaluli only when speaking to foreigners. Nevertheless, other formulas can function as flags which help to classify a routine as a certain type which calls for certain linguistic behavior. Kaluli children are taught to express appreciation through *elema* routines in which they are told to tell a third person who it was that gave them the desired food, thus expressing the relationship established by the giving (Schieffelin, 1990). These formulaic expressions in *elema* routines may serve as flags in a way similar to please and thank you in English.

Salient and consistent matching verbal cue: Routines that can be responded to with the exact same words as in the first pair part are easier to acquire because they have salient pre-verbal cues which provide the expected response. Thus, verbal praising routines like *maaloo* in Samoan (Ochs, 1993) and verbal greeting and leave taking routines like *hi* and *goodbye* in English (Greif & Gleason, 1980) are easy because they require only that the child imitate the speaker. In English, leave taking at a basic level is very easy because the word "good-bye" is used by both interlocutors, and can be used

appropriately in all leave taking contexts. In other languages, it is not always so simple. For example, when leaving the house in which one is living in Japan, each interlocutor uses a different expression. The appropriate expression for the one who is leaving is "Itte kimasu" which means, "I will go and come back." For the person who is staying at home, it is, "Itte irasshai" which means "Go and come back." When one is leaving for a long time, perhaps forever, the appropriate expression is "sayoonara", but this is not appropriate when leaving for short term absences. Thus the *good-bye* routine is inherently more complex in Japanese and places more demands on the child learning the language.

Routines which do not have a pre-verbal cue are more difficult to learn. For example, "thank you" in English is not preceded by any consistent verbal cue, but rather by the act of giving something. The required response is not there to be noticed unless a caregiver models or prompts it via a direct or indirect request such as "Say, thank you" or "Can you say thank you?" Prompting of thank you is therefore very often necessary. In fact, it is so pervasive that children may consider the prompt to be a necessary part of the routine (Becker and Smenner, 1986). There is some evidence that children spontaneously respond appropriately in routines with salient pre-verbal cues (such as *hi* and *goodbye*) earlier than in routines which do not contain salient pre-verbal cues (such as *thank you*) (Greif & Gleason, 1980). The latter type of routine would require interactional modifications such as increasing indirectness of the prompt until it was ultimately eliminated.

Nature of the Interaction

The likelihood of a child's noticing and understanding the input is not dependent on the inherent characteristics of the routine alone. Rather caregivers can manipulate the interaction so as to make certain information more noticeable and more understandable to the child. The ways in which caregivers interact with young children depends on cultural beliefs about the child's status and role in the society, the social organization of care giving, beliefs about language acquisition (Schieffelin & Eisenberg, 1984) and the feedback provided by the child (Snow, 1988).

The child's status and role in society: Societies differ in terms of whether they believe it is preferable for caregivers to adopt the perspective of the child or for the child to accommodate to the caregiver. Children are pushed to take the perspective of another in different ways and to different degrees at different stages in the developmental process depending on cultural values and beliefs and the ways in which these affect behaviors in interactional routines. The influence of values and beliefs on behaviors in routines can be seen in the willingness of caregivers to guess the child's meaning in clarification routines, and to modify the speech they address to infants.

Clarification routines: Cross-cultural differences in perspective taking are evident in clarification routines. In white middle class American society, when a child's meaning is not understood, the caregiver typically takes the perspective of the child. This is done by expressing a guess about what the child has said. In contrast, in Samoan society, the child must adapt to the caregiver. When the meaning of a child's utterance is unclear, the burden to clarify falls on the child. The adult either disregards the utterance, signals non-comprehension, or directs the child to redesign the utterance, but does not express a guess about what the child has said (Ochs, 1988).

Input modification: A variety of terms have been used to describe the speech spoken to infants and young children including motherese, caretaker speech (Snow, 1988), baby talk register, and simplified input (Ferguson, 1977). These different terms do not necessarily all mean the same thing; nor is the same term necessarily used in the same way by all those who use it. I will use the term input modification to refer to any differences in the input between speech addressed to babies and young children and that addressed to adults. Modified input may be simplified, or it may be input that is made more complex in certain ways. Similar kinds of input may also be present in speech addressed to adults, but not necessarily in the same contexts or with the same frequency.

Input modification in speech addressed to young children has been found in many unrelated and geographically distant language groups throughout the world (Ferguson, 1977), such as American white middle class (e.g., Gleason et al., 1984; Snow et al., 1990), ASL (Newport & Meier, 1985), Basotho (Demuth, 1986), Hebrew (Zeidner, 1978 cited by Berman, 1985),

Japanese (Clancy, 1985, 1986), Javanese (Smith-Hefner, 1988a, 1988b), Kwara'ae (Watson-Gegeo & Gegeo, 1986), and Romani (Reger & Gleason, 1991). Yet in at least some cultures such as African-American working class (Heath, 1983), Kaluli (Schieffelin, 1990), and Samoan, (Ochs, 1988, 1993), input modification is minimal at best.

However, even in these cultures, there is often apparently a limited amount of input modification. For example, Ochs (1988) reports that directives to very young Samoan children are different in tone and affect from those to older ones. Schieffelin (1985, 1990) states that Kaluli caregivers change the type of input they give to children as they develop. For example, speech directed to children in their first 6 months is limited to vocatives and expressives, but between 6 and 12 months of age, adults begin to direct imperatives and rhetorical questions to them as well. Also *elema* (repeating) routines change in voice quality and in semantic and syntactic content as the child matures. Heath (1983:95) reports that caregivers do not make phonological simplifications or use special lexical items, but does not explicitly mention whether there are any syntactic modifications in speech directed to African-American working class children or whether such speech is semantically constrained to the here and now (cf. Snow, 1988) in the early stages of language acquisition.

The relationship between cultural values and behaviors such as the willingness of caregivers to modify input to the child is not always straightforward. For example, hierarchy and status have been used to explain very different and sometimes opposite behaviors in societies which highly value them. In Samoan, Japanese and Javanese societies, hierarchy is highly valued, and the child must ultimately learn to take the perspective of another. The ways in which this is accomplished, however, are completely different because of complex relationships in their value systems.

Samoan caregivers expect children to accommodate to their elders. Ochs (1988, 1993) attributes this to the importance of hierarchy and social status in Samoan society. Because children, being of lower status, must accommodate to higher status elders, Samoans do little to modify input to young children. The Samoan child is, in a sense, forced to accommodate upward, as there is no other alternative except isolation.

Japanese society also places a high value on hierarchy and status, yet caregivers are quite willing to modify their input to children. They use a baby

talk register extensively, a practice which is considered to be "consistent with the more hierarchical nature of family and social structure in Japan" (Clancy, 1985:487) because it emphasizes the child's status as a child. This Japanese behavior in terms of input modification is similar to that of American behavior, although Americans do not place as high a value on hierarchy and status as Japanese (and Samoans) do. Yet both American and Japanese societies are considered to be very child-centered. Both values, hierarchy and child-centeredness, influence the caregiver-child interaction patterns. In spite of this child-centered approach, Japanese children still learn to adopt the perspective of another and to accommodate to the other. This is accomplished through empathy training, in which mothers explicitly and implicitly teach their children to be sensitive to the needs, wishes and feelings of others by speaking for others about their thoughts and feelings (Clancy, 1986).

Japanese culture is another one which places great importance on hierarchy and social status. Japanese caregivers (particularly mothers) take the child's perspective when teaching honorific vocabulary. They use a technique known as *mbasake' anake'* 'speaking the speech of the children' or 'speaking (polite) speech for the benefit of the children' (Smith-Hefner, 1988a:191, 1988b:543), a label which implies this adaptation on the part of the mother. In fact, this technique often requires mothers to use forms which are incorrect from their point of view but correct from the child's point of view. Yet this adaptation to the child's point of view is not motivated by an accommodation to the child's limited cognitive abilities, but rather by a desire to shape the child's speech to fit the addressee's status. In this way, taking the child's point of view is fundamentally different from that in white middle class American culture (Smith-Hefner, 1988a).

From these examples, it is clear that although behaviors can reflect cultural values and beliefs, the relationship is complex and unpredictable if only one value is considered at a time. Societies with similar belief systems may have entirely different behavioral patterns while those with different value and belief systems may have similar behavioral patterns along a particular dimension. So while knowledge of values may provide us with post hoc explanations of behaviors, we cannot predict exact behaviors from a single value (cf. Irvine, 1992).

As was mentioned earlier, differences in the input and interaction provided to children may force them to adopt different strategies for making sense of the data. This in turn, results in different language behaviors in two normally developing children of the same age from different cultures. Differences in language socialization patterns in interactional routines may push children in one culture to acquire certain pragmatic and politeness behaviors earlier than those in other cultures and may force them to utilize different strategies in doing so.

Social Organization of Caregiving: The organization and participation structure of routines depends in part on the social organization of caregiving in society. In some cultures, such as American white middle class culture, routines are typically dyadic (two-person). In some cultures (e.g., American white middle class, Japanese, and Javanese) the two participants are usually the mother and child (Clancy, 1985, 1986; Smith-Hefner, 1988a, 1988b). In other cultures (e.g., Hawaiian and part Hawaiian) routines may involve interactions with older siblings rather than with the mother (Boggs, 1985). Dyadic routines do not necessarily involve only two participants. For example, in Kwara'ae several adults work together sharing a single role to create a single routine with the infant (Watson-Gegeo & Gegeo, 1986).

Not all cultures prefer dyadic interactions; some prefer routines that involve more than two participant roles (Schieffelin & Eisenberg, 1984). In Kaluli culture, routines are typically triadic, involving the mother, an older child, and the baby. While Kaluli mothers do use dyadic routines in some contexts, dyadic routines tend to consist of fewer turns and have a narrower range of functions than triadic routines (Schieffelin, 1985, 1990). In Kwara'ae society, routines may also be either dyadic or triadic depending on the purpose of the routine. Dyadic repeating routines are typically used for correction of linguistic errors, to teach social behaviors such as table manners, and to teach the steps of infrequently performed household tasks. Triadic routines involve telling a child what to say to a third person and are used for social interactional behavior including the social uses of questions, requesting, calling out, greeting, leave-taking, and making polite conversation (Watson-Gegeo & Gegeo, 1986). An example of a triadic routine is provided by Schieffelin (1990:191) in which Seligiw (7 mos.) cries, and the mother initiates an elema routine with M li (24 mos.); a segment of this routine follows:

- Mother--M li--Seligiw : Odi ni y laya - l ma.
[Why are you crying? - Say it.]
- M li to Seligiw : odi ni y laya?! /
[Why are you crying?!]
- Mother--M li--Seligiw : Y l sabo! - l ma
[Don't cry! Say it.]
- M li to Seligiw : y l sabo! /
[Don't cry!]

In societies such as Kaluli and Kwara'ae, repeating routines are not limited to the purpose of teaching language and social behavior to young children. They are also used among adults in certain contexts, for example when the adult is not quick to respond to a humorous remark or challenge, or to show compassion for someone who has been criticized but does not wish to respond (Watson-Gegeo & Gegeo, 1986).

Beliefs about Language Acquisition: The nature of the interaction is also affected by cultural beliefs about language acquisition including what should be taught, how, and when. Children can acquire pragmatic knowledge from three potential data sources: direct teaching of the nature of rules governing politeness, direct teaching of forms to be used in various situations, and indirect teaching of forms (Cook, 1990; Snow et al., 1990). Routines can provide these different types of data which help the child acquire pragmatic knowledge of politeness.

Direct teaching of the nature of rules: Parents can directly teach the nature of rules governing politeness through explicit discussion about why we need to be polite, to whom, when etc. Explanations such as "You've got to be nice to me because I'm the boss" (Snow et al., 1990:303) which explicitly teach the relationship between a contextual variable and politeness rarely occurred in the American data reported by Snow et al. (1990), who specifically addressed this question. In other child language acquisition and socialization literature, there is likewise little or no mention of this phenomenon. Rather direct and indirect teaching of forms, functions, and situational appropriateness seem to predominate, at least in the early years of language development.

Direct teaching of forms, functions, and situational appropriateness: Direct teaching is employed in many diverse cultures, including American white middle and working classes (Gleason et al., 1984; Heath, 1983; Snow et al., 1990), Cakchiquel (Wilhite, 1983), Japanese (Cook, 1990; Clancy, 1985, 1986), Javanese (Smith-Hefner, 1988b), Kaluli (Schieffelin, 1990), Kwara'ae (Watson-Gegeo & Gegeo, 1986), Mexican-American Spanish (Eisenberg, 1982), Samoan (Ochs, 1988), and Turkish (Aksu-Koá & Slobin, 1985). Caregivers can directly teach which forms to use in various situations via repeating routines, imperatives, corrections,⁹ and explicit explanations. While repetition of modeled formulaic expressions in routines does not necessarily provide children with complete and instant knowledge of the contextual variables associated with the use of a form, it does provide them with an opportunity to practice the form, and to learn about the function of language in social interaction in general. In addition, direct teaching helps children to notice language forms and functions, and the contextual variables associated with them (Eisenberg, 1982; Gleason et al., 1984; Snow et al., 1990).

What caregivers prefer to teach directly, how, and when varies cross-culturally. Samoans believe that defiance and assertive behavior is natural to the child and therefore can be acquired without explicit teaching; politeness, on the other hand, originates from the caregiver, and must be taught (Ochs, 1988). Many other cultures also believe that politeness, or at least certain aspects of it need to be taught. They often use repetition routines of various sorts in politeness training. For example, Kaluli parents believe children must be explicitly taught how to make assertive requests including what to say and when to say it.¹⁰ This is done through *elema* routines in which caregivers model a series of syntactically variable request forms. After they provide these models, the child is instructed to imitate them, as in the following example provided by Schieffelin (1990:85) in which M li (24 mos.) is at home with her mother and father. Her cousin Mama (3:3) has taken M li's gourd outside. M li's parents model assertive requests to Mama for M li to imitate.

⁹Corrections could also be used to teach indirectly depending on how they are executed. The term is used here to mean corrections made directly.

¹⁰Kaluli culture distinguishes between assertive requests and requests based on appeal. The former are explicitly taught, whereas the latter are believed to come naturally and are therefore not explicitly taught. They are taught indirectly and will be dealt with later in this paper (Schieffelin, 1990).

- Mother: Sug bai di mino!l ma
[Bring the gourd! - say it.]
- M li: sug bai di mina /
- Mother: B b i!
[Quickly!]
- M li: di mina /
[Bring!]
- Mother: B b i!
- M li: b b i /
- Mother: Di mino!
- M li: di mino /
- Father: G n k l di ganey?! - l ma.
[Is it yours to take?! - say it.]
- M li: g n k l di gan?! /
- Mother: G n m sindilowaba?! - l ma.
[Aren't you ashamed of yourself?! - say it.]
- M li: g n m sindilowaba?! /
- Mother: Sindiloma - l ma.
[Be ashamed - say it].

Like the Kaluli, Italians also believe children need explicit instruction. Unlike the Kaluli, who prefer to model correct utterances before productions, Italians prefer to wait until after an error has been made, and then correct it (Ervin-Tripp & Gordon, 1986).

Children are also directly taught how to be polite by means of explanations about what does and does not constitute acceptable behavior and polite language, about the face needs of others (e.g., "Don't say that; that's not nice," Snow et al, 1990:302), and about the consequences they might suffer if they fail to be polite (e.g., "Hito ni warawareru." [You will be laughed at by other people] (Cook, 1990:389; Clancy, 1986:236).

Indirect teaching of forms, functions, and situational appropriateness: It seems likely that all cultures use indirect teaching techniques to teach politeness. While many cultures use direct teaching in at least some contexts, some cultures may use an indirect approach almost exclusively. Parents can

indirectly teach children about politeness and register variation by calling their attention to forms, functions, and contextual variables through indirect prompting and modeling, the manipulation of contextual variables, and teasing and shaming routines.

Indirect prompts: The term indirect prompts is used here to mean indirect directives which signal to the child that a particular speech act or form is required but without providing an exact model of the required response. They teach sociopragmatic knowledge by calling the child's attention to the fact that a certain kind of act is expected in a given situation, but they do not specify what that act is. Such would be the case in thanking routines when the prompt might be "What's the magic word?" or "What do you say?" In other cases, the prompts teach pragmalinguistic knowledge by pushing the child to produce a more grammatically complex and pragmatically appropriate politeness form. As children improve in their ability to produce complex syntactic forms, caregivers may increase the demands placed on them by rejecting simpler politeness forms and prompting more complex ones. For example, caregivers may accept the younger child's simple please used to make a request, but they may reject that form in an older child and insist on a full interrogative form instead. As more complex forms are demanded, however, the child may be unable to provide them initially with indirect prompting alone. Caregivers may begin with a general indirect prompt, proceed to a more specific indirect prompt, and if necessary, move to a direct prompt or model. Shifting to a less demanding format provides the child with information about different forms that can be used to accomplish the same function (Gleason et al, 1984; Greif & Gleason, 1980; Heath, 1983; Snow et al. 1990). An example of this kind of interactional routine is provided by Gleason et al, (1984:499)

Mother: All right, what do you ask daddy, what do you ask?

Daughter: Please.

Mother: Please, what?

Daughter: (Mumbles unintelligibly)

Mother: May I be excused, right?

One area in which indirect prompts play a role is in request reformulations. Requests can be reformulated to include clearer and more intelligible repetitions, the addition of vocatives to get the attention of the interlocutor, and more polite renditions of the request, grading them according to the type of resistance or feedback received from the interlocutor (e.g., ignoring, clarification request, refusal with justification) (Axia & Baroni, 1985; Ervin-Tripp & Gordon, 1986; Ervin-Tripp et al., 1990; Schieffelin, 1990). Reformulating requests is perhaps a universal behavior in the acquisition of pragmatic competence, although the exact form, direction of the reformulation, context in which it occurs, and the type and amount of help the child receives from caregivers depends on the culture and the relationship between the child and the requestee. For example, Hungarian children intensify their requests on second tries regardless of their interlocutor, whereas Norwegian children tend to become more indirect unless interacting with their mother, in which case they become more demanding (Hollos & Beeman, 1978). American children tend to become more polite on second tries with their mothers until about the age of six at which time they, somewhat like the Norwegian children, tend to make second tries more urgent (Ervin-Tripp et al., 1990). Hawaiian and part Hawaiian children, on the other hand, make second and subsequent tries less urgent when requesting from their mother. Otherwise the demand would be considered "talking back," the worst offence a child can commit (Boggs, 1985).

Some insight into one path children might follow in learning to modify requests is provided by Schieffelin (1990). As was mentioned earlier, the acquisition process of requesting behavior in Kaluli depends on whether the request is assertive or based on appeal. Since requests based on appeal are taught indirectly, they are of interest to us here. Parents typically do not refuse their children's appeals directly, but instead challenge them with rhetorical questions. Children who wish to pursue their requests must reformulate them in some way (e.g., by expanding on them, mitigating them, reducing the level of imposition etc.). Caregivers indirectly assist their children through a series of reformulations by means of clarification requests and repetitions of the child's utterances until an acceptable request which can be accommodated has been produced. This is illustrated in the following segment from Schieffelin (1990:193) in which M li (27.3 mos.) is requesting that her mother give her her breast so she can have some food.

- M li: N ne bow nelow ! / N ne bow /
[Mother, I want my breast! / Mother, my breast/]
- Mother: Ginow ?!
[Is it yours?!]
- M li: ((starting to cry)) nel w ! / ge oba! / we ginowele?! /
[I want! / Who are you?! / Is it yours?]
- Mother: Yagidi!
[Oh my! ((laughing))]
- M li: ((unzips mother's dress and takes the breast out)) oba? /
oba? / we dugufanig bale! / we ne m nig bale!/
[what? / what? / I'm really going to take this out! / I'm
really going to drink this! ((starts to nurse)).]
- Mother: Ai! ((Pushes M li away)).
- M li: N ba h lu nel n l /
[Mother, I only want to drink a little /]
- Mother: m?
[Huh?]
- M li: ba h lu nel n loga /
[I only want to drink a little, I said.]
- Mother: Wah?
[Huh?]
- M li: ba dey w h lu nel nol /
[I only want to drink a little of the swollen one.]
- Mother: Ba h lu gel naya?
[You only want to drink a little?]
- M li: dey / X / ba dey h lu nel n l /
[the swollen one / I only want to drink a little of the swollen
one.]
- Mother: Ba dey h lu gel naya?
[You only want to drink a little of the swollen one?]
- M li: m/
[yes.]
- Mother: m.
[yes.]
- ((M li nurses))

Modeling: Indirect teaching can also be accomplished by modeling. As was mentioned earlier, models can be used in repetition routines as a direct teaching technique. A number of other forms of modeling can be used to indirectly teach politeness forms. Modeling is often used when the child fails to produce the expected response, but it also occurs when no response is expected from the child.

Modeling may be done primarily for the benefit of the child. For example, as was mentioned before, in Javanese society, mothers intentionally model the correct terms of address for the child to use toward the addressee even though those forms would not be appropriate for the mother to use outside this context of modelling on behalf of the child. In this way mothers shape their children's speech so that it is socially appropriate for the addressee's status (Smith-Hefner, 1988a, 1988b). In other cases, children have an opportunity to observe family members interacting with each other in appropriate ways without making any adjustments on behalf of the child. For example, one strategy used by Cakchiquel children in order to address family members in the correct order (according to status) during the end-of-the-meal routine is to wait and observe the order followed by an adult and then imitate it (Wilhite, 1983). Likewise, a Javanese child may observe an older sibling interacting with their father using *krimi* forms, which are appropriate for a lower status person to use toward a higher status person (Smith-Hefner, 1988a). Children may also hear parents commenting on a sibling's pragmatic behavior in their presence. In these situations, caregivers may incidentally transmit pragmatic knowledge to children (Becker, 1990).

One form of modeling which is used in requesting (and possibly other) routines to facilitate comprehension of politeness forms and functions is sequencing. Sequencing is often used when children fail to comply with directives. Caregivers sometimes must repeat the request (in different forms) several times before compliance is finally achieved. Thus they give the child a sequence of requests, often in different forms, but with the same functional meaning (Schieffelin, 1990; Snow et al., 1990). This can be seen in the following example from Snow et al. (1990:298).

Mother: Can you finish eating your supper before you play with the
gun, Ryan?

Put the toy down and then finish and then play.

Sometimes these sequences proceed from less explicit to progressively more explicit until compliance is gained, although this is not always the case (Clancy, 1986). This sequencing of different request forms to achieve the same function may help children to understand the interchangeability of these different forms for performing the same speech act (Snow et al., 1990).

Manipulation of Contextual Variables: Indirect teaching of register variation can also take place through the manipulation of contextual variables. The (not necessarily conscious) manipulation of contextual variables such as power, rights, weight of imposition, and so forth can help the child to observe the correlation between these variables and the linguistic forms of acts such as requests. In Snow et al.'s (1990) study of interactional routines involving American children and their caregivers, they observed that the legitimacy of the request was not constant, but shifted, thus obligating the use of different forms. When the action children were requested to perform went beyond their basic obligations as family members, the requests were more highly mitigated.

Manipulation of contextual variables has also been reported in other societies such as Hawaiian and part Hawaiian (Boggs, 1985; Peters & Boggs, 1986), Kwara'ae (Watson-Gegeo & Gegeo, 1985) and Mexican-American Spanish (Eisenberg, 1982, 1986). Those who have studied these cultures have observed that the rights that children have in the interaction vary according to the mode of interaction (e.g., hierarchical versus egalitarian, child versus adult etc.). For example, in the teasing routines of Hawaiians and part Hawaiians, which take place in an egalitarian mode, children are allowed to contradict, challenge, and talk back to their parents because these behaviors are only play and not taken seriously whereas when interacting in a hierarchical mode, more polite and respectful behaviors are expected from the child (Boggs, 1985; Peters & Boggs, 1986).

Teasing and shaming: In some cultures teasing and shaming are used to teach children politeness when they fail to act appropriately. (Boggs, 1985; Eisenberg, 1982, 1986; Smith-Hefner, 1988b). For example, Mexican-American Spanish-speaking children may be teased or shamed when they refuse to greet someone. The teasing itself may give information to the child about what type of behavior is expected (Eisenberg, 1982, 1986).

Feedback: The way in which the input is manipulated in interactional routines not only depends on the caregiver, but also on the feedback caregivers receive from the child. While caregivers play an important role in providing children with comprehensible input which increases the salience and frequency of relevant features, children themselves play an active role in selecting what they hear through the cues they feed back to their caregivers. The importance of the child's feedback is evident in the fact that although caregivers modify their input when they imagine talking to their child, they do so to a lesser extent than when they actually talk to their child. The child's signals help the caregiver adjust the input to a more appropriate level. When their speech is not comprehensible, the child does not attend to it. When their directives are not understood, they are not complied with. These responses can cause the caregiver to modify the directive in order to make it comprehensible (Snow, 1988). In cultures such as Samoan where it is not socially appropriate to ignore or to signal lack of comprehension to a person of higher status, the child may have to direct the feedback to a peer. The higher status person, observing that he or she was not understood, will then clarify the input for the child. An example of such an interaction is provided by Ochs (1988:139).

Boy 1 (older) to Boy 3 (younger).

Sole, alu Sesi fai saka ee!

[Mate, go Sesi to make saka ((EMPH PRT))!]

Ke iloa fai -

[You know how to make -]

Boy 2: ((Hums))...eli ma'a.

(((Hums)))...dig stones]

Boy 3 to another boy his same age

Fai mai "Fai saka"?

[(He) said "Make saka?"]

Boy 1 to Boy 3:

Sole, alu oe e e ((pause)) koli mai ulu.

[Mate, you go to to ((pause)) twist off and fetch down breadfruit.]

IMPLICATIONS FOR L2 PRAGMATICS

While a large body of data in the literature on L1 acquisition of pragmatics has been examined in this paper, it is still far from a complete compilation of what has been written on the topic. First of all, it focuses on one domain of pragmatic behavior—linguistic politeness. Another domain which has been written about extensively, perhaps more so in L1 studies in non-western cultures, is that of assertive behaviors such as challenges and teasing. Even within the domain of politeness, the data presented here are drawn from a fairly narrow range of routines, including calling out, clarification, greeting, leave-taking, repeating, requesting, and thanking. Furthermore, I have primarily focused on how these routines facilitate noticing and understanding; other variables such as memory, affect, and motivation, which are also believed to be important in understanding how pragmatic knowledge and abilities are acquired, are not directly considered and discussed.

In spite of these limitations, I believe that this review has something to offer the study of interlanguage pragmatics. Detailed information is provided for a variety of cultures by many ethnographic and qualitative studies. These studies familiarize us with the ways speech acts are realized by native speakers, the cultural values and beliefs related to language acquisition and politeness, and the interactional routines used by members of the culture and the relationship of these routines to cognition, affect, and motivation. They are useful in a specific way for researchers studying interlanguage pragmatics involving speakers or learners of the languages and cultures in question. Knowing how native speakers acquire their language and the developmental steps through which they progress can help sort out which interlanguage features are due to developmental processes, which are due to cross-linguistic influence, and which are due to the learner's status as a cultural outsider. Through cross-cultural comparison, these studies are useful to the study of interlanguage pragmatics in a general way in that they provide information about universal and culturally-specific patterns in the acquisition, use, and teaching of pragmatics.

As mentioned before, many first language acquisition studies have examined the acquisition of politeness within the context of interactional routines. These routines increase the likelihood that politeness forms and functions and their associated contextual variables will be noticed and

understood. They provide children with the opportunity to hear and to practice various forms which serve the same function referentially, but which carry different relational meanings, and to receive feedback concerning the appropriateness of their use in a given context. Furthermore, these studies have yielded information on both universal and language specific patterns in pragmatic development.

Certain features of the acquisition of politeness appear to be consistent across languages and cultures. It is a process that begins in infancy and continues into the school years and even into adulthood. As children develop, they become more sensitive to register variation and their associated contextual variables, they acquire the abilities to understand and produce less explicit, less literal, and more syntactically complex requests, to take the perspective of another, and to rely more heavily on linguistic information and become less dependent on practical reasoning than in the early phases of development.

Intuitively we might expect similar sequences in interlanguage pragmatics. With L2 learners, however, cross-linguistic influence and status as a cultural outsider also play a role in pragmatic development. Differences in values and beliefs about language acquisition, learner roles and teacher roles, as well as different patterns of interaction and feedback may interfere with the acquisition of the target culture's pragmatic behaviors; in fact, the learner or foreign language user may not always consider native-like use to be a desirable goal (Anderson, 1991; Giles & Byrne, 1982; Marriott, 1991; Tyler, 1992b). Whatever the learners' goals in terms of pragmatic behavior, these behaviors can be acquired through interaction in routines, which facilitate their noticing and understanding the input.

Inherent characteristics of routines in SLA

Verbal cues: In L1 acquisition some routines are inherently easier to learn than others because the expected responses match the pre-verbal cues, and because they are used more consistently across situations. We would expect the same to be true for L2 learners as well. Thinking back to the examples of leave-taking in English as compared to Japanese discussed earlier, we would expect that leave-taking would be easier for L2 learners of English to learn than for L2 learners of Japanese because of the inherent nature of the routine

itself. In any language, routines in which the responses match the pre-verbal cues would most likely be easiest to learn, particularly if they are used across a variety of contexts in realizing a particular type of speech act. Those which have a non-matching pre-verbal cue and those which have no consistent pre-verbal cue would be inherently more difficult for the second language learner to acquire. Cross-linguistic influence would likely facilitate or interfere with acquisition of these more difficult routines, but the precise relationship between inherent difficulty and cross-linguistic influence has yet to be tested empirically.

The role of values and beliefs: Routines are also believed easier to learn in the native language when the words match the speaker's inner state. As was mentioned earlier, although learners may know the form of a politeness marker, understand its function and the context in which it is to be used, they may be unwilling to use it because of the value it implies to them. For example, a feeling of insincerity associated with using a particular formulaic expression could make it difficult for the learner to produce. The value that the learner associates with the behavior, however, may not necessarily be the value that members of the target culture associate with it.

The literature reviewed here indicates that it is too simplistic to assume that there is a one-to-one mapping between values and behaviors that holds across cultures. For example, one culture which places a high value on hierarchy and differences in status may require that the child accommodate to the caregivers and thus the caregivers avoid simplifying the input, while another culture with the same value may require that the caregivers accommodate to the child by simplifying the input because that is appropriate to the child's status. If values are examined in isolation from one another, the best we can hope for is a post hoc explanation of the behavior. If we wish to make predictions about a specific politeness behavior in a culture, all values will have to be taken together as a composite.

In interlanguage pragmatics, we will need to examine the relationship between values, beliefs, and behaviors in both the native and the target cultures. When the values, beliefs, and/or behaviors of the target culture clash with those of the native culture, the acquisition of pragmatics could become problematic. Given that there is not a one to one correspondence

between a value and a behavior, one of these might be in conflict while the other is not. It seems that when the behavior is shared even though the underlying value is different, there may be no problem with the learners' feeling comfortable with the behavior. Since the behavior is the same, there would not likely be reason to question the motivation behind it; a similar value would be assumed.

If behaviors are different, however, different values might be assumed, even if in fact, the values are the same or at least similar enough to be compatible with the learner's value system. In this case, the learner's knowledge and understanding of the underlying value might make it relatively easy to accept and/or produce the behavior.

In those situations in which neither the value nor the behavior in the target culture are the same as in the learners' native culture, native-like use might be resisted on some level and thus more difficult to acquire. An exception to this might be those situations in which a learners' personal value is not compatible with his or her culture's value; if the native culture's value is rejected and the target culture's value accepted, the target culture behavior may be easily acquired.

In cases where the two value systems clash, the differences in values might be relatively unimportant to a particular learner, making the behaviors associated with the value relatively easy to acquire. In other cases, values might be considered to important to compromise, and the learner might find that acting in a pragmatically appropriate way in the target culture is an unacceptable option. This is not always a problem because in some cases the learner, as a cultural outsider and a language learner, will not be expected to follow the target culture's norms; other norms may be considered more appropriate for the non-native learner by the target community (Færch & Kasper, 1989). In some cases, foreign language users may even expect the target culture to adapt to their norms, and the target community may in fact accomodate them (Marriott, 1991). In other cases, however, the target culture may desire and expect non-natives to follow the target culture's norms (cf. Tyler, 1992a, 1992b; Tyler, Jeffries & Davies, 1988).

Whenever the behavior expected of non-natives is different from that expected of natives, learning becomes more problematic in that appropriate role models for the learner become difficult to find. Native speakers would not necessarily make appropriate role models because their status as insiders

differentiates them from the learner. Many non-native speakers would not necessarily make good role models either since they may not be pragmatically competent in the language. Learners are left to carve their own way.

These issues remain empirical questions. So far, research on L2 acquisition of pragmatics has not examined the relationship between values, behaviors, and beliefs and their effect on the learning process in a systematic way. In addition to these issues, others which need to be investigated concern how the learning process is affected by differences in beliefs about what constitutes polite behavior and acceptable values, and about the roles, rights and obligations of participants in interactional routines.

The roles of the participants in routines

Cultural differences in beliefs about the status and roles of the participants affect the way in which participants interact with each other and the way input to children and learners is structured. The L1 research reported in this paper shows that the input is manipulated (though not necessarily simplified) in some way to promote acquisition of pragmatic abilities in all language communities discussed. The purpose behind manipulating the input depends on the culture. Some general aspects of caregiver speech may be universal, such as the use of indirect teaching of pragmatic knowledge and abilities; however, the specific ways in which these are applied—the forms they take, the contexts in which they are used etc.—are culturally specific. The ways that are chosen in a language community or in a family will depend on personal, social, and cognitive variables. Yet in all cultures, the input and interaction results in successful acquisition of pragmatic competence.

One typical pattern in the way input is provided is that used by white middle class American culture, where caregivers typically adopt the perspective of the child in order to accommodate to the child's limited cognitive capacities. They talk to children from birth, treat them as if they were able to communicate, express a guess concerning the child's intended utterance when it is unclear, modify the input to make it more easily understandable, adapt the register to one appropriate for the child, and give explicit information, such as names of objects, to the child. Another pattern, typical of Samoan and African-American working class culture, requires that

the child adopt the perspective of and accommodate to the caregivers. In cultures which prefer this pattern, children are not typically talked to until they are considered competent communicators. They are required to observe, and to figure things out for themselves by drawing analogies, by experimenting with different tactics, and so forth. Guidance provided by caregivers is typically indirect, often through devices such as rhetorical questions, teasing, and challenging. Clearly these two approaches place different cognitive and social demands on the children and prepare them to problem-solve and interact in different ways. Yet each approach is successful within its own socio-cultural context.

Although human beings are apparently capable of learning language in a variety of ways, social conditioning, may make learning in one way easier than learning in another way for older children and adults of a given culture. The rate at which learners acquire pragmatic abilities in the target culture may be facilitated when the nature of the input and interaction match that which they have been accustomed to receiving in the native culture, but impeded when it is significantly different (e.g., Boggs, 1985; Heath, 1986).

Furthermore, differences in beliefs about teachers' and learners' roles, how languages are acquired, and which techniques work and do not work in the teaching of language may also adversely affect the process. In first language acquisition, we can assume that, at least in the early stages, the child does not have a belief system concerning how language is acquired. In adult second language learning, however, the adult does have a system of beliefs about language learning or at least learning is general. Differences in the belief systems of the learners and the teachers could lead to difficulties in interactions in language learning routines. Learners who feel that they are not getting the type of input and interaction they are looking for, may become angry or frustrated, may lose motivation, perhaps to the point of abandoning their attempt to learn the language. When such a mismatch occurs, at least one side will have to accommodate if successful learning is to occur. The learning process will most likely be successful when both learners and teachers are open-minded and willing to entertain challenges to their beliefs about how language is acquired. Teachers need to critically examine the appropriateness of their teaching methods for their learners, as the methods which work for their native culture may not be the best for learners from another culture. This is particularly true for teachers from developed

countries teaching students in developing nations, where the assumption is often made that everything exported from the developed nation to the developing one is advanced (Pennycook, 1989). Learners also need to open their minds to the idea that they can learn in more than one way. Understanding the relationship between the behaviors and the values and beliefs underlying them may also facilitate the learning process.

The role of routines in the negotiation of meaning

The nature of the input and the interaction informs children and learners in terms of sociopragmatic knowledge by indicating the class of response that is expected in a situation and pragmalinguistic knowledge by indicating the form which is appropriate for a given context. The way in which this knowledge is transferred varies cross-culturally, with some cultures preferring to use some direct teaching techniques (such as providing models for the child to imitate in repeating routines or corrective feedback in the form of explanations about what constitutes polite and impolite behavior) and others relying almost exclusively on indirect techniques (such as indirect prompts and models, the manipulation of contextual variables, and teasing and shaming). These preferences may be more a matter of degree than of presence or absence of a particular technique. Regardless of whether the approach to language socialization relies heavily on direct teaching techniques or almost exclusively on indirect teaching techniques, children learn to become pragmatically competent. Different paths can lead to the goal of pragmatic competence, but will result in different strengths and different rates of development in different areas.

One indirect technique that has been studied in both L1 (e.g., Gleason et al, 1984; Snow et al., 1990), and adult L2 acquisition (e.g., Erlich, Avery & Yorio, 1989; Long, 1983; Pica, 1991, 1992; Pica, Holliday, Lewis, & Morgenthaler, 1989; Pica, 1992; Schmidt & Frota, 1986) is sequencing—the caregiver's or native speaker's recasting of their utterances so that meaning is retained but the form is changed. Most adult L2 studies (with the exception of Schmidt & Frota, 1986) have focused on referential meaning and the grammatical and lexical forms used to convey it, rather than on pragmatic features and relational meaning; nevertheless, they give us some insight into indirect teaching techniques which provide feedback to learners about their

interlanguage. One problem that has been noted is that it is not clear what indirect feedback in the input indicates to learners. How are they to know whether they have produced a grammatically incorrect utterance, a grammatically correct but pragmatically inappropriate utterance, or a grammatically correct and pragmatically appropriate utterance which is being recast in an alternative way? Because of the ambiguity inherent in this indirect approach, learners are not always aware that they are, in fact being corrected (e.g., Marriott, 1991; Schmidt & Frota, 1986). It is not yet clear how first or second language learners sort this out.

It is unlikely that L1 learners always figure out how to sort out this ambiguous information in a single experience; perhaps only through repeated exposure is this accomplished. Therefore, we would not expect second language learners to do this either. Yet, most adult L2 studies on negotiation of input (with the exception of Schmidt & Frota, 1986) have been experimental in nature with data collected in a single session, thus making it impossible to examine the long term effects of this type of feedback, as the author's themselves sometimes point out (e.g., Pica, 1992). In L2 acquisition, there is clearly a need for longitudinal studies which focus on the role of indirect teaching in the acquisition of pragmatics.

The role of feedback

While the facility with which a routine can be learned depends to some extent on the behavior of caregivers, it also depends on to some extent on the child. Children are not passive recipients of the input, but shape the way in which it is provided by their feedback responses in terms of compliance, attention, and so forth. Caretaker modifications to the input are believed to facilitate comprehension, and thus the language acquisition process including the acquisition of pragmatics. Thus, the provision of comprehensible input is not a one-sided phenomenon, but a two-sided one—the result of both participants' input into the interaction. Yet, while the child's or learner's feedback facilitates the acquisition process, it is not clear that it is a necessary condition for learning. Negotiation of meaning (i.e., the process by which adjustments are made to the input on the basis of feedback from the learner) may not be crucial if input is already comprehensible (Pica, 1992).

Nevertheless, the learner's feedback seems to have at least a facilitating effect on language acquisition. In cross-cultural interactions, however, the ability to use feedback is more problematic. Learners often provide feedback which signals that they have understood even when they have not in order to maintain their role as a discourse participant and not be forced to switch, however temporarily, back to the role of learner in the interaction (Harder, 1980). In addition to this problem, cultures differ in terms of which feedback signals are noticeable, how they are understood (Erickson & Schultz, 1982), and the extent to which they are socially acceptable in a given context. A successful learner in the target culture will have to learn to give the type of feedback signals that will be most effective for both language learning and maintaining harmony in social relationships.

SUMMARY

This paper has focused on the role of routines in the acquisition of pragmatics in L1 and the implications for L2 acquisition. Routines can facilitate acquisition by helping the learner to notice and understand linguistic expressions used in particular social contexts. Cultural similarities in values, behaviors, and beliefs about politeness, language acquisition, and teacher and learner roles may facilitate acquisition of pragmatics in the target culture; differences may often interfere with the process, although positive attitudes toward the differences may facilitate their acquisition. Many of the techniques which facilitate L1 acquisition are also used with L2 learners to help them notice and comprehend the linguistic forms, their functions and the contexts in which they occur. Yet the developmental process of acquisition in interlanguage pragmatics is largely unexplored. The nature of the input and the interaction in L2 pragmatics has yet to be examined.

One way in which they ought to be examined is by following the model of ethnographic research that has been undertaken with L1 learners. L2 learners should be studied ethnographically by examining their interactions in routines over a long period of time in order to determine both the developmental steps in interlanguage development, and the processes by which sociopragmatic and pragmalinguistic knowledge are acquired. A few studies in L2 acquisition have been done which do provide us with detailed information about the development of a single learner or a small group of

learners such as the case study of Wes (Schmidt, 1983), the diary study of Schmidt's acquisition of Portuguese combined with actual language data in naturalistic interactions at various phases of his development (Schmidt & Frota, 1986), and the longitudinal studies of children learning their second language (e.g., Wong-Fillmore, 1979) These studies do not focus on the acquisition of politeness per se, but they do provide some detailed information about the nature of the input and interaction and their effects on the acquisition of language including pragmatics over a period of time. Studies of these types combined with the more quantitative and experimental studies can provide us with a way of triangulating our methodology (Grotjahn, 1991) so as to get a more accurate picture of how politeness and pragmatic competence are acquired.

REFERENCES

- Aksu-Koá, A. A. & D. I. Slobin. (1985). The Acquisition of Turkish. In D. I. Slobin (Ed.), *The crosslinguistic study of language acquisition volume 1: The data* (pp.839-878). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Anderson, F. (1991, September). *Models of English for the expanding circle: A Japan perspective*. Paper presented at the First Annual Conference on issues of Culture and Communication in the Asia/Pacific Region, Honolulu.
- Axia, G. & M. R. Baroni. (1985). Linguistic politeness at different age levels. *Child Development* 56, 918-927.
- Axia, G., H. McGurk, & M. Glachan. (1987). *The development of social pragmatics: A cross-national study of the case of politeness*. Paper presented at the annual conference of the developmental section, British Psychological Society, York, England. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 287595)
- Bavin, E. L. (1991). The acquisition of Walpiri kin terms. *Pragmatics* 1:3, 319-344.
- Becker, J. A. (1990). Processes in the acquisition of pragmatic competence. In G. Conti-Ramsden & C. E. Snow (Eds.), *Children's language*, volume 7 (pp. 7-24). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Becker, J. A. & P. C. Smenner. (1986). The spontaneous use of thank you by preschoolers as a function of sex, socioeconomic status, and listener status. *Language in Society* 15, 537-546.
- Beebe, L. M., T. Takahashi, & R. Uliss-Weltz. (1990). Pragmatic transfer in ESL refusals. In S. D. Krashen, R. Scarcella & E. Andersen, (Eds.) *On the development of communicative competence in a second language* (pp.55-73). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Berman, R. A. (1985). The Acquisition of Hebrew. In D. I. Slobin (Ed.), *The crosslinguistic study of language acquisition volume 1: The data* (pp. 255-371). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Boggs, S. T. (1985). *Speaking relating and learning: A study of Hawaiian children at home and at school*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

- Camras, L. A., T. M. Pisto, & M. J. K. Brown. (1985). Directive choice by children and adults: affect, situation, and linguistic politeness. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly* 31:1, 19-31.
- 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, Inc.
- Clancy, P. M. (1986). Acquiring communicative style in Japanese. In B. B. Schieffelin & E. Ochs, (Eds.), *Language socialization across cultures* (pp. 213-250). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Cook, H. M. (1990). The role of the Japanese sentence-final particle no in the socialization of children. *Multilingua* 9:4, 377-395.
- Craig, S. & L. A. Kimball. (1987). The early stage vocabulary and grammar acquisition of a Brunei Malay child. *Language Sciences* 9:2, 253-266.
- 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: Cambridge University Press.
- Eisenberg, A. R. (1982). Understanding components of a situation: Spontaneous use of politeness routines by Mexicano 2 year olds. *Papers and Reports in Child Language Development* 21, 46-54.
- Eisenberg, A. R. (1986). Teasing: Verbal play in two Mexicano homes. In B. B. Schieffelin & E. Ochs (Eds.), *Language socialization across cultures* (pp. 182-198). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Erickson, F. & J. Schultz. (1982). *The counselor as gatekeeper: Social interaction in interviews*. New York: Academic Press.
- Erlich, S., P. Avery & C. Yorio. (1989). Discourse structure and the negotiation of comprehensible input. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 11:4, 397-414.
- Ervin-Tripp, S. (1977). Wait for me, roller skate! In S. Ervin-Tripp & C. Mitchell-Kernan (Eds.), *Language, thought, and culture: Advances in the study of cognition* (pp. 165-188). New York: Academic Press.
- Ervin-Tripp, S. & D. Gorden. (1986). The development of requests. In R.L. Schiefelbusch (Ed.), *Language competence: Assessment and intervention* (pp. 61-95). San Diego: College Hill Press.

- Ervin-Tripp, S., J. Guo & M. Lampert. (1990). Children's request tactics. *Journal of Pragmatics* 14:2, 307-331.
- Ervin-Tripp, S., A. Strage, M. Lampert & N. Bell. (1987). Understanding requests. *Linguistics* 25, 107-143.
- Færch, C., & G. Kasper. (1989). Internal and external modification in interlanguage request realization. In S. Blum-Kulka, J. House, and G. Kasper (Eds.), *Cross-cultural pragmatics* (pp. 221-247). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Ferguson, C. A. (1977). Baby talk as a simplified register. In C. E. Snow & C. A. Ferguson (Eds.), *Talking to children: Language input and acquisition* (pp. 209-235). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Giles, H. & J. L. Byrne. (1982). An intergroup model of second language acquisition. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 3, 17-40.
- Gleason, J. B., R. Y. Perlmann & E. B. Greif. (1984). What's the magic word: Learning language through politeness routines. *Discourse Processes* 7, 493-502.
- Greif, E. B. & J. B. Gleason. (1980). Hi, thanks, and goodbye: More routine information. *Language in Society* 9, 159-166.
- Grotjahn, R. (1991). The research programme subjective theories: A new approach in second language research. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 13, 187-214.
- Harder, P. (1980). Discourse as self-expression on the reduced personality of the second language learner. *Applied Linguistics* 1:3, 262-270.
- Harkness, S. (1977). Aspects of social environment and first language acquisition in rural Africa. In C. E. Snow & C. A. Ferguson (Eds.), *Talking to children: Language input and acquisition* (pp. 309-316). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Harkness, S. & C. M. Super. (1977). Why African children are so hard to test. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences* 285, 326-331.
- Heath, S. B. (1983). *Ways with words: Language, life, and work in communities and classrooms*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Heath, S. B. (1986). What no bedtime story means: Narrative skills at home and school. In B.B. Schieffelin & E. Ochs (Eds.), *Language socialization across cultures* (pp. 97-124). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Holland, D. & N. Quinn. (1987). Introduction. In D. Holland & N. Quinn (Eds.), *Cultural models in language and thought* (pp.3-40). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hollos, M. & W. Beeman. (1978). The development of directives among Norwegian and Hungarian children: An example of communicative style in culture. *Language in Society* 7, 345-355.
- Hollos, M. (1977). Comprehension and use of social rules in pronoun selection by Hungarian children. In S. Ervin-Tripp & C. Mitchell-Kernan (Eds.), *Child Discourse* (pp. 211-223). New York: Academic Press.
- Irvine, J. T. (1992). Ideologies of honorific language. *Pragmatics* 2:3, 251-262.
- James, S. L. (1978). Effect of listener age and situation on politeness of children's directives. *Journal of Psycholinguistic Research* 7, 307-317.
- Kasper, G. (1989), Variation in interlanguage speech act realization. In S. Gass, C. Madden, D. Preston, & L. Selinker (Eds.), *Variation in Second Language Acquisition: Discourse and Pragmatics*. Clevedon, Avon: Multilingual Matters Ltd.
- Kasper, G. (1992). Pragmatic transfer. *Second Language Research* 8:3, 203-231.
- Kasper, G. & R. W. Schmidt. (1992). *Interlanguage pragmatics and language learning*. Presentation at ESL symposium. Fall, 1992.
- Larsen-Freeman, D. & M. H. Long. (1991). *An introduction to second language acquisition research*. London & New York: Longman.
- Leech, G. N. (1983). *Principles of Pragmatics*. London: Longman.
- Long, M. H. (1983). Linguistic and conversational adjustments to non-native speakers. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 5:2, 177-193.
- Long, M. H. (1992, March). *Input, focus on form, and SLA*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Association of Applied Linguistics. Seattle, WA.
- Markus, H. R. & S. Kitayama. (1991). Culture and self: Implications for cognition, emotion, and motivation. *Psychological Review* 98, 224-253.
- Marriott, H. E. (1991). Native-speaker behavior in Australian-Japanese business communication. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 92, 87-117.
- Nelson, K. (1973). Structure and strategy in learning to talk. *Monographs of the society for research in child development* 38:1-2, (Serial No. 149).

- Newport E. L., & R. P. Meier. (1985). The Acquisition of American Sign Language. In D. I. Slobin (Ed.), *The crosslinguistic study of language acquisition volume 1: The data* (pp. 881-938). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Nippold, M. A., L. B. Leonard & A. Anastopoulos. (1982). Development in the use and understanding of polite forms in children. *Journal of Speech and Hearing Research* 25:2, 193-202.
- Ochs, E. (1988). *Culture and language development: Language acquisition and language socialization in a Samoan village*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ochs, E. (1993). Indexing gender. In B. D. Miller (Ed.), *Sex and gender hierarchies* (pp.146-169). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Olshtain, E. (1983). Sociocultural competence and language transfer: The case of apology. In S. Gass & L. Selinker (Eds.), *Language transfer in language learning* (pp. 232-249). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Olshtain, E. & L. Weinbach. (1987). Complaints: A study of speech act behavior among native and nonnative speakers of Hebrew. In J. Verschueren & M. Bertucelli-Papi (Eds.), *The pragmatics perspective* (pp. 195-208). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Pennycook, A. (1989). The concept of method, interested knowledge, and the politics of language teaching. *TESOL Quarterly* 23:4, 589-618.
- Perilli, V., D. Ponterotto & F. Maniere. (1984). Children's use of deference in urban and rural environments. *Revue Roumaine de Linguistique* 29:6, 493-498.
- Peters, A. M. (1983). *The units of language acquisition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Peters, A. M. & S. T. Boggs. (1986). Interactional routines as cultural influences upon language acquisition. In B. B. Schieffelin & E. Ochs (Eds.), *Language socialization across cultures* (pp. 80-96). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Pica, T. (1991). *Do second language learners need negotiation?* Paper presented at the 11th Annual Second Language Research Forum, Los Angeles, California.

- Pica, T. (1992). The textual outcomes of native speaker-non-native speaker negotiation: What do they reveal about second language learning? In C. Kramsch & S. McConnell-Ginet (Eds.), *Text and context: Cross-disciplinary perspectives on language study* (pp. 198–237). Lexington, MA: D.C. Heath & Co.
- Pica, T., L. Holliday, N. Lewis & L. Morgenthaler. (1989). Comprehensible output as an outcome of linguistic demands on the learner. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 11:1, 63–90.
- Reger, Z. & J. B. Gleason. (1991). Romani child-directed speech and children's language among Gypsies in Hungary. *Language in Society* 20, 601–617.
- Sachs, J., B. Bard & M. Johnson. (1981). Language learning with restricted input: Case studies of two hearing children of deaf parents. *Applied Psycholinguistics* 2, 33–54.
- Schieffelin, B. B. (1985). The Acquisition of Kaluli. In D. I. Slobin (Ed.), *The crosslinguistic study of language acquisition volume 1: The data* (pp. 525–593). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Schieffelin, B. B. (1990). *The give and take of everyday life: Language socialization of Kaluli children*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Schieffelin, B. B. & A. R. Eisenberg. (1984). Cultural variations in children's conversations. In R. L. Schiefelbusch & J. Pickar (Eds.), *The acquisition of communicative competence* (pp. 377–420). Baltimore, MD: University Park Press.
- Schmidt, R. W. (1983). Interaction, acculturation, and the acquisition of communicative competence: A case study of an adult. In N. Wolfson & E. Judd (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics and language acquisition* (pp. 137–174). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Schmidt, R. W. (1993). Consciousness, learning and interlanguage pragmatics. In G. Kasper & S. Blum-Kulka (Eds.), *Interlanguage Pragmatics* (pp. 21–42). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Schmidt, R. W. & S. N. Frota. (1986). Developing basic conversational ability in a second language: A case study of an adult learner of Portuguese. In R. Day (Ed.), *Talking to learn: Conversation in second language acquisition* (pp. 237–326). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Smith-Hefner, N. J. (1988a). The linguistic socialization of Javanese children in two communities. *Anthropological Linguistics* 30:2, 166–198.

- Smith-Hefner, N. J. (1988b). Women and politeness: The Javanese example. *Language in Society* 17:4, 535-554.
- Snow, C. E. (1988). Conversations with children. In P. Fletcher & M. Garman (Eds.), *Language acquisition*. Second edition (pp. 69-89). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Snow, C. E., R. Y. Perlmann, J. B. Gleason & N. Hooshyar. (1990). Developmental perspectives on politeness: Sources of children's knowledge. *Journal of Pragmatics* 14, 289-305.
- Thomas, J. (1983). Cross-cultural pragmatic failure. *Applied Linguistics*, 4, a.91-112.
- Tyler, A. (1992a). Discourse structure and the perception of incoherence in international teaching assistants' spoken discourse. *TESOL Quarterly* 26:4, 713-729.
- Tyler, A. (1992b). Discourse structure and the specification of relationships: A cross-linguistic analysis. *Text* 12:1, 1-18.
- Tyler, A., A. A. Jeffries & C. E. Davies. (1988). The effect of discourse structuring devices on listener perceptions of coherence in non-native university teacher's spoken discourse. *World Englishes* 7:2, 101-110.
- Watson-Gegeo, K. A. & D. W. Gegeo. (1985, December). *Fantasy and reality: The paradoxical framing of work and play among Kwara'ae children*. Paper presented at the 84th Annual Meeting of the American Anthropological Association, Washington, D.C.
- Watson-Gegeo, K. A. & D. W. Gegeo. (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: Cambridge University Press.
- Waller, M. (1984). Die Entwicklung der Beurteilung des Distanzgehaltes alltagsprachlicher Fragen in Abhängigkeit von der Frageform und vom Sprachschichtniveau der Fragegegenstandsbenennung [The development of children's judgment of the distance-signalizing content of ordinary questions as dependent on their syntactical form and the speech level of the question object.] *Sprache and Kognition* 3:3, 185-196. (From Psychological Abstracts, 1985, 72, Abstract No. 09248.)
- Wilhite, M. (1983). Children's acquisition of language routines: The end-of-meal routine in Cakchiquel. *Language in Society* 12:1, 47-64.

- Wong Fillmore, L. (1979). Individual differences in second language acquisition. In C. J. Fillmore, D. Kempler, & W. S-Y. Wang (Eds.), *Individual differences in language ability and language behavior*. New York: Academic Press.
- Zeidner, M. (1978). Aspektim psixolingvistiym sel mislav sfat hatinokot be'ivrit. [Psycholinguistic aspects of the "baby talk" register in Hebrew]. *Studies in Education* 20, 105-120 (Haifa University).