
“New” Mainstream SLA Theory: Expanded and Enriched

MERRILL SWAIN

*Modern Language Centre
The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education of the
University of Toronto
252 Bloor Street West
Toronto, Ontario M5S 1V6
Canada
Email: mswain@oise.utoronto.ca*

PING DETERS

*Modern Language Centre
The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education of the
University of Toronto
252 Bloor Street West
Toronto, Ontario M5S 1V6
Canada
Email: pdeters@oise.utoronto.ca*

How have the ideas raised by Firth and Wagner (1997) influenced the construction of second language acquisition (SLA) theories? In this article, we take the position that prior to and since 1997, there was and has been a notable increase in SLA research and theory that prioritizes sociocultural and contextual factors in addition to acknowledging individual agency and multifaceted identities. This article focuses on 4 major influences on a growing body of SLA research: sociocultural theory of mind, situated learning, poststructural theories, and dialogism. We highlight aspects of these perspectives that have been used in SLA theory, and provide examples of research that illustrate the richness and complexity of constructs such as languaging, legitimate peripheral participation, subjectivity, and heteroglossia. These perspectives and constructs address Firth and Wagner's call for a reconceptualization of SLA by offering alternative understandings of language and language learning.

IN THEIR 1997 *MODERN LANGUAGE JOURNAL* (MLJ) article, Firth and Wagner called for a reconceptualization of second language acquisition (SLA) theory, methodology, research, and foci. The reconceptualization they called for would place a greater emphasis on social and contextual orientations relative to what they saw as an overwhelming priority then placed on cognitive accounts of second language (L2) acquisition. The reconceptualization would also provide an emic perspective and would broaden the traditional database in the field of second language acquisition (SLA) research.

Firth and Wagner (1997) claimed that mainstream SLA theory and research skewed our view of language users and learners, seeing them only as nonnative speakers, struggling to reach the (assumed) goal of being like a native speaker (NS) of the target language. Other social identities of individuals (e.g., mothers, brothers, friends, employers, journalists, professors) engaged in using and

learning an L2 were ignored. Firth and Wagner argued that mainstream SLA viewed acquisition as a cognitive and individual phenomenon. Research methodology favored experiments and quantification over more ethnographically oriented, qualitative studies. The former were conducted in contexts where attempts were made to control all extraneous variables, whereas the latter were conducted in naturalistic settings. Experimental research also prioritized etic, researcher perspectives over emic perspectives. Firth and Wagner called for a more “holistic approach to and outlook on language and language acquisition” (p. 296) that acknowledged the influence of social context, identity, task, and setting on language use and acquisition.

Prior to the appearance of Firth and Wagner's (1997) article, the seeds for such a reconceptualization of SLA research and theory had already been sown in other related fields, for example, anthropology, sociology, and cultural psychology, as well as in SLA. For example, Block (1996), Lantolf (1996), and van Lier (1994) had contributed to the discussion about theory-building in SLA by suggesting that a variety of perspectives,

including those from sociocultural orientations, were needed to explore the complexity of the L2 acquisition process. In addition, a special issue of the *MLJ* in 1994 (Lantolf), which focused on sociocultural theory and L2 learning, as well as the 1994 edited volume of SLA studies informed by Vygotskian perspectives (Lantolf & Appel), reflected increasing interest in sociocultural perspectives in SLA prior to 1997. However, the appearance of the Firth and Wagner article undoubtedly provided a stimulus for SLA research that would incorporate an even greater diversity in methodology and theoretical perspectives. Since the appearance of the Firth and Wagner article, a variety of alternative perspectives have blossomed, extending the boundaries of SLA theory, adding to and enriching its constructs and methodologies.

Although we recognize that the Firth and Wagner (1997) article was a response to and a stimulus for much discussion and debate among SLA scholars over a theory of language acquisition, and although we realize that different orientations, including traditional psycholinguistics, make important contributions to our understanding of the complexities in the SLA process, in this article, we focus on four major influences on SLA theory over the past decade that prioritize sociocultural and contextual factors in addition to the importance of individual agency and the multiple identities involved in the process of learning and using an L2: sociocultural theory of mind, situated learning, poststructural theories, and dialogism. In the four sections that follow, we highlight aspects of these perspectives that have been used in SLA theory, and provide examples of research illustrating the richness of the constructs embedded in them. These perspectives, among others, address Firth and Wagner's call for a reconceptualization of SLA—the “new” mainstream SLA—by offering alternative understandings of language and language learning that differ from those found in the psycholinguistic theories of the 1990s, by presenting emic perspectives of the L2 acquisition process, and by acknowledging the complexity and importance of sociocultural identities and human agency in L2 learning.

SOCIOCULTURAL THEORY OF MIND AND SLA

Over the past decade, there has been a notable increase in SLA research that is informed by a sociocultural theory of mind (hereafter SCT). This theoretical perspective is based on the work of the Russian psycholinguist Vygotsky (1978, 1986),

who argued that it was essential to incorporate the study of human culture and history into the effort to understand the development of the human mind. Vygotsky's theory was further developed by his students and colleagues, for example, Galperin (1969), Leont'ev (1978), and Luria (1982), and also by contemporary scholars in fields such as psychology, anthropology, and education (e.g., Cole, 1996; Holland, Lachiotte, Skinner, & Cain, 1998; Ratner, 1991; Robbins, 2003; Rogoff, 1990; Wells, 1999; Wertsch, 1991, 1998), as well as in SLA (e.g., Donato, 1994; Lantolf, 2000; Lantolf & Appel, 1994; Lantolf & Thorne, 2006; Swain, 2000, 2006a, 2006c).

In contrast to the Cartesian dichotomy between mind and matter, Vygotsky's work (see, e.g., 1978) posited a dialectic relationship between the mind and the social milieu. Physical and semiotic tools enable individuals to change their physical and social environments, which in turn change the individuals and the way in which they relate to their physical and social environments. This theory differs fundamentally from other theories of mind in its stance that the social environment is not the context for, but rather the source of, mental development.¹ Whereas traditional approaches to the study of mental behavior focus on the individual and what the individual is doing, SCT takes into account the complex interaction between the individual acting with mediational means and the sociocultural context. That is, SCT focuses on what tools the person is acting with (mediational means), where the action takes place, and why the person is acting (motives and goals).² SCT views individuals as agents-operating-with-mediational-means (Wertsch, 1998); that is, people are not free agents, but their behavior is enhanced or constrained by the tools they have available to use and the affordances present in (or absent from) their environment (see e.g., van Lier, 2000, 2004).

A fundamental principle of SCT is mediation: Humans use physical tools and socioculturally—and sociohistorically—constructed symbolic artifacts, of which language is the most important, to control and master nature and themselves. According to SCT, higher cognitive functions develop from interactions with the social milieu and are mediated through language and other semiotic artifacts.

What we wish to highlight in this section are only two of the many central concepts from SCT that have important implications for alternative conceptualizations of SLA. First, SCT views language in a manner fundamentally different from traditional SLA conceptions of language. Whereas traditional psycholinguistics views language as a

conveyor of an already formed thought, SCT views language as a tool of the mind,³ a tool that contributes to cognitive development and is constitutive of thought. Through *linguaging*, defined as the use of speaking and writing to mediate cognitively complex activities, an individual develops cognitively, and as we shall see, affectively. The act of producing spoken or written language is thinking in progress and is key to learners' understanding of complex concepts. These understandings are reached through interacting with others, ourselves, and social and cultural artifacts. Through linguaging—a crucial mediating psychological and cultural activity—learners articulate and transform their thinking into an artifactual form, and in doing so, make it available as a source of further reflection (Swain, 2006a).

There is a growing body of research that examines the importance of linguaging as part of the process of learning, although this particular term has not been used until recently (Kinnear, 2006; Swain, 2006c; Thorne & Lantolf, 2007). Topics that have been examined include inner and private speech (e.g., Centeno-Cortés, 2003; de Guerrero, 1994, 1999, 2004; DiCamilla & Antón, 2004; Lee, 2006; McCafferty, 1992, 1998), collaborative dialogue (e.g., Belz & Kinginger, 2002, 2003; Buckwalter, 2001; Nassaji & Swain, 2000; Ohta, 2001; Swain, 2000; Swain & Lapkin, 1998), language play (e.g., Bell, 2005; Broner & Tarone, 2001; Tarone, 2000; Tocalli-Beller & Swain, in press), and the effect of language choice on first person narratives (Steinman, 2005).

In one of our current studies (Lapkin, Swain, & Knouzi, in press; Swain, Lapkin, Knouzi, Suzuki, & Brooks, 2007), university students of French were asked to read aloud a lengthy passage (approximately 950 words) about the grammatical concept of *voice* (active, passive, and middle voice sentences), one *chunk* of meaning at a time. After reading each chunk, the students were asked to explain in their own words (i.e., to language) the meaning of what they had just read. The students were both pretested and posttested on their understanding of the concept of voice, and they were posttested on their ability to identify and produce verb forms to realize the appropriate voice of sentences embedded in a story. The test results show that high language learners demonstrated a deeper knowledge of the concept of voice, as well as a greater ability to correctly identify the voice of a sentence and to produce the appropriate verb form than low language learners (Swain, 2007).

Furthermore, the transcripts of the students' linguaging revealed the different ways that they grappled with this difficult concept of voice and

either came to an understanding of it or not. To further our emic perspective of what the students were doing, in follow-up interviews, we asked them how they felt about talking out loud about French grammar, whether they would consider doing so by themselves, and if they thought it helped them to learn. Most students said they found it useful to talk out loud about what they were reading. As M9 told us:

my sister'll walk by and be like "are you talking to yourself?" And I'll just do like I was doing with those sheets [the text on grammatical voice] when I was reading them . . . Like where I don't get it when reading through, I'll say it out loud so I can hear myself saying it and then I'll, I'll talk myself through it usually. (Swain, 2006b, unpublished data)

And M11 told us:

but to sort of get it sunk in, I have to sort of explain it to myself. (Swain, 2006b, unpublished data)

In effect, for these students, linguaging mediated their comprehension of the concept of voice, and made possible the internalization of their conception of this new substantive knowledge, and in some cases, made possible the application of this knowledge to language use.

In a doctoral dissertation that examined the interdependency of emotions, language, and communication in a collaborative learning context in a university English as a Foreign Language (EFL) course in Japan, Imai (2007) provided an example in which a group of three students co-constructed their emotion of anger through linguaging their feelings of frustration. At one point in their group discussion, one of the students (Tomoyo) made an offhand comment about how boring their EFL class was. The discussion immediately turned to how disorganized their teacher was and with each passing turn (32 of them), the three students co-constructed an increasingly negative image of their teacher, creating an intense level of anger (resulting from their frustration) among them. The parting shot came from Naomi who concluded angrily:

Not only that, I really felt that the teacher, you know, since that man is a teacher, he should cover expenses for our photocopying [the material he wants us to read]. (group discussion, 4th session)

Based on other data from the students' emotion logs, emotional temperature assessment, and stimulated recalls, Imai (2007) presented an excellent case for the interpretation of this conversation as revealing the development of the emotion

of anger through languaging. That is, had the students not had this discussion, they might never have felt this intense level of anger. Imai also argued that through this conversation, emotional intersubjectivity among the group members was created. It is interesting to note that this group finished their assignment on time and obtained a high grade for it; whereas in another group, where the students remained relatively neutral emotionally, the students were unable to complete their assignment on time.

The second point about SCT that we wish to highlight is the importance it places on genesis, that is, on the history of a present entity or process. According to Vygotsky (1978), one cannot understand the human mind without knowing how it came to function in the way it functions. This is why Vygotsky studied children—because he wanted to understand the process of how something comes into being.⁴ As Hall (2002) noted, traditional SLA conceptualizes learners as “stable, internally homogeneous, fixed entities” (p. 31). In addition, individuals are seen as independent from context, and individual actions are believed to be driven by internally motivated states. In contrast, a sociocultural perspective views individuals and their cognitive and emotional development as constituting and constituted by their social milieu. From an SCT perspective, individuals have histories that are complex and variable and that affect their actions and motivation to engage in L2 learning.

In a recent study, Kim (2007) examined L2 motivation from an SCT perspective, making particular use of activity theory. Each month for approximately a year, Kim individually interviewed recently arrived Korean immigrants and Korean visa students living in a large metropolitan city in Canada. Kim’s data illustrate three important findings informed by SCT and not evidenced in previous motivational research. First, his longitudinal data demonstrate that L2 motivation is not a stable characteristic of an individual, but instead fluctuates and changes over time. Second, the occurrence of localized specific events, which have uniquely personal importance to an individual learner, are critical in determining a learner’s motivational trajectory. Third, a learner’s history as reflected in his or her belief systems, interacts with his or her L2 motivational development. For example, one Korean immigrant participant, Paul, believed that the only useful input for his English language learning was that which came from a NS of English. As a result, in the multilingual city in which he lived, there were few people among his acquaintances and contacts with whom

he considered it worthwhile to interact, and his motivation to continue learning English declined over time. In contrast, another immigrant, Sandra, who considered any speaker of English (certainly including other learners of English) to be a language learning resource, interacted with a wide variety of individuals. Her L2 motivation did not decline. In the case of these two students, Paul had the goal of achieving NS abilities in English. Nevertheless, it was Sandra who performed better on a test of spoken English at the end of the data collection period.

SITUATED LEARNING AND SLA

Another major strand of socioculturally informed SLA research is framed by situated learning models. Such models have developed in recent decades as a result of increasing interest in situated cognition in diverse disciplines such as cognitive science, artificial intelligence, education, and anthropology. Wilson and Myers (2000) noted that situated cognition, which focuses on human knowledge and interaction *in situ*, can be approached from a perspective that primarily examines individual cognitive mechanisms, such as in cognitive science and artificial intelligence, or from a perspective that prioritizes the social and cultural (e.g., Lave, 1988). In this section, given the focus of this article on socioculturally informed perspectives, we present examples from the latter perspective. Situated learning models have had an important impact on SLA research in diverse learning contexts, including the area of computer-assisted language learning (see e.g., Salaberry, 1996). As we noted in our introduction, and will elaborate, such research had already garnered interest in SLA prior to Firth and Wagner’s (1997) article, and has flourished since then.

The participation metaphor has increasingly drawn attention in SLA to complement the traditional acquisition metaphor (Donato, 2000; Pavlenko & Lantolf, 2000; Sfard, 1998). According to the participation metaphor, learning is a process of becoming a member of a community, and this process involves developing the ability to communicate through the language and behavior that are deemed acceptable by the community. In this section, we focus on two models that incorporate the participation metaphor and theoretical orientations from anthropology, namely, language socialization and the community of practice framework. Both of these orientations emphasize the social situatedness of learning, and conceive of learning as becoming an active, full participant in a particular community,

which necessarily involves constructing identities in relation to these communities.

Language socialization gained prominence through the work of Heath (1983), Ochs (1988), Schieffelin and Ochs (1986), and Watson (1975), to name but a few. Garrett and Baquedano-Lopez (2002) defined socialization as "the process through which a child or other novice acquires the knowledge, orientations, and practices that enable him or her to participate effectively and appropriately in the social life of a particular community" (p. 339) and stated that this process is realized primarily through the use of language. Language socialization research, then, examines how novices are socialized through the use of language as well as how they are socialized to use language. According to Garrett and Baquedano-Lopez, language socialization research seeks a holistic and integrative perspective to understanding human development, and is longitudinal and ethnographic in orientation. This theoretical orientation began to appear in SLA research over a decade ago, with key earlier studies by (a) Harklau (1994) and Poole (1992), who examined the language socialization of students in English as a second language (ESL) classes in the United States; (b) Duff (1995), who examined language socialization in a dual language high school in Hungary; (c) Ohta (1994), who examined Japanese as a foreign language learners; and (d) Willet (1995), who examined ESL first graders in a mainstream classroom. More recent research from a language socialization perspective includes work by Bayley and Schecter (2003), Duff and Uchida (1997), Duff, Wong, and Early (2000), Lam (2004), Li (2000), Moore (1999), Ohta (1999, 2001), and Schecter and Bayley (1997). These studies have examined language socialization in a variety of L2 and foreign language (FL) contexts, focusing on teachers and students in classrooms, as well as on adult immigrants in the workplace.

In a recent *MLJ* article, Watson-Gegeo (2004) made an argument for a language socialization paradigm for SLA that would be consistent with new findings about mind and language from the cognitive sciences. Watson-Gegeo identified the key premises of language socialization theory as including (a) the dialectic relationship between the acquisition of language and culture, and the importance of human agency in the acquisition process; (b) the inherent social, cultural, and political nature of all contexts in which learners interact with others and which affects the linguistic forms that are available to learners; (c) the complexity, multidimensionality, and historicity of contexts and the need to examine both

macro- and microlevels of the institutional, social, political, and cultural aspects of a particular context; and (d) learning as participation in communities of practice.

Contemporary language socialization theory, especially as it is used to inform SLA research, has evolved from its earlier form, which was based on anthropological studies and which assumed a more unproblematic apprenticeship of novices into a particular language and culture. Watson-Gegeo (2004) incorporated Lave and Wenger's (1991) framework of legitimate peripheral participation into a contemporary language socialization theory. Indeed, many researchers using a situated learning orientation move seamlessly between concepts from language socialization and the community of practice framework. However, we will discuss the community of practice framework separately because there are some key differences, which we will highlight with a number of examples.

Lave and Wenger's community of practice framework (Lave & Wenger, 1991; Wenger, 1998) has been used by a number of SLA researchers to inform their studies of L2 acquisition in various naturalistic contexts. These studies include earlier works by Haneda (1997) and Toohey (1996), as well as more recent studies by Leki (2001), Morita (2004), and Toohey, Waterstone, and Julé-Lemke (2000). As mentioned previously, there are many similarities between language socialization and the community of practice framework, but one key difference is that the community of practice framework is more explicit than language socialization about power differentials in learning in situ. A central concept in Lave and Wenger's situated learning model is that of legitimate peripheral participation. Learners must be seen as legitimate participants in order to access a particular community's resources. *Peripherality* is a positive term that describes the engagement of newcomers in varying degrees of participation. Both legitimacy and peripherality are necessary in order for an individual to become a full participant in a particular community. Newcomers must be accepted by others in a community of practice in order to gain access to resources and opportunities for socialization. Access is key and crucial. As we shall see later, individuals in L2 or FL contexts do not necessarily have unproblematic access to the learning community.

The community of practice framework emphasizes learning as involving the whole person with a sociocultural history and focuses on "activity in and with the world" and on the view that "agent, activity, and the world mutually constitute

each other" (Lave & Wenger, 1991, p. 33). Another central concept is that learning involves the (re)construction of identities. Furthermore, rather than reproducing the existing community, the participation of newcomers also entails changes and transformation of the community.

In Wenger's (1998) more recent elaboration of this framework, issues of identity take centre stage: "our membership constitutes our identity, not just through reified markers of membership but more fundamentally through the forms of competence that it entails" (p. 152). Wenger also introduced issues of nonparticipation in addition to participation:

We not only produce our identities through the practice we engage in, but we also define ourselves through practices we do not engage in. Our identities are constituted not only by what we are but also by what we are not. (p. 164)

Thus, a community of practice perspective views the negotiation of identities as potentially conflictual as learners move across the boundaries of different communities.

Toohy's (1996) study of kindergarten ESL learners was one of the first SLA studies that was informed by a community of practice framework. This ethnographic study examined the communities in which two Asian newcomer children, Harvey and Amy, participated peripherally. Toohy focused on the identities of these children, the social practices and resources that were available for newcomer children, and the power relations in each community's social structure that determined the conditions for legitimate peripheral participation. Toohy found that various communities existed within this kindergarten class: the official class community, which included the teacher and all of the pupils, and a number of communities formed by children with a common first language (L1), for example, Chinese and Polish. Regarding social practices, Toohy observed the interaction between identity and access to a community's resources, which in this context included social play and toys.

Toohy (1996) found a two-way relationship between identity and participation, and that identity and access to participation and resources are historical, dynamic, and problematic for the children. For example, Harvey was constructed as *polite* by his peers, and as a result, had much difficulty accessing the social and material resources in the classroom. Amy, however, had a constructed identity of *cute little girl* who was compliant, quiet, and welcomed by the classroom

community of peers. Another observation was that identities were contextually and temporally bound. For example, Amy's identity was quite different when she was interacting in Cantonese with her Cantonese-speaking peers. In this context, she was assertive and talkative. This study showed that the process of learning an L2 in a classroom setting is much more complex than previously thought, and that, contrary to common belief, L2 learning for a young child is not an easy task.

A more recent SLA study that used the community of practice framework is Morita's (2004) one-year ethnographic study that examined the experiences of six female Japanese graduate students in a Canadian university. Morita found that the students faced major challenges in negotiating competence and identities, and power relations, which were necessary for them to be recognized as legitimate peripheral participants in their classroom communities. The methods of negotiation depended on the context, and the particular classroom community, as well as on the student's personal history, values, and goals. A number of interesting findings emerged from this study.

The data clearly showed the contingent nature of the students' identities because their identities could change in different contexts or in the same context over time. For example, in one class, Nanako felt like a legitimate peripheral participant because the instructor acknowledged that there are different learning styles and that it was normal for international students to take some time to get accustomed to the North American style of classroom interaction. The instructor also told Nanako that as an outsider, she had a valuable perspective to contribute. However, in another course, when Nanako appealed to the instructor for help, the instructor "did not seem to care" and "offered no constructive advice" (Morita, 2004, p. 589). As a result, Nanako's limited participation was not peripheral but marginalized. This example is also important in showing the value of learners' perspectives. To an outside observer, Nanako appeared to exhibit similar behavior in both courses, that is, limited participation. But Nanako's narrative shows that her identity as a member of the classroom community was quite different in these two contexts.

This study, as in the work by Lantolf and Genung (2003) and Norton (2001), revealed the importance of learners' agency in shaping their own learning and participation. As mentioned previously, Wenger (1998) maintained that issues

of nonparticipation are indicative of identity and agency. For example, Rie, another participant in Morita's (2004) study, actively resisted being marginalized in a course where the instructor and other students whose L1 was English positioned the international students as deficient. As a result of the unsupportive atmosphere in the class, Rie consciously decided not to become a full participant as a way of "coping and exercising her personal agency" (p. 594). Lantolf and Genung's study, although framed by an activity theoretical perspective rather than a community of practice perspective,⁵ also demonstrated a student's agency to direct her learning in her FL course. In this case, the Chinese as a foreign language student changed her goal from learning an FL successfully to merely passing the course to fulfill her doctoral program requirements when her values about language learning practices clashed with those of her instructor.

One of our current research studies (Deters, in preparation) also uses the community of practice framework to examine the professional acculturation experiences of highly educated immigrants in Canada. We present excerpts from the narrative of one of the participants to illustrate the dialectic and co-constructed nature of identity and agency.

Peter, a chemist from Poland, arrived in Canada with a handful of phrases in English. Because he had to work full time to support himself, he learned English on his own and through his interactions with people, for example, with co-workers and customers in the coffee shop where he worked for the first year and a half. At the time of the interview, Peter had been in the country for 17 years and had achieved professional success, first as a chemist in the food industry, and later as a full-time faculty member in the Department of Chemical Engineering at a college. Peter's narrative reflected issues of identity and agency in learning the language and culture of his adopted country. First of all, when asked why he decided to move to Canada, he stated:

It was a very personal reason. I'm gay. So Poland is a very Catholic country. . . . This kind of behavior and lifestyle is not accepted in Poland. . . . So that was a very personal reason. That's why I am here. (Deters, 2006, unpublished data)

Thus, Peter's identity was the main reason for his migration. In Peter's case, his desire to learn English led to his withdrawal from the Polish community in Canada. He had been sponsored by a Polish Canadian couple who lived in a Polish neighborhood. Peter said:

Unfortunately for the first half a year I ended up in a Polish area, where everyone speaks Polish and I hated it. . . . Because my attitude and my understanding was I'm here, I have to learn English in order to survive. I could survive in a little Polish area or little Poland or whatever you call it. But that wasn't my goal. (Deters, 2006, unpublished data)

In contrast to the forms of nonparticipation discussed previously in the studies by Morita (2004), and Lantolf and Genung (2003), which involved withdrawal from and resistance to the target-language learning community, Peter's nonparticipation involved withdrawal from his own ethnic community.

Peter's narrative throughout reflected his strong motivation to learn and his agency in learning English:

And then again I was very highly motivated. I was like okay, I have to learn. I have to learn another word. I have to learn another rule, blah, blah, blah. And I will get somewhere with that, because I was very pleased when my diploma, university degree was evaluated by (the local university). I was extremely pleased with that and it was like thank God. It means that my knowledge, my university degree will be recognized in this country. . . . That was the biggest point and I thought okay, because the (university), which is a huge institution, said okay, we agree with you, you have your Master's degree, I thought okay, I will get somewhere with that. I will use it. Sooner or later I will use it. (Deters, 2006, unpublished data)

These excerpts reflect the relation between Peter's identity and his agency to become a member of a new community, which also involved nonparticipation in his former community, as shown in the second excerpt. The last excerpt reveals how Peter's identity as an educated professional was affirmed when the local university officially recognized his previous education, and how this reification of academic membership contributed to his perception of his identity as a professional, and contributed to his agency to learn English in order to reach his goal of entering his professional community in Canada. Thus, issues of identity and agency, and the dialectic relationship between them, are highlighted in the community of practice framework.

In summary, the findings from these various studies reveal that L2 learning is a highly complex and socially situated process that is dynamic and involves the negotiation of access, participation, and above all, identity. An important contribution of the community of practice framework to SLA is its focus on the contingent and dialectic nature of language learning, learner identity, and

learner agency. This framework also draws attention to power relations in socially situated learning, which affect a newcomer's access to a community's resources.

POSTSTRUCTURALISM AND SLA

Poststructuralism refers to a range of theoretical approaches that focuses on the role of language in the construction of reality and identity. As the term indicates, these approaches developed in reaction to structuralism, which is attributed to the structural linguistics of Saussure (1916/1974). Saussure argued that language is an abstract system of signs, and that each sign has a *signifier* (the sound pattern of a word) and a *signified* (concept or meaning of a word), and that these are related in an arbitrary way. Saussure's conception of language was radically different from previous understandings of words and their direct relationship to objects in the world.

Poststructural theories, which are often associated with the work of Barthes (1977), Derrida (1976), Foucault (1978, 1980), Kristeva (1984), and Lacan (1977), were a response to structuralist theories of language. A key concept in poststructural theories is that meaning is not fixed, but created through social discourses and practices.

According to Weedon (1997), who developed a feminist poststructural theory, poststructural theorists share fundamental assumptions about language, meaning, and subjectivity. Meanings are socially produced and constituted within language; thus, language constructs "our sense of ourselves, our subjectivity" (p. 19). The term *subjectivity* is used by poststructural theorists to refer to the concept of identity, to emphasize the contingent nature of identity. Whereas the individual was previously essentialized as "unique, fixed and coherent" (p. 32), a poststructural perspective "proposes a subjectivity which is precarious, contradictory and in process, constantly being reconstituted in discourse each time we think or speak" (p. 32). Of particular significance for SLA is the relationship between the acquisition of language and subjectivity. Weedon stated: "As we acquire language, we learn to give voice—meaning—to our experience and to understand it according to particular ways of thinking, particular discourses, which pre-date our entry into language" (p. 32).

However, Weedon (1997) also noted that language cannot have "social and political effectivity except in and through the actions of the individuals who become its bearers by taking up the

forms of subjectivity and the meanings and values which it proposes and acting upon them" (p. 34). This statement is significant because it gives agency to individuals, and thus, implies the possibility of change.

Poststructural perspectives have also emerged in SLA, including the oft-cited earlier works of Norton Peirce (1995), who examined the language learning experiences of immigrant women in Canada, of McKay and Wong (1996), who examined the experiences of ethnic Chinese immigrant students in a U.S. middle school, and of Siegal (1996), who examined Western women learning Japanese. More recent works that are informed by poststructural perspectives include those by Blackledge and Pavlenko (2001), Kubota (2001), Miller (2004), and Pavlenko (2001). Another related branch of study is that of critical theory and pedagogy, including earlier works by Canagarajah (1993, 1999), Cummins (2001), Morgan (1997, 1998), Pennycook (1998, 2001), and Phillipson (1992). Worth's (2006) study of resistance in an Italian as a foreign language classroom is a recent study that is informed by a critical pedagogical perspective. In this section, we will highlight briefly the studies by Norton, Miller, and Worth.

Norton's (2000; Norton Peirce, 1995) study of the social identity and language learning experiences of five immigrant women in Canada drew upon Weedon's (1997) feminist poststructural theory of subjectivity to highlight the dialectic relationship between language learning and a language learner's identity: "When language learners speak, they are not only exchanging information with target language speakers, but they are constantly organizing and reorganizing a sense of who they are and how they relate to the social world" (Norton, 2000, p. 11). In contrast to mainstream SLA conceptions of learner identity as critiqued by Firth and Wagner (1997), Norton argued that the social identities of language learners are multiple, a site of struggle, and subject to change. Norton's work also examined the crucial role of power relations in the social interactions between language learners and target language speakers, which was a topic that had not been addressed in mainstream SLA, nor in other areas of SLA research, for example, in conversational analysis (see e.g., Markee, 2004). Following Bourdieu's (1977) use of economic metaphors, that is, cultural, social, and symbolic *capital*, Norton developed the concept of *investment*, which conceives of learners as having a complex social history and multiple, sometimes conflicting, desires, thus, problematizing the traditional notion of motivation in SLA theory.

One of Norton's (2000) participants was Eva, an immigrant from Poland. Through Eva's narratives of her experiences at her workplace, Norton demonstrated the intersections between investment, identity, and language learning. Eva was well aware of the symbolic and cultural capital afforded by fluency in English, which would help her to pursue her career goals in Canada. Norton described Eva's initial social and linguistic exclusion from the Anglophone community at her workplace, and how Eva was eventually able to gain access to social interactions with co-workers. Eva gained entry into this community by claiming spaces to speak and to be heard, and by showing her co-workers that she was able to make a positive contribution to their lives. For example, during a lunch break, Eva's co-workers started talking about places they liked in Canada. Because Eva had not traveled in Canada, she shared her knowledge of Europe, and was able to participate in the conversation.

On another occasion, Eva was able to share her knowledge of other European languages by teaching some Italian to her manager. Thus, through her discourse, Eva was able to challenge her initial positioning by her co-workers as someone who was unworthy of speaking and listening to, and made her co-workers aware of her skills and experience. Eva's identity as a multilingual European helped her to assert herself as an educated person. As a result of Eva's participation in conversations at her workplace, her co-workers saw her in a different light. Thus, her discourse both came from and formed her social identity.

Using a critical perspective, Norton's work has made a significant contribution to the *social turn* in SLA research (Block, 2003) by drawing attention to the complexity of social identities, and highlighting the issue of power relations in the real world of L2 learners. A key point that Norton made through this example is that access to Anglophones does not necessarily mean access to opportunities to use English. Eva had to challenge the discourses about immigrants in dominant, mainstream society in order to resist marginalization and to access the social network at her workplace. It was only then that she had opportunities to use and improve her English skills.

Miller's (2004) three-year ethnographic study also used a poststructural perspective to examine the experiences of 10 immigrant students from Asia and Europe in their transition from an intensive program at an ESL high school to a mainstream high school. Miller used the notion of *audibility*, which she defined as "the degree to which speakers sound like, and are legitimated

by, users of the dominant discourse" (p. 291). Audibility requires the collaboration of speaker and listener. Miller also highlighted the ideas that identity is represented and negotiated through speaking and hearing. Findings from this study revealed the difficulties the students faced in entering the mainstream school community.

The transition from the supportive community at the ESL high school to the mainstream high school, where monolingual Australian students and some teachers were often unwilling to provide attentive and sympathetic listening, made it difficult for these students to be audible. This was especially the case for the students from Chinese backgrounds. The Mandarin-speaking students often connected with the many other Mandarin speakers in their schools, which further limited their opportunities to speak English. Miller (2004) described how the negotiation of identity through language use was different for students from Bosnia. For example, immediately upon arriving at a mainstream high school, one student was able to convince her teacher to move her up to Grade 11 even though her previous ESL teachers had recommended that she be placed in Grade 10. Miller argued that this student's symbolic and linguistic capital prior to arriving in Australia gave her the agency to be audible. Miller also suggested that visible difference or ethnicity was salient to the students' language learning and use, and to their negotiation of their identity. Thus, the nonvisible minority student with a European accent and an assertive personality was more audible than the Asian students.

Whereas most of the critical pedagogists cited previously deal with English language learning contexts, Worth (2006) examined resistance in an Italian as a foreign language context. The study was primarily a critical ethnographic microanalysis of classroom and student discourse gathered through observations, videorecordings, interviews, and documents. Nevertheless, Worth also conducted pre- and postcourse surveys of students' attitudes, for example, their attitudes toward learning Italian, their desire to learn Italian, their interest in FLs, their instrumental orientation, and their motivational intensity. Worth found statistically significant changes in the students' attitudes over one academic semester. A disturbing finding was that many of the students' attitudes changed from positive to negative. This quantitative finding confirms the qualitative findings of student resistance. Worth identified several types of resistance, including (a) the use of codeswitching from Italian to English to resist the instructor's strict enforcement of the

target-language-only policy, which had the effect of threatening the students' identity of competence; (b) the students' playing dumb to protect their identities and to create solidarity among classmates; and (c) resistance to the instructor's discourses of *Italy Is the Best* and *When You Go There*, which clashed with the students' own views and experiences as well as with their diverse goals for taking the course. Worth concluded that such findings can be used to improve practice through critical pedagogies, for example, rethinking the appropriateness of the communicative language teaching approaches in FL contexts and also target-language-only policies.

DIALOGISM AND SLA

The work of Russian literary theorist and philosopher Bakhtin (1981, 1986) has captured the attention of some SLA researchers in recent years (e.g., Hall, Vitanova, & Marchenkova, 2005; Kramsch, 2000; Savignon & Sysoyev, 2002; Toohey et al., 2000). Compared to the other three perspectives discussed previously, to our knowledge, SLA research that is informed by Bakhtin's theories has appeared more recently. Central to Bakhtin's conception of language, thought, and meaning is the *utterance*, which reflects the specific conditions and goals of various areas of human activity (Bakhtin, 1986).

Utterances are both individual and belong to *speech genres*, which are relatively stable types of utterances. According to Bakhtin (1981), all utterances are dialogic; that is, all utterances have an addressor and addressee. Furthermore, dialogism holds that all language, and indeed, human consciousness, is dynamic, interactional, and context-dependent. Bakhtin introduced the term *heteroglossia* to describe the co-existence of multiple meanings, perspectives, and values in language. As Holquist stated in the introduction to Bakhtin's (1981) work, "this extraordinary sensitivity to the immense plurality of experience more than anything else distinguishes Bakhtin from other moderns who have been obsessed with language" (p. xx). Hall et al. (2005) argued that Bakhtin's conceptualization of language has important implications for SLA, given that language, from a Bakhtinian perspective, is seen as structured and emergent, and is learned through social interaction. When learning a language, we appropriate the meanings that have been historically and socially constructed, but we are also able to add our own voice.

The theories of Bakhtin, who was Vygotsky's contemporary, have been compared, contrasted,

and integrated with those of Vygotsky (see e.g., Cheyne & Tarulli, 1999; Marchenkova, 2005; Sullivan & McCarthy, 2004; Wertsch, 1991). Indeed, the compatibility of, as well as the differences in, Bakhtinian and Vygotskian theories of language and learning have recently garnered considerable attention, as revealed by a number of studies that address concepts from both theoretical perspectives. Cumming-Potvin (2004) used concepts from SCT and Bakhtin's (1981, 1986) concept of voicing to examine a fourth-year student's learning of French in Australia. Curdt-Christiansen (2006) drew upon Vygotskian and Bakhtinian perspectives of language as a mediational tool to examine the discourse in Chinese as a heritage language classrooms in Montreal. Dufva and Alanen (2005) used SCT concepts and dialogism to examine the metalinguistic awareness and FL learning of Finnish primary school children. Iddings, Haught, and Devlin (2005) incorporated Bakhtin's and Vygotsky's views on meaning-making to examine third graders' learning of English in an American classroom. Lee's (2006) study of Korean students at an American university focused on the dialogic nature of private speech. Yi and Kellog (2006) examined the English diaries of Korean primary school children to explore the concepts of other- and self-mediation, and the dialogic nature of utterances.

Bakhtin's work has also been discussed in relation to poststructuralism and is viewed as preceding it. The common thread that connects Vygotskian, Bakhtinian, and poststructural perspectives is the acknowledgment of the social and historical construction of language and the creation of meaning through discourse. However, a key difference between SCT and poststructuralism is that according to SCT, languaging leads to internalization, which implies a degree of stability in an individual's psyche, whereas according to poststructuralism, the subjectivity of an individual is always in progress and is reconstituted in discourse. A commonality between a Bakhtinian and a poststructural view of language is that both acknowledge the plurality and heterogeneity of language (Vitanova, 2002). However, although dialogism and poststructuralism share some similar assumptions, they are also different in significant ways. One difference is that Bakhtin's (1981, 1986) dialogic perspective creates a greater space for human agency. For example, Sullivan and McCarthy (2004) argued that a dialogic perspective takes into account the lived, felt experiences of agency, that is, feelings and emotions, that are downplayed in the approaches of other systems, such as activity theory and community

of practice. Two recent studies that examine language through a dialogic perspective are those by Lee (2006) and by Vitanova (2005).

Lee's (2006) study of L1 Korean students at an American university is an example of a growing body of research that incorporates theoretical constructs from Vygotsky (1978, 1986) and Bakhtin (1981, 1986). This study focuses on learners' private speech and private writing to explore how oral and written language/speech is used as a mediational tool by learners during their solitary activity of preparing for their examination. In relation to this question, Lee examined the self-regulatory function of private speech and writing and the use of language alternation, that is, the mixed use of L1 and L2. Lee's second research focus in this study was to find empirical evidence for the dialogic nature of private speech, based on Bakhtin's concept of dialogism. Using techniques from conversation analysis, Lee found examples of interactional structures such as question-answer sequences, repair sequences, and reactive expressions in the participants' private speech, thus demonstrating the structural parallels between private and social speech. Lee's study makes an important contribution to ongoing work on Vygotskian and Bakhtinian theoretical constructs by providing empirical evidence of the dialogic nature of private speech. According to Lee, these findings support Vygotsky's claim about the social origin of private speech.

Vitanova (2005) used Bakhtin's (1981) dialogic philosophy to examine how five Eastern European adult immigrants to the United States authored themselves in a new language and environment. According to the dialogic theory of language, "it is impossible to voice oneself without appropriating others' words . . . linguistic forms have already been used in a variety of settings, and language users have to make them their own, to populate them with their own accents" (p. 154). Furthermore, according to Bakhtin, dialogue is not merely a medium that reveals a ready-made character: "in dialogue a person not only shows himself outwardly, but he becomes for the first time what he is" (Bakhtin, 1984, p. 252, as cited in Vitanova, 2005, p. 154). Thus, to speak is to create oneself.

Through the narratives, Vitanova (2005) showed how language was central to positioning the participants. First, because none of the participants was fluent in English, all initially lost their ability to reveal themselves, and consequently lost their previous status as intelligentsia. For example, Vera, who was a journalist in her country of origin, worked as a kitchen manager upon her arrival in the United States. Vera said that she felt

like a child in kindergarten because of her lack of English proficiency. The loss of language not only affected the participants' professional status and identity, but all aspects of existence. Boris, who was an architect before immigrating to the United States stated, "without know the language, you don't know anything, you cannot understand how people communicate with each other, their relations" (p. 159). Vitanova explained that according to Bakhtin (1981), "one becomes a subject only by participating in dialogue. There is nothing more frightening than not being understood, heard, and answered by another, yet this is exactly what happened to these immigrants" (p. 159).

Vitanova (2005) showed how narrative consciousness includes the presence of others in the narrator's emotional-volitional tone. *Emotional-volitional* tone refers to feelings, desires, and moral evaluations. According to Vitanova, emotional-volitional tone is a "key aspect of authoring selves because it makes one's responses to ordinary social realities unique and inherently moral" (p. 158). Furthermore, emotional-volitional tone is "constructed by a particular discursive situation" (p. 158). For example, Dimitri and Natalia recounted an incident in a restaurant where some clients attributed Dimitri's lack of comprehension to his lack of English language ability rather than to the loud noise in the restaurant. Vitanova stated that when Natalia recounted this incident, she re-accented it with her own emotional-volitional tone and evaluative stance, that is, with anger and indignation.

Vitanova (2005) also highlighted the transformative power of personal narratives: "By evaluating and naming the world around them, the participants in this study have claimed their voices and signed their own acts of authoring" (p. 156). Furthermore, through their narratives, the participants were able to understand and analyze their situations better, which provides the foundation for agency. Last, Vitanova showed how her participants also demonstrated their agency through acts of resistance. For example, some participants resisted authoritative voices, oppressive utterances, and their positioning by others through laughter and irony.

Vitanova (2005) maintained that a dialogic theory of language can further our understanding of how adult immigrants are able to reestablish their voices in a new language, and that through discursive practices and narratives, individuals are able to exert their agency and to author themselves. This idea brings us full circle to the initial section of this article on SCT and the concept of

linguaging, the process through which the social is internalized, and the internal self is expressed to the external milieu.

CONCLUSION

Our review and discussion of a diverse range of socioculturally informed approaches to SLA research demonstrate that incorporating a social perspective of learners and language learning can make a significant contribution to furthering our understanding of the complexity of the L2 learning process. Such approaches have enlarged the ontological and empirical parameters of SLA, as called for by Firth and Wagner (1997) a decade ago, and have drawn attention to the importance of individuals' identities, agency, and the situated nature of their language learning. Such research addresses Firth and Wagner's call for an emic perspective to the L2 acquisition process by the use of qualitative methods such as verbal protocols, ethnography, and first-person narratives. Although the range of perspectives were diverse in many ways, all emphasize L2 learning as a highly complex activity in which human cognition and human agency develop and multiple identities are co-constructed through interaction with others, the self, and the cultural artifacts of our environments. Drawing from disciplines other than cognitive psychology, we have seen how SLA has taken in a variety of theoretical perspectives and applied them to create, expand, and enrich its theory and research. Participation has found its place alongside acquisition; individuals are seen as agents-operating-with-mediation-means as well as agents with will; and the struggle to develop and maintain a single identity sits uneasily alongside the acceptance of multiple identities.

Some scholars will claim that the balance between the cognitive and social that Firth and Wagner (1997) argued for has already shifted too far in the direction of the social. Some will argue it should never have moved that way at all. Although we have focused on social/sociocultural perspectives in this article, we believe that in our goal to understand L2 learning, we must pay balanced attention to social, cognitive, and affective aspects that bear on the ways we learn an L2. Also, both etic and emic perspectives are important. We must try to understand learners from their own perspectives, but as theorists and researchers we must add our own interpretations guided by our theories. "New" SLA theory insists that we will have a more complete understanding of L2 learning by having a broader perspective of the nature of language itself, by having a broader database,

and, perhaps most of all, by listening to the stories of the learners, and by observing them as they move through their complex worlds. A challenge to the field is whether the issues raised by the broadening of our understanding of the L2 acquisition process through such sociocultural perspectives will find their way into current models of communicative performance (e.g., Bachman, 1990; Canale & Swain, 1980) that affect L2 learning through pedagogy, teacher education, and assessment of proficiency. Thus, much work lies ahead as we seek ways to incorporate our broadened understanding of L2 acquisition to benefit and empower learners.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We would like to thank Tae-Young Kim, Penny Kinnear, Jim Lantolf, Sharon Lapkin, Linda Steinman, and Wataru Suzuki for their insightful comments and feedback on earlier versions of this manuscript. We are also grateful for the thoughtful and helpful comments from the three anonymous reviewers and from the editors.

NOTES

¹ However, the theory does not ignore human biology, see Vygotsky (1987).

² We are subsuming activity theory within this description of SCT.

³ In SCT, language is viewed as a tool of the mind that is genetically related to egocentric speech (Vygotsky, 1986).

⁴ Vygotsky (1987) discussed four genetic domains of importance to understanding the human mind: (a) *phylogenesis* (the development of primates), (b) *sociocultural history* (the development of a society), (c) *ontogenesis* (the development of an individual), and (d) *microgenesis* (the development of a specific process during ontogenesis).

⁵ There are similar elements in these frameworks: Wenger (1998, p. 282) acknowledged that her understanding of the concept of practice has been influenced by activity theorist Engeström (1987) and by psychologist Vygotsky, among others.

REFERENCES

- Bachman, L. F. (1990). *Fundamental considerations in language testing*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Bakhtin, M. M. (1981). *The dialogic imagination: Four essays* (M. Holquist, Trans.). Austin: University of Texas Press.

- Bakhtin, M. M. (1984). *Problems of Dostoevsky's poetics* (C. Emerson, Trans.). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Bakhtin, M. M. (1986). *Speech genres and other late essays* (1st ed., C. Emerson & M. Holquist, Trans.). Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Barthes, R. (1977). *Image, music, text* (S. Heath, Trans.). New York: Hill and Wang.
- Bayley, R., & Schecter, S. R. (Eds.). (2003). *Language socialization in bilingual and multilingual societies*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Bell, N. D. (2005). Exploring L2 language play as an aid to SLL: A case study of humour in NS–NNS interaction. *Applied Linguistics*, 26, 192–218.
- Belz, J., & Kinginger, C. (2002). The cross-linguistic development of address form use in telecollaborative language learning: Two case studies. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 59, 189–214.
- Belz, J., & Kinginger, C. (2003). Discourse options and the development of pragmatic competence by classroom learners of German: The case of address forms. *Language Learning*, 53, 591–647.
- Blackledge, A., & Pavlenko, A. (2001). Negotiation of identities in multilingual contexts. *The International Journal of Bilingualism*, 5, 243–257.
- Block, D. (1996). Not so fast: Some thoughts on theory culling, relativism, accepted findings and the heart and soul of SLA. *Applied Linguistics*, 17, 63–83.
- Block, D. (2003). *The social turn in second language acquisition*. Edinburgh, UK: Edinburgh University Press.
- Bourdieu, P. (1977). *Reproduction in education, society and culture*. London: Sage.
- Broner, M., & Tarone, E. (2001). Is it fun? Language play in a fifth-grade Spanish immersion classroom. *Modern Language Journal*, 85, 363–379.
- Buckwalter, P. (2001). Repair sequences in Spanish L2 dyadic discourse: A descriptive study. *Modern Language Journal*, 85, 380–397.
- Canagarajah, A. S. (1993). Critical ethnography of a Sri Lankan classroom: Ambiguities in student opposition to reproduction through ESOL. *TESOL Quarterly*, 27, 601–626.
- Canagarajah, A. S. (1999). *Resisting linguistic imperialism in English teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Canale, M., & Swain, M. (1980). Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing. *Applied Linguistics*, 1, 1–47.
- Centeno-Cortés, B. (2003). *Private speech in the second language classroom: Its role in internalization and its link to social production*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The Pennsylvania State University, University Park.
- Cheyne, J. A., & Tarulli, D. (1999). Dialogue, difference and voice in the zone of proximal development. *Theory and Psychology*, 9, 5–28.
- Cole, M. (1996). *Cultural psychology: A once and future discipline*. Cambridge, MA: Berknap Press.
- Cumming-Potvin, W. (2004). Disrupting literacy practices in a learning community: Empowerment through voicing. *McGill Journal of Education*, 39, 199–219.
- Cummins, J. (2001). *Negotiating identities: Education for empowerment in a diverse society* (2nd ed.). Los Angeles: California Association for Bilingual Education.
- Curdt-Christiansen, X. L. (2006). Teaching and learning Chinese: Heritage language classroom discourse in Montreal. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, 19, 189–207.
- de Guerrero, M. C. M. (1994). Form and function of inner speech in adult second language learning. In J. P. Lantolf & G. Appel (Eds.), *Vygotskian approaches to second language research* (pp. 83–116). Hillsdale, NJ: Ablex.
- de Guerrero, M. C. M. (1999). Inner speech as mental rehearsal: The case of advanced L2 learners. *Issues in Applied Linguistics*, 10, 27–55.
- de Guerrero, M. C. M. (2004). Early stages of L2 inner speech development: What verbal reports suggest. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 14, 90–112.
- Derrida, J. (1976). *Of grammatology* (1st American ed., N. Frye, Trans.). Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Deters, P. (in preparation). *Internationally educated teachers and professors in Ontario: Identity, agency and the acquisition of professional language and culture*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation in preparation, The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education of the University of Toronto, Ontario, Canada.
- Deters, P. (2006). *Internationally educated teachers and professors in Ontario: Identity, agency, and the acquisition of professional language and culture*. Unpublished data from Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada, Doctoral Fellowship Award #792—2005–2028.
- DiCamilla, F. J., & Antón, M. (2004). Private speech: A study of language for thought in the collaborative interaction of language learners. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 14, 36–69.
- Donato, R. (1994). Collective scaffolding in second language learning. In J. P. Lantolf & G. Appel (Eds.), *Vygotskian approaches to second language research* (pp. 33–56). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Donato, R. (2000). Sociocultural contributions to understanding the foreign and second language classroom. In J. Lantolf (Ed.), *Sociocultural theory and second language learning* (pp. 27–50). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Duff, P. (1995). An ethnography of communication in immersion classrooms in Hungary. *TESOL Quarterly*, 29, 505–538.
- Duff, P., & Uchida, Y. (1997). The negotiation of teachers' sociocultural identities and practices in post-secondary EFL classrooms. *TESOL Quarterly*, 31, 451–486.
- Duff, P., Wong, P., & Early, M. (2000). Learning language for work and life: The linguistic socialization of immigrant Canadians seeking careers in healthcare. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 57, 9–57.

- Dufva, H., & Alanen, R. (2005). Metalinguistic awareness in dialogue: Bakhtinian considerations. In J. K. Hall, G. Vitanova, & L. Marchenkova (Eds.), *Dialogue with Bakhtin on second and foreign language learning* (pp. 99–118). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Engeström, R. (1987). *Learning by expanding: An activity theoretical approach to developmental research*. Helsinki, Finland: Orienta-Konsultit.
- Firth, A., & Wagner, J. (1997). On discourse, communication, and (some) fundamental concepts in SLA research. *Modern Language Journal*, 81, 286–300.
- Foucault, M. (1978). *The history of sexuality* (1st American ed.). New York: Pantheon Books.
- Foucault, M. (1980). *Power/knowledge: Selected interviews and other writings, 1972–1977* (1st American ed.). New York: Pantheon Books.
- Galperin, P. I. (1969). Stages in the development of mental acts. In M. Cole & I. Maltzman (Eds.), *A handbook of contemporary Soviet psychology* (pp. 249–273). New York: Basic Books.
- Garrett, P. B., & Baquedano-Lopez, P. (2002). Language socialization: Reproduction and continuity, transformation and change. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 31, 339–361.
- Hall, J. K. (2002). *Teaching and researching language and culture*. London: Pearson Education.
- Hall, J. K., Vitanova, G., & Marchenkova, L. (Eds.). (2005). *Dialogue with Bakhtin on second and foreign language learning: New perspectives*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Haneda, M. (1997). Second language learning in a 'community of practice': A case study of adult Japanese learners. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 54, 11–27.
- Harklau, L. (1994). ESL versus mainstream classes: Contrasting L2 learning environments. *TESOL Quarterly*, 28, 241–272.
- Heath, S. B. (1983). *Ways with words: Language, life, and work in communities and classrooms*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Holland, D., Lachiotte, W., Jr., Skinner, D., & Cain, C. (1998). *Identity and agency in cultural worlds*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Iddings, A. C. D., Hought, J., & Devlin, R. (2005). Multimodal representations of self and meaning for second language learners in English-dominant classrooms. In J. K. Hall, G. Vitanova, & L. Marchenkova (Eds.), *Dialogue with Bakhtin on second and foreign language learning: New perspectives* (pp. 33–53). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Imai, Y. (2007). *The interdependency of emotions, language, and communication: A cross-case analysis of collaborative learning in a Japanese university EFL course*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education of the University of Toronto, Ontario, Canada.
- Kim, T.-Y. (2007). *Second language learning motivation from an activity theory perspective: Cases of Korean ESL students and immigrants in Toronto*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education of the University of Toronto, Ontario, Canada.
- Kinnear, P. (2006, September). *Re-linguaging experience: Linking theory and practice*. Paper presented at the British Applied Linguistics Association and Irish Applied Linguistics Association Joint International Conference, Cork, Ireland.
- Kramsch, C. (2000). Social discursive constructions of self in L2 learning. In J. P. Lantolf (Ed.), *Sociocultural theory and second language learning* (pp. 133–154). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kristeva, J. (1984). *Revolution in poetic language* (M. Waller, Trans.). New York: Columbia University Press.
- Kubota, R. (2001). Discursive construction of the images of U.S. classrooms. *TESOL Quarterly*, 35, 9–38.
- Lacan, J. (1977). *Écrits: A selection*. (A. Sheridan, Trans.). New York: Norton.
- Lapkin, S., Swain, M., & Knouzi, I. (in press). Postsecondary French as a second language students learn the grammatical concept of voice: Study design, materials development, and pilot data. In J. P. Lantolf & M. Poehner (Eds.) *Sociocultural theory and the teaching of second languages*. London: Equinox Press.
- Lam, W. S. E. (2004). Second language socialization in a bilingual chat room: Global and local considerations. *Language Learning and Technology*, 8, 44–65.
- Lantolf, J. P. (Ed.). (1994). Sociocultural theory and second language learning [Special issue]. *Modern Language Journal*, 78(4).
- Lantolf, J. P. (1996). SLA theory building: Letting all the flowers bloom! *Language Learning*, 46, 713–749.
- Lantolf, J. P. (2000). *Sociocultural theory and second language learning*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Lantolf, J. P., & Appel, G. (Eds.). (1994). *Vygotskian approaches to second language learning*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Lantolf, J. P., & Genung, P. (2003). 'I'd rather switch than fight.' An activity theoretic study of power, success, and failure in a foreign language classroom. In C. Kramsch (Ed.), *Language acquisition and language socialization* (pp. 175–196). London: Continuum.
- Lantolf, J. P., & Thorne, S. L. (2006). *Sociocultural theory and the genesis of second language development*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Lave, J. (1988). *Cognition in practice: Mind, mathematics, and culture in everyday life*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lee, J. (2006). *Talking to the self: A study of the private speech of adult bilinguals*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Wisconsin, Madison.
- Leki, I. (2001). "A narrow thinking system". Nonnative-English-speaking students in group projects

- across the curriculum. *TESOL Quarterly*, 35, 39–67.
- Leont'ev, A. N. (1978). *Activity, consciousness and personality*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Li, D. (2000). The pragmatics of making requests in the L2 workplace: A case study of language socialization. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 57, 58–87.
- Luria, A. R. (1982). *Language and cognition*. New York: Wiley.
- Marchenkova, L. (2005). Language, culture, and self: The Bakhtin–Vygotsky encounter. In J. K. Hall, G. Vitanova, & L. Marchenkova (Eds.), *Dialogue with Bakhtin on second and foreign language learning: New perspectives* (pp. 171–188). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Markee, N. (2004). Zones of interactional transition in ESL classes. *Modern Language Journal*, 88, 583–596.
- McCafferty, S. G. (1992). The use of private speech by adult second language learners: A cross-cultural study. *Modern Language Journal*, 76(2), 179–189.
- McCafferty, S. G. (1998). Nonverbal expression and L2 private speech. *Applied Linguistics*, 19, 73–96.
- McKay, S. L., & Wong, S.-L. C. (1996). Multiple discourses, multiple identities: Investment and agency in second-language learning among Chinese adolescent immigrant students. *Harvard Educational Review*, 66, 577–608.
- Miller, J. (2004). Identity and language use: The politics of speaking ESL in schools. In A. Pavlenko & A. Blackledge (Eds.), *Negotiation of identities in multilingual contexts* (pp. 290–315). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Moore, L. C. (1999). Language socialization research and French language education in Africa: A Cameroon case study. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 56, 329–350.
- Morgan, B. (1997). Identity and intonation: Linking dynamic processes in an ESL classroom. *TESOL Quarterly*, 31, 409–429.
- Morgan, B. (1998). *The ESL classroom: Teaching, critical practice, and community development*. Toronto, Canada: University of Toronto Press.
- Morita, N. (2004). Negotiating participation and identity in second language academic communities. *TESOL Quarterly*, 38, 573–603.
- Nassaji, H., & Swain, M. (2000). Vygotskian perspective on corrective feedback in L2: The effect of random versus negotiated help on the learning of English articles. *Language Awareness*, 9, 34–51.
- Norton, B. (2000). *Identity and language learning: Gender, ethnicity and educational change*. Harlow, UK: Longman.
- Norton, B. (2001). Non-participation, imagined communities and the language classroom. In M. P. Breen (Ed.), *Learner contributions to language learning: New directions in research* (pp. 159–171). Harlow, UK: Pearson Education.
- Norton Peirce, B. (1995). Social identity, investment, and language learning. *TESOL Quarterly*, 29, 9–31.
- Ochs, E. (1988). *Culture and language development: Language acquisition and language socialization in a Samoan village*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Ohta, A. S. (1994). Socializing the expression of affect: An overview of affective particle use in the Japanese as a foreign language classroom. *Issues in Applied Linguistics*, 5, 303–325.
- Ohta, A. S. (1999). Interactional routines and the socialization of interactional style in adult learners of Japanese. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 31, 1493–1512.
- Ohta, A. S. (2001). *Second language processes in the classroom: Learning Japanese*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Pavlenko, A. (2001). Bilingualism, gender, and ideology. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, 5, 117–151.
- Pavlenko, A., & Lantolf, J. P. (2000). Second language learning as participation and the (re)construction of selves. In J. Lantolf (Ed.), *Sociocultural theory and second language learning* (pp. 155–177). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Pennycook, A. (1998). *English and the discourses of colonialism*. London: Routledge.
- Pennycook, A. (2001). *Critical applied linguistics: A critical introduction*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Phillipson, R. (1992). *Linguistic imperialism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Poole, D. (1992). Language socialization in the second language classroom. *Language Learning*, 42, 593–616.
- Ratner, C. (1991). *Vygotsky's sociohistorical psychology and its contemporary applications*. New York: Plenum Press.
- Robbins, D. (2003). *Vygotsky's and A. A. Leontiev's semiotics and psycholinguistics*. Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers.
- Rogoff, B. (1990). *Apprenticeship in thinking: Cognitive development in social context*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Salaberry, M. R. (1996). A theoretical foundation for the development of pedagogical tasks in computer mediated communication. *CALICO Journal*, 14, 5–34.
- Saussure, F. de. (1974). *A course in general linguistics*. London: Fontana. (Original work published in 1916).
- Savignon, S. J., & Sysoyev, P. V. (2002). Sociocultural strategies for a dialogue of cultures. *Modern Language Journal*, 86, 508–524.
- Schecter, S. R., & Bayley, R. (1997). Language socialization practices and cultural identity: Case studies of Mexican-descent families in California and Texas. *TESOL Quarterly*, 31, 513–541.
- Schieffelin, B. B., & Ochs, E. (1986). *Language socialization across cultures*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

- Sfard, A. (1998). Two metaphors for learning and the dangers of choosing just one. *Educational Researcher*, 27, 4–13.
- Siegal, M. (1996). The role of learner subjectivity in second language sociolinguistic competency: Western women learning Japanese. *Applied Linguistics*, 17, 356–382.
- Steinman, L. (2005). Writing life 1 in language 2. *McGill Journal of Education*, 40, 65–79.
- Sullivan, P., & McCarthy, J. (2004). Toward a dialogical perspective on agency. *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour*, 42, 291–309.
- Swain, M. (2000). The output hypothesis and beyond: Mediating acquisition through collaborative dialogue. In J. P. Lantolf (Ed.), *Sociocultural theory and second language learning* (pp. 97–114). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Swain, M. (2006a). Language, agency and collaboration in advanced second language learning. In H. Byrnes, (Ed.), *Advanced language learning: The contribution of Halliday and Vygotsky* (pp. 95–108). London: Continuum.
- Swain, M. (2006b). *Sociocultural perspectives on the output hypothesis: Three contexts*. Unpublished data from Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada Grant #410–2004-2099.
- Swain, M. (2006c). Verbal protocols: What does it mean for research to use speaking as a data collection tool? In M. Chalhoub-Deville, C. A. Chapelle, & P. Duff (Eds.), *Inference and generalizability in applied linguistics: Multiple perspectives* (pp. 97–113). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Swain, M. (2007, April). Talking-it-through: Language as a source of learning. Plenary paper presented at the Social and Cognitive Aspects of Second Language Learning and Teaching Conference, University of Auckland, New Zealand.
- Swain, M., & Lapkin, S. (1998). Interaction and second language learning: Two adolescent French immersion students working together. *Modern Language Journal*, 82, 320–337.
- Swain, M., Lapkin, S., Knouzi, I., Suzuki, W., & Brooks, L. (2007, June). *Language: University students learn the concept of voice in French*. Paper presented at the Canadian Association of Applied Linguistics, University of Saskatchewan at Saskatoon.
- Tarone, E. (2000). Getting serious about language play: Language play, interlanguage variation and second language acquisition. In B. Swierzbins, F. Morris, M. E. Anderson, C. A. Klee, & E. Tarone (Eds.), *Social and cognitive factors in second language acquisition: Selected proceedings of the 1999 SLRF* (pp. 31–54). Somerville, MA: Cascadia Press.
- Thorne, S. L., & Lantolf, J. P. (2007). A linguistics of communicative activity. In S. Makoni & A. Pennycook (Eds.), *Disinventing and reconstituting languages* (pp. 170–195). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Tocalli-Beller, A., & Swain, M. (in press). Riddles and puns in the ESL classroom: Adults talk to learn. In A. Mackey (Ed.), *Conversational interaction in second language acquisition: Empirical studies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Toohey, K. (1996). Learning English as a second language in kindergarten: A community of practice perspective. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 52, 549–576.
- Toohey, K., Waterstone, B., & Julé-Lemke, A. (2000). Community of learners, carnival, and participation in a Punjabi Sikh classroom. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 56, 421–436.
- van Lier, L. (1994). Forks and hope: Pursuing understanding in different ways. *Applied Linguistics*, 15, 328–347.
- van Lier, L. (2000). From input to affordance: Social-interactive learning from an ecological perspective. In J. P. Lantolf (Ed.), *Sociocultural theory and second language learning* (pp. 245–259). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- van Lier, L. (2004). *The ecology and semiotics of language learning: A sociocultural perspective*. Boston: Kluwer Academic.
- Vitanova, G. (2002). *Gender and agency practices in the second language*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Cincinnati, Ohio.
- Vitanova, G. (2005). Authoring the self in a non-native language: A dialogic approach to agency and subjectivity. In J. K. Hall, G. Vitanova, & L. Marchenkova (Eds.), *Dialogue with Bakhtin on second and foreign language learning: New perspectives* (pp. 149–169). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1986). *Thought and language*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1987). Thinking and speech. In R. W. Reiber & A. S. Caron (Eds.), *The collected works of L. S. Vygotsky, Volume 1* (pp. 43–285). New York: Plenum.
- Watson, K. A. (1975). Transferable communicative routines: Strategies and group identity in two speech events. *Language and Society*, 4, 53–70.
- Watson-Gegeo, K. A. (2004). Mind, language, and epistemology: Toward a language socialization paradigm for SLA. *Modern Language Journal*, 88, 31–350.
- Weedon, C. (1997). *Feminist practice and poststructuralist theory* (2nd ed.). Cambridge, MA: Blackwell Publishers.
- Wells, C. G. (1999). *Dialogic inquiry: Towards a sociocultural practice and theory of education*. Cambridge/New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Wenger, E. (1998). *Communities of practice: Learning, meaning, and identity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wertsch, J. V. (1991). *Voices of the mind: A sociocultural approach to mediated action*. London: Harvester Wheatsheaf.
- Wertsch, J. V. (1998). *Mind as action*. New York: Oxford University Press.

- Willett, J. (1995). Becoming first graders in an L2: An ethnographic study of L2 socialization. *TESOL Quarterly*, 29, 473–503.
- Wilson, B. G., & Myers, K. M. (2000). Situated cognition in theoretical and practical context. In D. Jonassen & S. Land (Eds.), *Theoretical foundations of learning environments* (pp. 57–88). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Worth, R. (2006). *Learner resistance in the university foreign language classroom*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Wisconsin, Madison.
- Yi, J., & Kellog, D. (2006). Beneath higher ground: Vygotsky, Volosinov, and an archeology of reported speech in primary EFL writing. *Language Awareness*, 15, 38–52.