

*Also by Mastin Prinsloo*

LITERACIES, GLOBAL AND LOCAL (*co-edited*)

LITERACY STUDIES (*co-edited, 5 vols*)

THE FUTURE OF LITERACY STUDIES (*co-edited*)

THE SOCIAL USES OF LITERACY

Theory and Practice in Contemporary South Africa (*co-edited*)

*Also by Christopher Stroud*

STYLE, IDENTITY AND LITERACY

English in Singapore (*co-authored*)

# Educating for Language and Literacy Diversity

Mobile Selves

Edited by

Mastin Prinsloo

*University of Cape Town, South Africa*

and

Christopher Stroud

*University of Western Cape, South Africa*

Palgrave  
Macmillan



Selection, introduction and editorial matter © Mastin Prinsloo and Christopher Stroud 2014  
Individual chapters © Respective authors 2014

All rights reserved. No reproduction, copy or transmission of this publication may be made without written permission.

No portion of this publication may be reproduced, copied or transmitted save with written permission or in accordance with the provisions of the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988, or under the terms of any licence permitting limited copying issued by the Copyright Licensing Agency, Saifron House, 6–10 Kirby Street, London EC1N 8TS.

Any person who does any unauthorized act in relation to this publication may be liable to criminal prosecution and civil claims for damages.

The authors have asserted their rights to be identified as the authors of this work in accordance with the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988.

First published 2014 by  
PALGRAVE MACMILLAN

Palgrave Macmillan in the UK is an imprint of Macmillan Publishers Limited, registered in England, company number 785998, of Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire RG21 6XS.

Palgrave Macmillan in the US is a division of St Martin's Press LLC, 175 Fifth Avenue, New York, NY 10010.

Palgrave Macmillan is the global academic imprint of the above companies and has companies and representatives throughout the world.

Palgrave® and Macmillan® are registered trademarks in the United States, the United Kingdom, Europe and other countries.

ISBN 978-1-137-30983-9 hardback

ISBN 978-1-137-30984-6 paperback

This book is printed on paper suitable for recycling and made from fully managed and sustained forest sources. Logging, pulping and manufacturing processes are expected to conform to the environmental regulations of the country of origin.

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library.

A catalog record for this book is available from the Library of Congress.

Typeset by MPS Limited, Chennai, India.

# Contents

<i>List of Figures</i>	vii
<i>List of Tables</i>	viii
<i>Acknowledgements</i>	ix
<i>Notes on the Contributors</i>	x
Introduction	1
<i>Mastin Prinsloo and Christopher Stroud</i>	
<b>Part I Studying Diversity in Education Settings</b>	
1 Classroom Constructions of Language and Literacy Activity <i>Constant Leung and Brian Street</i>	23
2 What is Quechua Literacy for? Ideological Dilemmas in Intercultural Bilingual Education in the Peruvian Andes <i>Virginia Zavala</i>	45
3 Growth of Communicative Competence in a Dynamic African Context: Challenges for Developmental Assessment <i>Robert Serpell</i>	73
4 Moving between Ekasi and the Suburbs: the Mobility of Linguistic Resources in a South African De(re)segregated School <i>Carolyn McKinney</i>	97
5 Shades, Voice and Mobility: Remote Communities Resist and Reclaim Linguistic and Educational Practices in Ethiopia <i>Kathleen Heugh</i>	116
<b>Part II Teaching and Research with Diverse Students</b>	
6 Marginalised Knowledges and Marginalised Languages for Epistemic Access to Plaget and Vygotsky's Theories <i>Michael Joseph and Esther Ramani</i>	137
7 Reassembling the Literacy Event In Shirley Brice Heath's <i>Ways with Words</i> <i>Kimberly Lenters</i>	153
8 Recontextualising Research, Globalising Practice <i>Elsa Auerbach</i>	173

# Introduction

*Martin Prinsloo and Christopher Stroud*

Attention to language and literacy diversity in education is both timely and challenging. Our focus in this introductory chapter is on what to make of this diversity and its impact on education systems and practices. We conclude by introducing the chapters in this volume, pointing out the particular contributions they make to this collection.

We start from the common observation that educators and researchers in very many different locations around the world (though not everywhere) increasingly encounter linguistically and socioculturally diverse groups of students in their classrooms and lecture halls (Gardner and Martin-Jones, 2012; Creese and Blackledge, 2010). Fundamentally, this is due to the changes in recent years in the core dynamics of social, cultural and economic life, one indication of which is the changing language dynamics in particular settings, another the rise in translocal and transnational communication that takes place through electronic media. These dynamics raise concerns of a specifically linguistic and sociolinguistic kind: for example, what happens when people with diverging language histories share the same social or educational space, when their communication involves 'crossing', mixing or 'meshing' of language resources, or where they use 'colloquial' or local versions of standard languages? How do we understand everyday talk and writing in relation to schooling expectations under conditions of heightened linguistic and sociocultural diversity? Not surprisingly, such developments pose a range of social, cultural and material challenges to educational systems, where growing sociocultural and linguistic student diversity is accompanied by intensifying standardisation of assessment practices and often by institutional insistence on monolingual instruction through the medium of a standard national or international language. On the other hand, educational institutions also comprise

vibrant sites of innovation and breakthrough that attempt to address the concerns of this diverse population – a healthy counterpoint to systems that all too easily tend towards resisting change.

Evidence of such diversity would seem to require more dynamic and mobile concepts around language and literacy than is often the case in educational discourse (Makoni and Pennycook, 2007; Blommaert, 2010; Blommaert and Rampton, 2011). It is also a question of interest and concern as to whether trends towards an increasing sociolinguistic diversity are happening uniformly across diverse settings across the world or themselves are subject to diverse manifestations: are there important differences between, for example, the nature of the diversities in neighbourhoods and schools in, say, West or East European or North American cities, on the one hand, and African, South American or other cities in the 'South', on the other. And what are the conceptual resources that best help us to make sense of these differences?

In what follows, we review key arguments on globalisation, language and literacy that serve to contextualise the contributions in the present volume. We discuss ideas, first, about sociolinguistic scales, hierarchy, social complexity and systemic views of the global. Then we examine competing models of complexity and scale, and develop a view on how global resources of language and literacy are distributed, assembled and adapted in distinctive ways in particular contexts; how they are 'placed' or territorialised in assemblages that combine mobile and widely circulating forms and resources with locally developed categories and practices, in shifting and often unpredictable combinations.

### **Globalisation at large**

It has become commonplace in recent times to situate research on language, literacy and diversity in educational and wider social contexts by way of references to globalisation as the source of the flows of migrants into local communities, and across nations and regions of the world. These dynamics present 'quotidian and formal public challenges to inherited Western assumptions about linguistic uniformity, cultural homogeneity, and national membership' (Blommaert et al., 2005: 201). However, while globalisation is widely seen as the source of increased cultural contact and linguistic diversity, it is also, in an apparent paradox, the source of centripetal processes of centralisation and homogenisation (Lo Bianco, 2010). In educational contexts, this takes the form of intensifying high-stakes testing of standardised language

and knowledge forms in education institutions. Such testing, a spin-off of the quality assurance resources and processes that were developed for the reorganisation of work in multinational companies around the world, reminds us that globalisation, however we understand it, is more than simply about increasing diversity but also about changing forms of regulation and attempts at regulation, in schools and in social life.

Seen as a multifaceted agent which causes economic, political, cultural and environmental changes in the world, globalisation is primarily and commonly theorised as the global spread of socio-economic processes that Western capitalism has triggered. Globalisation is said to have gathered pace in the late 1980s with the deregulation of markets (Castells, 1996; Collier, 2006; Featherstone, 2006), where marketisation, or the rise of neo-liberalism as 'a logic of governing' (Ong, 2007: 3) becomes the defining characteristic of reorganised social life on a world scale, evident in the ease with which capital investments flow around the world in a supranational world economy. Although these dynamics are in many respects similar to earlier versions of world trade, developments in telecommunications infrastructure and transportation of goods and people (Castells, 1996; Jacquemet, 2005) have made possible a greater level of market coordination than previously. This has allowed an extensive interconnectedness of trade, investment and particularly finance. Sophisticated technologies for rapid human mobility and global communication are also transforming the communicative environment of the globalised social world, allowing the economy to operate as a unit with 'real-time' transactions happening at a global level.

But while the world economy may be global in the production and distribution of goods and services, only a very small fraction of work is skilled work in the multinational companies that account for close to half of the gross world product and two-thirds of international trade (Castells, 2009). Labour, therefore, has not been globalised and many regions, or places within those regions, are outside of the new economic order. This imbalance leads to movements of people, in particular, from parts of the world that are left out of the global network to those areas that are part of it, as well as movements of people across world centres and to different parts of the global periphery. Thus, this broad socio-economic model of globalisation provides an entry point into understanding phenomena such as increasing skilled and unskilled migration and the resulting linguistic diversity in many places as well as the dominance, for example, of particular language resources in others.

### Scales theory, superdiversity and language-in-education

Now a ubiquitous term, globalisation is also a central theme of contemporary social theory, but questions remain as to how 'global' and 'local' relate to one another with what kinds of results for language and literacy in education. One influential and productive approach in sociolinguistics for understanding linguistic diversity in relation to globalisation is by way of scales theory (Blommaert, 2007, 2010; Collins et al., 2009) which provides a set of conceptual resources for understanding the way power relations on a global scale shape the uptake of language resources in specific local contexts. This approach pursues the difficult task of integrating sociolinguistics, discourse analysis and social theory to address questions of power, social inequalities, language diversity and social interactions in their situated occurrence while taking account of the interconnectedness of social life across spaces and regions. This work offers a language, a framework and a set of constructs to talk about the remarkable movements of people, language and texts in recent times. The scales model suggests that each context (local, regional, national, global) has its own 'orders of indexicality' which assign meanings, values and statuses to diverse codes. Blommaert and Rampton (2011: 7) explain the concept of indexicality as follows:

the denotational and propositional meanings of words and sentences lose their preeminence in linguistic study, and attention turns to *indexicality*, the connotational significance of signs. So for example, when someone switches in speaking and/or writing into a different style or register, it is essential to consider more than the literal meaning of what they are saying. The style, register or code they have moved into is itself likely to carry associations that are somehow relevant to the specific activities and social relations in play.

These values or indexicalities are organised hierarchically at a global level in a world that is systematically organised in terms of scales from top to bottom. While local scales are momentary, situated and restricted, the codes and literacies of dominant groupings are valued at a translocal level because they are resilient, highly mobile and they can 'jump scales' (Blommaert, 2010: 36).

World systems analysis or WSA (Wallerstein, 1974, 1991), which this model draws on for a model of the global, argues that a world system and not nation states is the defining feature of contemporary social life and should be the primary focus of social analysis. In this model, the

modern world system, essentially capitalist in nature, emerges out of European capitalism and operates as a social unit that consists of, primarily, core and peripheral regions, as well as semi-peripheral regions which act as a periphery to the core and a core to the periphery. Core countries, or sites within countries, focus on high-skill, capital-intensive production and peripheral sites and regions focus on low-skill production and resource exports to the core. A key point in WSA is that events and processes move and develop on a continuum of layered scales, with the strictly local (micro) and the global (macro) as extremes, and with several intermediary scales (for example the level of the state) in between, with varying degrees of impact and status (Blommaert, 2007). A sociolinguistics of globalisation (Blommaert, 2010) working with this model of the social as systemic pays attention to language hierarchy and processes that are seen as holding across situations and transcending localities. Scales theory thus provides a productive metaphor to analyse the way language resources retain or lose social value depending on where they are placed along spatio-temporal lines within social contexts, where power relations shape the uptake of language resources. Interaction between different scales is a crucial feature for understanding the sociolinguistic dimensions of such events and processes, because language and literacy practices are subject to social processes of hierarchical ordering. This analysis aims to account for large-scale features of language and literacy in particular, for example on institutional, national and transnational levels, as well as their impact on the dynamics of face-to-face interaction (Blommaert, 2007, 2010).

Blommaert (2007: 2) suggests that scales theory helps us to understand how children and adults can become inarticulate and deficient when they move from a space in which their linguistic resources are valued and recognised to a classroom or workplace closer to the economic and political centre, because these processes happen in a way that is shaped by the world system at a global scale. He cites the case of migrant children who possess complex and developed language and literacy skills but who nevertheless are declared illiterate in Belgian immersion classes, where Dutch language and literacy are the only recognised linguistic capital. Such processes of ordering are seen as happening not only at an interregional or cross-state level but also at a national and local level. Societies with pronounced levels of social inequality correspondingly devalue the diverse language and literacy resources of their citizens the further they are from national and local centres of power and authority. In this approach sociolinguistic and discursive phenomena are 'essentially *layered*', even if they appear to be

one-time, purely synchronic and unique events' (Blommaert, 2007: 3), and social settings are seen as polycentric and stratified, with a multitude of centres of authority, local as well as translocal, cohering within a layered and hierarchical systemic global order. Thus, in this model social and linguistic 'norms' are the outcomes of local centres of authority which are 'stratified complexes' that are hierarchically located. Sociolinguistic scales are often both 'nested' within and overlapping with another, reflecting the criss-crossing complexities that constitute social and human organisation, with different linguistic values attaching to different languages in different scales of consideration. From this perspective, scales provide a tool with which to understand the way power relations shape the uptake of language resources.

### Competing models of sociolinguistic and socio-material complexity

There is a question to be asked, however, about the appropriateness of the fit between WSA, on one hand, and social and linguistic complexity on the other. One starting point amongst alternative views to WSA is that social life has become too complex and diverse for analysis that employs overarching narratives, such as the concept of a world system. Whatever globalisation is in contemporary times, it might be said to have unfolded in different ways, with a non-linearity about contemporary processes of global integration at least partly because of the ways people intercede in ways that disrupt systemic dynamics. If globalisation does have systemic features, it is not a closed system and, as a system 'open to the environment' it is *not* 'its own sweet beast' (Law, 2003: 13). In this criticism, Wallerstein also overstates the centrality of European capitalism in the new global economic order. His is a diffusionist model in which the significant changes were produced in one place, at the expense of other kinds of influences from elsewhere in the world (Featherstone, 2006).

Indeed, one of the troubling problems about conceiving of globalisation as systemic and hierarchical is the assumption that complexity is synchronous and scaled, that higher scales are more complex and that lower scales and peripheries are simpler forms of social organisation, with developments at the 'top' or the core of the world system having effects at the 'bottom', for example, observations that developments in the field of sophisticated, multimedial and multimodal Internet communication have effects on other, 'less sophisticated' forms of literacy in the periphery. The problem with such observations is that they do

not take account of how these socially constructed resources are 'taken hold of' or refigured as 'placed resources' and as 'global assemblages' in 'peripheral' contexts and within particular networks of association. The suggestion that sophistication is a characteristic of one site and not the other would appear to be a judgement made from 'the centre', based on the assumption that sophistication (which we might read here as a synonym for complexity) is intrinsically an upper-scale phenomenon.

A case in point is the notion of 'grass-roots literacy' (Blommaert, 2008, 2010), a scaled view of writing across low socio-economic sites in Africa. Blommaert describes grass-roots literacy as a 'genre', a characteristic form of writing across poor communities in Africa, describing it as a non-elite form characterised by what he calls 'heterography' – the deployment of graphic symbols in ways that defy orthographic norms: words spelled in different ways, often reflecting the way they are pronounced in spoken vernacular varieties rather than following conventional orthographic norms or prestige language forms. Such texts, he says, will have local value but examined from beyond the local, they appear as inferior examples of writing, pointing to the low status of these persons on a larger stage. This analysis, accurate as it might seem from one perspective, deflects our attention from how these texts might well have a complexity in their uses and meanings which is not apparent from a distance or from a perspective which is not attentive to the complex networks of practice that shape these textual practices in specific ways. Attention to some familiar text features by the researcher such as orthography/heterography does not provide a sufficient account of these texts as literacy practices. To label such practices as forms of 'peripheral normativity' (Blommaert et al., 2005) might deflect our attention from the particularities and complexities at that site, and within those socio-material networks.

Canagarajah (in press), in contrast, argues that while particular communities might display characteristic writing forms, they might not necessarily be 'stuck' at 'one scale-level' or 'locked' into peripheral modernity. Canagarajah's study in a Cape Town school setting, in contrast with Blommaert et al.'s (2005) study in a similar setting, finds in the texts of the students a *recognition* of different norms from outside the local. In their writings on a school Facebook site students' heterography is evident in their mixing of English and isiXhosa, abbreviations and icons. Canagarajah identifies their writing here as a hybrid form of literacy activity, combining spoken, literate and visual resources and diverse languages. In their classroom written work, however, students do not mix codes in the same way and Canagarajah suggests they have

shifted to a translocal norm, approximating to Standard Written English and with an emerging sense of the genre requirements of school essay writing. While student writing displays the types of grammatical problems that Blommaert identified, Canagarajah sees teachers as striving to correct these as they work to help students to develop their translocal English-language writing resources, albeit from a strongly constrained starting point. The scaled and hierarchical view of teachers' and students' struggles emphasises the structural constraints that situate them in a regime of norms and standards that is pre-given as a function of the assumed nature of social complexity. Canagarajah, on the other hand, presents an approach where the emphasis is more on the agentic dynamics that characterise the 'contact zones' between the language and literacy resources that students bring to school and the resources, discourses and practices of schooling in that context.

The view that complexity is produced systemically, that sophistication happens at higher-scale levels and that persons on the periphery are somehow 'stuck' with restricted language and writing resources because of their fixed place in the periphery of the world system offers a view that has been identified as 'romantic complexity' by Law (2003) and Kwa (2002). The researcher or theorist 'looks up' here to make sense of what is observed by examining its place in the larger complex system. Law offers an alternative view, closer perhaps to the ethnographic intentions of Blommaert and colleagues. Drawing on work on a material semiotics (Law, 2009) that treats everything in the social and natural worlds as a continuously generated effect of the webs of relations within which they are located (see e.g. Callon and Latour, 1981; Latour, 1990), Law finds complexity by 'looking down', at specificity and detail in the concrete and the specific. Our predominant understandings of complexity, he suggests, including the size or scale assumptions that we make, assume that the whole emerges as a result of the interconnectedness of its component parts. One of the outcomes of this sense-making strategy is that located complexity is passed over because, for the researcher who is looking up, the system may be of more interest than the components. Where the romantic intuition is that the global is necessarily large, with the local inserted somewhere down the hierarchy of emergence, Law prefers a view of the global as situated, specific and constructed in the practices included in each specificity. 'There is no system, global order or network', he suggests, 'these are, at best, partially enacted romantic aspirations' (Law, 2003: 9). The distinction between big and small is a relational effect, he insists, where scale is tenuous and precarious. Heterogeneous elements need to play their part moment by moment

or it all comes unstuck. This is a view of the global as something that is poorly formed and elusive, that changes size and shape and only travels uncertainly. It is also close to the view that Street (2004) offered in his discussion of literacy practices and whether they are globally shaped or locally produced. Street's point was that the global only exists as substantiated in the local.

Collier's (2006) and Collier and Ong's (2005) discussion of 'global assemblages' is relevant here: seeking an alternative to the categories of global and local, they develop the notions of global forms and global assemblages. They see the idea of global assemblage as 'an alternative to the categories of local and global, which serve to cast the global as abstraction, and the local in terms of specificity' (Collier, 2006: 380). Global forms are seen as widely distributed conceptual and organisational resources that are assembled and adapted in distinctive ways at local and regional levels so as to work in those contexts, articulated in specific situations – or territorialised in *assemblages*. These assemblages define new material, collective and discursive relationships. Collier and Ong (2005) restrict this term to material technology and specialised social expertise, such as ISO standards in the workplace (international standardised quality-assessment criteria) as they are applied in particular locations), but we can certainly think of schooling assessment practices and high-stakes testing as constituting this kind of assemblage, and we can also think of language resources in this way when they become articulated and networked in particular settings – for example, English or Englishes when thought of as a world language or an 'English language complex' (Mesthrie and Bhatt, 2008) where particular mobile resources become 'placed'. These global forms interact with other resources and elements in particular contexts, in contingent, uneasy, unstable interrelationships. In the space of assemblage, a global form is simply one among a range of elements. An assemblage is the product of multiple determinations that are not predictable by a single logic. These interactions might be called the *actual* global, or the global in the space of assemblage. The assemblage is not a 'locality' to which broader forces from the global are counterposed. Nor is it the structural effect of such forces (Collier, 2006: 380). The term 'global assemblage' suggests inherent tensions, forms that are shifting, in formation, or at stake, heterogeneous, contingent, unstable, partial and situated (Collier and Ong, 2005). In this light, as an illustrative example here, Ong (2007: 3) conceptualises neo-liberalism 'not as a fixed set of attributes with pre-determined outcomes, but as a logic of governing that migrates and is selectively taken up in diverse political contexts', including South

American and African contexts. The product of these interactions might be called the *actual* global, or the global in the space of assemblage. The point is that in the space of the 'global', heterogeneous things combine in ways that are hard to pin down with diagnostic resources which stress a global logic. Similarly, Featherstone (2006: 370), drawing on the arguments of Knorr Cetina, refers to such phenomena as major imbalances between cause and effect, unpredictable outcomes, and self-organising, emergent structures as features of globalisation. He suggests that 'the management of uncertainty, task predictability and orderly performances were much easier to facilitate in the "relatively complex" organizations of modern industrial societies'. A global society, on the other hand, he writes, 'entails a different form of complexity: one emanating more from microstructural arrangements that institute self-organizing principles and patterns'. In conclusion, perhaps such a concept of 'the global' is a productive way to think of language, literacy and diversity rather than via a scaled, systemic view of the social as comprising macro and micro dimensions and, indeed, closer to the ethnographic orientations of those scholars who have been using scale as a metaphor for understanding social complexity. Wortham (2012) similarly argues against the macro/micro conceptual frame that is familiar in the sociolinguistic field and suggests that researchers attend to multiple scales with no single scale treated as foundational or determinant. Wortham (2006) studied how students and teachers socially positioned each other in a single classroom over an academic year by drawing upon widely circulating sociohistorical models as well as locally developed categories of identity (such as 'loud black girls', 'disruptive students'), and the curriculum itself. What such an orientation leads to is a concern less with grand theorising but with small and focused research into the *actual* global in particular settings, as presented in the range of studies in this collection.

### Concepts of mobility, language and literacy

The chapters gathered in this collection offer a series of case studies or vignettes of the *actual* global in a diverse range of settings and they address a varied but complementary set of topics, from studies of the challenges presented to education by societal multilingualism and social inequalities in Zambia, South Africa, Ethiopia, London, Peru, the USA and Mexico. They examine questions of migration, transnationalism and the relationships between minority and dominant linguistic resources in particular contexts. They draw on and elaborate on recent

work in interactional sociolinguistics and literacy studies that has questioned prevailing views from recent decades on language, literacy and bilingualism. This work has sought to develop alternative concepts for conditions of linguistic diversity (e.g. Makoni and Pennycook, 2007; Heller, 2007; Blommaert, 2010). We provide a short introduction to some of these debates here, before introducing the individual studies.

Widdowson (2010: 10) makes the point that linguists make statements and claims about language in general or languages in particular but 'these statements are necessarily abstractions from the actuality of language as experienced by its users'. Assumptions around the connectedness of language and ethnicity (Errington, 2008: 9) have encouraged linguists to look past the variability and complexity of the language resources they observed to name languages that identified groups of people and helped to construct or legitimate linguistic hegemony around the notion of national or ethnic languages. In doing so, they drew on highly naturalised and questionable assumptions about language-race-nation unity.

In contemporary contexts of language diversity these approaches to languages as bounded constructs that are closely identified with situated, homogeneous speech communities are seen to be increasingly problematic in contexts of increasing diversity and multilingualism, and with regard to studies of bilingualism in social and educational contexts. Heller (2007: 1) described prevalent views on bilingualism as offering 'a "common-sense" but in fact highly ideologised view of bilingualism as the coexistence of two linguistic systems'. She argued against the notion that languages are objectively speaking whole, bounded systems and for the notion that speakers draw on linguistic resources which are organised in ways that make sense under specific social conditions. She supported a focus on language as a resource and languages as practices which are socially and politically embedded. We might say, with reference to the preceding discussion on global assemblages that, in this view, while they have been thought of before as forms which are autonomous, languages, in this view, are always assembled in actual contexts, where they receive shape and purpose.

A view of language as practised offers a perspective on language practices as socially embedded, of speakers as social actors and of boundaries between particular resources as products of social action. Indeed, literacy has been studied from this perspective for some time since the shaping work in literacy studies of Street (1984), Heath (1983), Scribner and Cole (1981) and Barton and Hamilton (1998). In this tradition, literacy is studied not as a single entity but as a complex of communicative



practices and historically influenced attitudes to these practices (see also Prinsloo and Baynham, 2013; Baynham and Prinsloo, 2009). From this literacy studies perspective, literacy in school is produced by the practices of the classroom, providing not just technical skills but also a set of prescriptions about what knowledge is and how to display its use. These classroom practices include particular kinds of interaction amongst teacher and students, and literacy is produced through group activity, informally communicated judgements, as well as standardised tests and all the other evaluative apparatus of schooling (Cook-Gumperz, 2006). Such an approach to language and literacy as situated practices is better able to account for the varied ways that speakers draw on their resources when social or linguistic boundaries are no longer essentialised and are crossable. From an ideological perspective, however, we can recognise that language and literacy are resources and practice both in the fluid sense intended by Heller and Blommaert above, but also in more reified or institutionalised forms, as statements and understandings about the value or necessity of some rather than other of these available resources. Thus, for example, Lin (1997) pointed to both the grave educational consequences following from English language dominance in Hong Kong schools but also the urgent need to pay attention to the right of access to English by children of disadvantaged groups (for example, children whose parents speak little English and who live in communities where there is little access to English). She argued that curricular reforms are needed to help these disadvantaged children to acquire the dominant English capital while also affirming and building on their indigenous linguistic and sociocultural identities and resources. How such contradictory objectives are to be achieved, though, is not clear. In this light, Stroud and Wee (2012) present a nuanced view of youths in Singapore struggling with the effects of the dominance of standard English and Mandarin Chinese along with government's somewhat hollow insistence that 'heritage languages' should be maintained at home. Zavala (this volume) shows similar tensions between literacy classes in one site in Peru that associate Quechua literacy with an 'essential' Quechua culture and classes in another site where Spanish language and literacy resources are produced and shaped by teachers and students as skills for standardised testing within the schooling system.

### **Bilingualism, education and heteroglossia**

Critical interpretive sociolinguistics makes the case for research into the interactional and textual fine grain of everyday life in educational

settings with attention to specific institutional regimes, including wider processes of political economy and change in contemporary society (Martin-Jones, 2007; Heller, 2007; Creese and Blackledge, 2010). Martin-Jones (2007) calls for attention to the everyday communicative practices of teachers and learners in schools as well to the wider policy discourses as they are articulated in policy documents, and this is indeed what Leung and Street (this volume) and Serpell (this volume) undertake. A starting point in this research is a recognition of the potential fluidity of language resources and attention to their often more rigid construction in educational policy and practice. As Creese and Blackledge (2010) put it,

Schools operate as institutions (linked to the state) where specific languages (national official languages) and specific linguistic practices (ways of speaking, reading and writing) come to be inculcated with legitimacy and authority.

They draw our attention to the ways in which schools function as spaces to select and categorise students, for assessing performance (including linguistic performance) and providing credentials tied to positioning in the world of work. Bailey (2007) suggests that 'processual and socially infused constructs such as heteroglossia and indexicality' are useful for directing attention to the historical and ideological dimensions of language meanings and identity construction. We can then study the ways in which educational policies and classroom practices contribute to the reproduction of asymmetries of power between groups with different social and linguistic resources in specific places. Heller (1999) coined the term *parallel monolingualism*, to describe 'bilingual' language teaching strategies in schools where two or more standard languages are taught as if in separate silos, and Martin-Jones (2007: 167) pointed to a 'container metaphor of competence' in prevailing discourses around 'mother tongue' education and bilingual education, with a common preference for the construction of parallel monolingual spaces for learning, including strict monitoring of those spaces for their monolingualism. Such approaches manifest in terms like 'balanced bilingualism', 'additive bilingualism' and 'subtractive bilingualism', in effect all conceiving of languages and linguistic competencies as separate containers, side by side, that are more or less full or empty. Creese and Blackledge (2010) question understandings of bilingual pedagogy which keep languages rigidly separate in what they call a 'two solitudes' approach and describe instead a flexible bilingual approach to language teaching and learning in which two or more languages are used alongside each other, in an

approach they call *translanguaging*. Canagarajah (2006: 58) advocates a similar strategy of 'code-meshing' where 'students bring in their preferred varieties' of a language into a conventional text in 'rhetorically strategic ways resulting in a hybrid text'.

In the light of the earlier discussion presented here, we might consider such concepts as translanguaging, code-meshing and heteroglossia as global forms for developing studies and instructional approaches to language and literacy in education under conditions of diversity or 'superdiversity' (Vertovec, 2007; Blommaert and Rampton, 2011). The next stage would be to study them as assemblages, as they are taken up in distinct and less or more coherent ways by researchers at particular sites. We see this work happening in a variety of ways in the chapters that follow, which we now introduce briefly. The book is divided into two parts: the first focuses on studies of diversity in educational settings, the second on methodologies and resources for pedagogy and research in contexts of language and literacy diversity.

### Part I: Studying diversity in education settings

1. Leung and Street's school-based study takes place in the context of 'high and rising levels of ethnic, linguistic and social diversity in British schools'. Their study of classroom work shows how everyday diversity and heterogeneity in particular contexts are at odds with the understandings and intentions embodied in central policies and also with teaching practices. Calls to 'improve achievement in literacy' in schools are reflected in 'return to basics' approaches, emphasising phonics teaching within a monolingual English perspective. They focus on how literacy is constructed and enacted in the classroom, against policy prescriptions and intentions. While the curriculum emphasises content, and referential uses of language, Leung and Street's observation of interaction, social relations, texts and practices shows that much more is going on, and they consider these classroom performances with regard to questions of social inequality, pedagogy and multilingualism. In seeing literacy, language and other modalities as sociocultural phenomena or as social practices, they see them as particular resources produced within the communicative framework of schooling.

2. Virginia Zavala's chapter focuses on 'intercultural' bilingual education and she examines two schools in Peru which are considered to be successful, but which present contrasting ways of reading in Quechua and reading in Spanish. Her study of this variability in what counts as reading draws on resources for the study of literacy as a social practice

and her attention is again on the performance of diverse types of actions which produce these differences. She identifies an ideological dilemma in Peruvian education where different interpretive repertoires about literacy education produce strategies that differently promote homogeneity and diversification. On one hand neo-liberalism as a 'strategy of governing' is taken up in schooling to promote an approach to education as technical and socially neutral, with results shown through standardised test scores. One critical result of this approach is a shared emphasis on testing on the part of students. While the orientation in school policy is towards the production of competitive, flexible and functional graduates, a gap is produced where there is a demand for education that produces critical, ethical and political citizens. Alternative indigenous movements and non-government organisations orient towards ideas on postcoloniality and interculturality as well as recovery of local cultural practices. However, some of these strategies index Quechua culture and language as ancestral cultural practices and promote a type of ethnic separatism as political action. In this way Quechua becomes identified as signalling a static site that is resistant to change and mobility. Zavala suggests that Quechua literacy remains a field of struggle where dominant interpretative repertoires construct it as an invisible language or as an ancestral language anchored in the rural world.

3. Robert Serpell's chapter examines research that assesses children's communicative competence in Zambia and questions the bias towards standard languages. He questions the colonial era survey of tribes and language that identified 73 languages and ethnicities indigenous to Zambia. Colonial linguists ignored the great deal of commonality in the language resources that they counted, Serpell suggests. He identifies a monolingual bias in Zambian education, in a setting where children grow up with adults who are competent in three or more language varieties, where the varieties have a strong core of grammatical and lexical commonalities and where the borders between varieties are porous. This diversity produces problems for tests of children's cognitive abilities, when children do not always easily switch from a vernacular language to the official local Zambian language that is used for instruction. It remains unclear how the boundaries should be drawn between 'cognate languages', here as elsewhere in Southern Africa. Along with these complexities, there are problems around superficial categorisation along the lines that this child is a speaker of that language. In fact, children growing up in multilingual African contexts are likely to encounter multiple strands of language before entering school that are seldom

explicitly labelled as an utterance in a particular language or dialect before schooling, and children's repertoires in designated languages seldom match the officially expected repertoire. He concludes that, if initial literacy is to be taught effectively to children enrolled in multilingual multilingual classrooms, it seems essential to respect their prevailing patterns of communication.

4. Carolyn McKinney's chapter similarly draws on a school-based study to examine the complexities of social mobility and schooling with regard to linguistic resources. Her study of a desegregated suburban school shows the complexity of emerging and solidifying language practices around the production of an 'expanding "black" middle class'. Her study shows how close study of complex everyday language practices can offer us insights into changing sociocultural practices.

5. Kathleen Heugh's chapter shows Afar pastoralists resisting Amharic, the 'working regional language' of the Ethiopian federal centre, in their schools because of its historical associations for them with both Coptic Christianity and oppressive administrative regimes, but they embrace English-language instruction because of the perceived wider connectivity which English affords. From the perspective of the Ethiopian centre they are regarded as 'anti-school' but close up a different, more complex picture emerges.

## Part II: Teaching and research with diverse students

6. Michael Joseph and Esther Ramani's chapter focuses on a methodology to teach university students in the north of South Africa through the medium of Sesotho sa Leboa, a dominant language of the Limpopo province in the northernmost region of South Africa but not used officially to date as a medium of instruction beyond the early years of schooling. Learners are encouraged to draw on local knowledges in narratives that provide the grounds for further learning of an academic kind. The engagement with local as well as dominant language resources contributes to an in-depth understanding of the relation between language and thought in this setting.

7. Kimberley Lenters' chapter offers a close engagement with Shirley Heath's well-known accounting of the literate practices of three culturally diverse groups living in close proximity to one another in *Ways with Words* which was ground-breaking in its redefinition of the study of literacy. Lenters is concerned to update the methods Heath used to make them relevant for contemporary times and she shows how a greater sense of how the 'local' is a historically and politically networked site

is needed to complement the depth of Heath's engagements with local sociolinguistic and cultural specificities.

8. Elsa Auerbach's chapter offers an orientation towards a pedagogy of 'glocalization' that is aimed at benefiting the migrants who are the subjects of research on mobility. What does research about global, transnational and translocal processes mean for students and teachers as they work with each other inside and outside the classroom, she asks. She goes on to suggest ways of recontextualising research so that it might be used to enable people to participate in organising for change as part of global networks, in what she identifies as 'glocalised' action for change. She offers examples of initiatives that recontextualise language and literacy pedagogy in the service of transformation processes.

9. Hilary Janks offers an approach to critical language and literacy pedagogy through the example of engaging with xenophobia in the South African context. She examines the link between apartheid discourses and contemporary xenophobic Othering through a close and critical reading of *District 9*, the science fiction movie that was set in South Africa but widely distributed elsewhere. Following an engagement with the film as text and narrative, she concludes by offering an example of critical literacy activities relating to *District 9* and 'the role of movies, language and discourse in the construction of the dangerous Other'.

10. In a conclusion to the collection, Crain Soudien offers a reflection on language and the politics of social difference. He treats South Africa as an ontological hotspot for both the production and undoing of racialised forms of difference. He draws attention to language's role in allowing and prohibiting engagement with new identity practices in conditions of diversity. He identifies what he describes as the new embodied spaces in post-'formal apartheid', where people are having to learn how to manage their historically inscribed bodies in new ways and says that one of our quests should be to examine further how languages have become attached to racial identity in this setting.

## References

- Bailey, B. (2007). Heteroglossia and boundaries. In M. Heller (ed.), *Bilingualism: a social approach* (pp. 257-74). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Barton, D. and Hamilton, M. (1998). *Local literacies: reading and writing in one community*. London: Routledge.
- Baynham, M. and Prinsloo, M. (eds) (2009). *The future of literacy studies*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Blommaert, J. (2007) Sociolinguistic scales. *Intercultural Pragmatics*, 4(1): 1-19.

- Blommaert, J. (2008). *Grassroots literacy*. London: Routledge.
- Blommaert, J. (2010). *The sociolinguistics of globalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Blommaert, J., Collins, J. and Slembrouk, S. (2005). Spaces of multilingualism. *Language & Communication*, 25: 197–216.
- Blommaert, J. and Rampton, B. (2011). Language and superdiversity. *Diversities*, 13(2): 1–20.
- Callon, M. and Latour, B. (1981). Unscrewing the Big Leviathan: how actors macrostructure reality and how sociologists help them to do so. In K. D. Knorr-Cetina and A. V. Cicourel (eds), *Advances in social theory and methodology: toward an integration of micro- and macro-sociologies* (pp. 277–303). London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Canagarajah, A. S. (2006). The place of world Englishes in composition: pluralization continued. *College Composition and Communication*, 57(4): 586–619.
- Canagarajah, A. S. (in press). Negotiating mobile codes and literacies at the contact zone: another perspective on South African township schools. In C. Stroud and M. Prinsloo (eds), *Language, literacy and diversity: moving words*. London: Routledge.
- Castells, E. (1996). *The rise of the network society*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Collier, S. (2006). *Communication power*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Collier, S. and Ong, A. (2005). Global assemblages. *Theory, Culture & Society*, 23(2–3): 379–81.
- Ong, A. and S. Collier (eds), *Global assemblages: technology, politics, and ethics as anthropological problems* (pp. 3–21). Malden, Mass.: Blackwell.
- Collins, J., Slembrouk, S. and Baynham, M. (eds) (2009). *Globalization and language in contact: scale, migration, and communicative practices*. London: Continuum.
- Cook-Gumperz, J. (2006). The social construction of literacy. In J. Cook-Gumperz (ed.), *The social construction of literacy* (2nd edn) (pp. 1–18). Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Creese, A. and Blackledge, A. (2010). Translanguaging in the bilingual classroom: a pedagogy for learning and teaching? *The Modern Language Journal*, 94(1): 104–15.
- Errington, J. (2008). *Linguistics in a colonial world: a story of language, meaning, and power*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Featherstone, M. (2006). Genealogies of the global. *Theory, Culture & Society*, 23(2–3): 367–99.
- Gardner, S. and Martin-Jones, M. (eds) (2012). *Multilingualism, Discourse and Ethnography*. New York: Routledge.
- Heath, S. (1983). *Ways with words: language, life and work in communities and classrooms*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Heller, M. (1999). *Linguistic minorities and modernity: a sociolinguistic ethnography*. London: Longman.
- Heller, M. (2007). Bilingualism as ideology and practice. In M. Heller (ed.), *Bilingualism: a social approach* (pp. 1–22). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Jacquemet, M. (2005). Transidiomatic practices: language and power in the age of globalization. *Language & Communication*, 25: 257–77.
- Kwa, C. (2002). Romantic and baroque conceptions of complex wholes in the sciences. In J. Law and A. Mol (eds), *Complexities: social studies of knowledge practices* (pp. 23–52). Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Latour, B. (1990). Drawing things together. In M. Lynch and S. Woolgar (eds), *Representation in scientific practice* (pp. 19–68). Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Law, J. (2003). And if the global were small and non-coherent? Method, complexity and the Baroque, published by the Centre for Science Studies, Lancaster University, Lancaster LA1 4YN, UK, accessed July 2010 at <http://www.comp.lancs.ac.uk/sociology/papers/Law-And-if-the-Global-Were-Small.pdf>
- Law, J. (2009). Actor network theory and material semiotics. In Bryan S. Turner (ed.), *The new Blackwell companion to social theory* (pp. 141–58). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Lin, A. (1997). Hong Kong children's rights to a culturally compatible English education. *Hong Kong Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 2(2): 23–47.
- Lo Bianco, J. (2010). The importance of language policies and multilingualism for cultural diversity. *International Social Science Journal*, 61: 37–67.
- Makoni, S. and Pennycook A. (eds) (2007). *Disinventing and reconstituting languages*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Martin-Jones, M. (2007). Bilingualism, education, and the regulation of access to language resources. In M. Heller (ed.), *Bilingualism: a social approach* (pp. 161–82). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Mesthrie, R. and Bhatt, R. M. (2008). *World Englishes: the study of new linguistic varieties*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ong, A. (2007). Neoliberalism as a mobile technology. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, NS, 32: 3–8.
- Prinsloo, M. and Baynham, M. (eds) (2013). *Literacy studies*, set of five vols. London: Sage.
- Scribner, S. and Cole, M. (1981). *The psychology of literacy*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Street, B. (1984). *Literacy in theory and practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Street, B. (2004). The limits of the local – 'autonomous' or 'disembedding'? *International Journal of Learning*, 10: 2825–30.
- Stroud, C. and Wee, L. (2012). *Style, identity and literacy: English in Singapore*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Ventovec, S. (2007). Super-diversity and its implications. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 30(6): 1024–54.
- Wallerstein, I. (1974). *The modern world system I: capitalist agriculture and the origins of the European world-economy in the sixteenth century*. New York: Academic Press.
- Wallerstein, I. (1991). *Geopolitics and geoculture: essays on the changing world-system*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Widdowson, H. (2010). The theory of practice. In G. Cook and S. North (eds), *Applied linguistics in action: a reader* (pp. 7–18). London and Milton Keynes: Routledge and the Open University.
- Worham, S. (2006). *Learning identity: the joint emergence of social identification and academic learning*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Worham, S. (2012). Beyond macro and micro in the linguistic anthropology of education. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly*, 43(2): 128–37.