

TESTING PRACTICE IN A SOUTHERN SCHOOL

Mastin Prinsloo and Lara-Stephanie Krause

Pre-print draft of a chapter in Bloome, D., Rowsell, J., Leung, C. and Castanheira, M.L., *Re-Theorizing Literacy Practices*. New York: Routledge.

Literacy Studies researchers have studied 'literacy in its social context' since the early shaping work in the New Literacy Studies of Brian Street (1984) along with Heath (1983), Scribner and Cole (1981), Scollon and Scollon (1981) and others. As Street (2009, p. 28) put it, literacy should be thought of "not as an issue of measurement or of skills but as social practices that vary from one context to another" and as shaped by the effects of social power. The study of literacy as situated practices that can best be studied ethnographically has become an influential approach over recent decades but has had to adjust to the challenges of changing social contexts. This chapter focuses specifically on the question of whether the idea of practices continues to be an important one in responding to these shifts. We examine the application of and response to the last round of the Progress in Reading Literacy Survey (PIRLS) in South Africa and contrast this with a study of a classroom in Cape Town where a teacher prepares her students for a standard, centrally distributed test. We argue that the contrast between these two shows us the critical role that situated practices continue to play in research on literacy.

Practices Writ Large or Small?

The microskills of writing competence are often referred to as examples of how much explicit and background knowledge as well as a situated repertoire make up literacy practices, beyond basic coding and decoding skills (Barton & Hamilton, 1998; Gee, 1996, Lewis & Fabos, 2005; Burnett et al., 2014), including a feel for occasion, grasp of subject matter, along with a sense of audience and purpose. These practices are thought of as carrying a history, as situated and, indeed, as

hard to pinpoint sometimes, because they include elements that are both stated and implicit, foregrounded and backgrounded, value-based and seemingly trivial on occasion, as well. This raises challenges for their theorisation and their use in research analysis and also produces considerable variability amongst Literacy Studies researchers as to how they think about practices in their work. Street (2000, p. 13), in referencing an exchange with Janet Maybin, noted that the term practices in Literacy Studies since the 1980s seemed to cover “rather different kinds of stuff” within one term, some of them more amenable to empirical investigation while some were more abstract, to do with arguments about what underlying ideologies were at play. In elaborating on this insight, here we examine competing and critical arguments both from within Literacy Studies and sociolinguistics, as well as from broader social theory.

Practices, Vanishing Points and ‘Multilevel Analysis’

Luke (2004, p. 333) argued that literacy researchers needed to avoid “a kind of new autonomous model” that assumes that ‘social practices’ have an intrinsic value and instead called for a finer grained “multilevel of analysis of which kinds of textual practice count, for whom, where, and in what contexts, but also in relation to the availability of other kinds of capital: economic, social, ecological, libidinal and otherwise”. He suggested to literacy studies researchers that “we should take Street’s axiom about literacy as social practice as but a starting point for analysis and not as the end point – lest it become a ‘vanishing point’”. Luke’s reference to practices as vanishing points invokes a debate around practices theory amongst post-Wittgenstein philosophers, launched by Turner’s (1994, p. 1) ringing critique: “Practices, it would appear, are the vanishing point of twentieth-century philosophy... the concept is deeply elusive”. Turner takes on major arguments by philosophers for the centrality of practice and practices (Wittgenstein, Heidegger and Dreyfus, in particular) and finds them wanting. He insists that they present an incoherent view that orientations to knowledge, or convictions, inevitably draw from a largely tacit and unstated picture of the world that a person has acquired from their immediate community. Its incoherence lies, he says, in the notion of a practice as a “shared possession” because there is no way to account for how practices in the form of knowledge orientations might be transmitted from person to person such that the “same internal thing, the same practice, is produced in another person” if they are not made explicit, brought to consciousness and consciously transmitted (Turner, 1994, p. 54). His conclusion is, that we should reject the notion of practice in favour of talk of habits, as a less encompassing concept that takes account of behavioural routines that are not consciously acquired or equated with consciousness, because knowledge, he insists, cannot be transmitted if it is not explicit and consciously held and communicated. His version of ‘habituation’ does not depend on the idea that

'practices' are shared or social, and consequently, he says, is not a 'social theory of practice'.

Turner's criticisms of practices would appear, in turn, however, to rely on a separation of reasoning from activity, along with a preference for a model of language as autonomous and without ambiguity (as Street might have described it). In Turner's model, knowledge can be explicitly formulated in the form of ideas that are context-free in their formulation and transmitted in propositional or other explicit form, and as politically and contextually neutral, while they might have political consequences. Some of Turner's colleagues have rejected his formulation (Stern, 2000; Bohman, 1997). Stern insists that theories of practice already exist, in ethnomethodology, in reconstructive social theory and in thick ethnographic description where practices and knowledge processes are articulated, and where researchers are able to describe how normative practices get from their public locations into the persons whose activities are shaped by them and who act them out or respond to them.

This brings us back to Luke's call for a finer grained "multilevel analysis" of which kinds of textual practice count. His call rests on the premise that the localised studies produced through ethnographic research are unable to account for larger determining dynamics from outside the context of study that shape the local. Two prevalent attempts currently to produce such multi-level analysis are those of the sociolinguistics scales model (Blommaert, 2010) and critical realist theory in sociology (Elder-Vass, 2004) but neither of these have yet developed a convincing account of how 'micro-interactional' dynamics relate to 'macro-sociological' contexts. Critical realist scholars insist that structural, cultural and agential components have to be analysed separately, with attention to their relations with each other and what these enable and disallow, and not to merge levels in analysis, as Bourdieu's and Giddens's accounts of practices are said to do (Archer et al., 2016; Pratten, 2013<AQ>; Bhaskar, 1998). The sociolinguistics scales model sees language-linked social inequalities as effects of a contemporary global capitalist system that is divided between structurally unequal parts, described as centres and peripheries in relation to each other in a cascade of scales, starting at the global and including centre-periphery relations at national, regional and local levels, for example between urban and rural environments in particular regions and between centres and peripheries within cities and other local environments. Language and literacy resources get stigmatised or valorised depending on their location, so for example, 'grassroots literacy' emerging from African settings is seen as low status at the global centres (Blommaert, 2008) and Nigerian or Indian English are seen as low status in Northern centres (Dong & Blommaert, 2009). Because of their systemic and relational orientation, however, neither of these two theoretical orientations is well attuned to dealing with the constructed, political, variable and unpredictable nature of language and literacy practices in particular contexts, rather taking a 'long-distance' or 'bird's eye' view on such matters. The sociolinguistics scales model, for example places its emphasis on social inequalities

occurring in relations between sites and scales, e.g., rural accents regarded with contempt in Beijing, in Dong and Blommaert's (2009) study or samples of writing by Africans in France treated as inferior and racialised displays in Europe (Blommaert, 2008, Vigouroux, 2015). It pays less attention to inequalities within sites, and its systemic emphasis can have the effect of naturalising boundaries between sites as well as between groups of people rather than seeing them as constructed, contested, or shifting (Canagarajah, 2015; Prinsloo, 2017). They are consequently less effective at dealing with micro-interactional dynamics and the complexities of situated practices.

In response, we here look at education settings where 'local literacies' encounter 'macro-level' national, standardised and transnational criteria. We examine if the local is 'disappeared' in the face of centralised or standardised activity. It turns out that the idea of practices remains crucial for making sense of such local encounters and that the stripping out of practices in state-level interventions turns out badly for all concerned. Our focus here is a discussion of the outcomes and responses to the Progress in Reading Literacy Survey (PIRLS) tests run in South Africa in 2016 and reported on in 2017 (Howie et al., 2017). We also look at how teachers in a sub-elite Cape Town school prepare their students for writing centralized and standardized tests.

The PIRLS Tests

The release of the latest PIRLS report for South Africa in December 2017 was a moment of public alarm as reflected in news reports and comments on social media at the time. The study tested a selection of Grade 4 children across the country in 2016 and compared their results to 50 other countries where the test was also run. The one glaring finding that kept getting repeated and endorsed in news reports and online conversations was that "78 percent of Grade 4s in SA cannot read for meaning". A news article summed up the source of alarm:

The students in question failed to meet the lowest literacy benchmark of the study: retrieving basic information from texts to answer simple questions. To put this into global perspective, only 4 percent of students internationally were unable to reach this benchmark, as opposed to South Africa's 78 percent".

(Daily Maverick, 6 December 2017)

The *Mail and Guardian's* (December 2017 end of year Cabinet Report Card gave the national Minister of Basic Education a D rating, largely because of the PIRLS results, adding: "This is shocking".

But there are problems with these generic, transnational tests and what is wrong with them has got everything to do with their claim to be reliably testing literacy as a neutral and supposedly context-free phenomenon. They are exercises

designed to focus on the so-called comprehension skills of retrieval, inference, interpretation and evaluation, understood as generic or contextless skills which have either been learnt or have not been learnt and can be reliably tested for and compared across widely diverging socio-economic, socio-cultural and socio-linguistic contexts. The PIRLS data is based on a test devised in Boston USA, where children read two passages and then answer questions on them. South African implementers translated the passages from US into UK Standard English and then into the remaining ten recognised South African standard languages (Howie et al., 2017). The implementers assume that South African children will each have most ease in reading and responding to these passages in one standard South African language amongst the 11 so-called national languages. The implementers also assume that the translated passages are equivalent to, or carry a commensurate comparability with the English original. Amongst other problems with this procedure is the notion that students are at ease reading in the standard language identified as their 'mother tongue' and that such 'mother tongues' are unified and homogenous resources that are carried by individuals. Instead, the local languaging of children in multilingual urban and other settings in South Africa absorbs diversity and unpredictability in a frame of language as socially practised and dynamic rather than as static standard resources that were codified in the nineteenth century by European missionaries (Harries, 2007). The administrators of the South African PIRLS tests will not let researchers examine the original nor the translated test passages used across the designated 11 South African languages, on the grounds that the tests and the text pieces that they used have to be kept confidential in case there is a reason to use them again for testing purposes. The two examples of text passages that the PIRLS centre in Boston gives for the 2016 tests (Mullis & Martin, 2015) include a discussion of dinosaurs and fossils and it is unlikely that the translators would have found recognisable equivalent terms for these in all, or any, of the nine designated languages or that students would make sense of whatever alternatives were devised to designate dinosaurs and fossils, if that passage was indeed used for the test.

Literacy, along with language, is a simplified construct in these exercises, streamlined for administration and for measurement and presented as context-neutral. The tests purport to test children's individual literacy skills but are more examinations of whether the children's experiences of schooling match the unexamined or unstated assumptions of the tester as to how schooling is done. What they are then, are tests for compatible practices. They don't show conclusively that children can or can't 'read for meaning', only that they are prepared or unprepared for a certain kind of activity which includes a narrow focus on textual comprehension and a particular kind of response to questions about that text. In a related study of children and PIRLS testing in England, Maybin (2013) identified this narrow focus on textual comprehension processes as missing out on the imaginative and dialogic engagement with reading and writing of the children she studied in informal and non-testing contexts. Children as readers and writers

are constructed by this literacy as generalised subjects without any social location and who are, or can become, more or less efficient processors of narrative and informative text. The model of language in these tests is a similarly contextless one, resting on the flawed assumption that 'reading for meaning' involves taking meaning that rests autonomously and unambiguously on the page or screen, almost as if language was a nomenclature: a list of terms corresponding to a list of things (Harris, 1998). In this guise 'literacy' is an historical product of particular discourses on language, schooling and development and is what Freebody and Freiburg (2008) describe as a compact concept, its value apparently self-evident. Questioning the value of this literacy is like questioning the value of water. We might call this an autonomous model of literacy. For our purposes here, we can see this as literacy without the practices that make reading and writing a relevant human activity.

Seeing Like a State

An alternative way of describing the autonomous model of literacy with regard to schooling contexts that does indeed involve a 'multi-level analysis' is to say that it involves 'seeing like a state' in Scott's (1982) memorable phrase. The construction of literacy in the PIRLS tests as a unitary, portable and readily testable property of individuals can be seen as not just evidence of an autonomous model of literacy in practice but as an example of administrative strategies commonly associated with state administration, or with related strategies of governmentality (Foucault, 2010). Here, officials and academics take what are often "exceptionally complex, illegible and local social processes" in Scott's words and create a standard grid, which allows centralised recording and monitoring, to make these diverging practices "more legible – and hence manipulable – from above and from the centre" (Scott, 1998, p. 2). Scott points out that such designed constructs that purport to correspond to actual practice are necessarily schematic and always ignore essential features of any real functioning social order or site of activity. (A work-to-rule strike is one example where production processes can be severely disrupted by workers simply refusing to carry out all the informal improvisations and practices that aren't codified but which make things work.) The formal scheme is parasitic on informal processes that, alone, it could not create or maintain and to the degree that the formal scheme makes no allowances for these processes or actually suppresses them, "it fails both its intended beneficiaries and ultimately its designers as well" (Scott, 1998, p. 3). Such simplifications are like abridged maps in that they represent only the slice of social activity that interests the official observer, but unlike maps they can sometimes cause much of the reality they depict to be remade or distorted through the effects of state power. Scott describes examples of such strategies where the actual features of located complexity, or situated practices, were suppressed or ignored and which failed as strategies in a variety of sites, including scientific forestry initiatives, standardisations of language and legal

discourse, also the Ujamaa village campaign in Tanzania from 1973 to 1976, along with Stalin's first 5-year plan for a collective economy in 1920s Soviet Russia, all of which ignored situated complexity or established practices and failed or distorted the practices that they were intending to remove or enhance.

In the South African case, policy, curriculum and teaching methods in schooling in the twentieth century that impacted South African schooling were developed primarily in ideologically monolingual contexts such as the USA and the UK, over many decades, and then packaged and exported to South Africa and elsewhere. They present an administratively tailored view of literacy and language, and ignore the situated and variable nature of language and literacy practices, effectively turning away from what it is that children, youths and adults bring with them to the literacy-learning and language use in educational settings. In examining how this 'abridged map' of centralised curriculum statements and standardised testing encounters the situated linguistic and institutional realities of mass schooling in a southern sub-elite context, we examine one example of classroom teaching and testing in a township school in Khayelitsha, Cape Town, taken from a longer study by Lara Krause on language and teaching in one school and also presented and discussed in Krause and Prinsloo, 2016; Dowling and Krause, 2018<AQ>; and Prinsloo and Krause (in press).

Putting Context into Testing

The school site that we focus on here is located in Khayelitsha, a residential area in Cape Town. The spatialization of apartheid, achieved through city planning aimed at keeping population groups separate, continues to be a defining feature of Cape Town, more so even than Johannesburg. Townships such as Khayelitsha, comprising low-cost formal housing along with proliferating shack settlements, cluster and grow on the city periphery and are strong reminders to residents and visitors alike that Cape Town, which is often idealised in tourist publicity, is a profoundly unequal, spatially fractured environment. Originally laid out in the late 1980s to house 250 000 people moved from elsewhere in Cape Town because of their race classification, commonly quoted estimates talk now of 1 to 1.2 million and even 2 million inhabitants in Khayelitsha. The large majority of children here live and go to school in this township and often stay isolated from the city centre, along with their parents, due to the geographical distance, a lack of financial means and widespread unemployment. Children's language use is therefore very much situated in this particular setting, which, linguistically, is predominantly associated with Xhosa. However, the Xhosa that is spoken in people's homes is not the same as the standard language that is tested in schools and that is also the official medium of instruction from Grade 1 to Grade 3 in primary school. This standard was codified by European missionaries from one regional dialect among several, in a rural environment in the nineteenth century and the contemporary urban language that is spoken by residents and their children differs considerably

from it (Harries, 2001; Prinsloo, 1999). After 3 years of this so-called ‘mother-tongue education’, Standard English now becomes the medium of instruction for the remaining 4 years of primary school and then throughout high school and university. As efficient urban languagers equipped with language resources that do not easily fit linguistic boxes, children in Khayelitsha, along with others in ex-colonial settings are ‘caught between the Standards’. They have to ‘leave behind’ the language/semiotic repertoire, ‘ways of knowing’ (Heath, 1983) and practices that they grow up with in their homes, to learn at school through hegemonic standard languages, and the material and semiotic practices that characterise formal schooling in this setting (Krause and Prinsloo, 2016). Except for concessions made by way of the 3 years of ‘mother-tongue education’, the education system then administratively positions all students as monolingual by way of curricula, textbooks and tests that are available in English only. Official education department communications to schools also ask teachers to refrain from ‘code-switching’ in classrooms (Tyler & McKinney, in press) and with that devalue and delegitimise teachers’ and students’ urban languaging practices as potential resources in teaching and learning. Children’s meaningful engagement with reading and writing is hardly possible under such conditions where what counts as school literacy is either in Standard Xhosa or in Standard English whereas the children – and for the most part also their teachers – are perhaps best described as urban Xhosa languagers.

Here is one devastating example of what ‘seeing like a state’ produces in this context, where the insistence on “the erroneous and deadening fiction of normative mono-dialectalism” (Fishman, quoted in Rampton, 2010, p. 275) would produce near paralysis of learning in the classroom if teachers didn’t defy their principal’s instruction that there is to be ‘no code-switching’ in class. We can describe this mono-dialectal fiction as constructing an imaginary speech community on a national scale, of children who are fluent in the codes and practices of the urban middle classes and teachers who are similarly fluent as well as being appropriately trained for teaching in their contexts. When it comes to testing, all children are treated as equals and context-free. As Silverstein (2014, p. 5 elaborates, when children are asked, by teachers or testers, ‘What language do you speak?’, the enquirer means ‘what denotational code(s) – centrally, grammatically conforming words and expressions – for representing things and states-of-affairs in the world do you control?’. It is a construct of language devoid of all the practices that give meaning to language, both spoken and written, along with all the other semiotic resources with which communication happens. Standard English in this setting is a “voice from nowhere” as he describes it, occupying ‘top-and-centre’ as a register for denotation in formal contexts. In the case of Xhosa in the Western Cape, it is not what people speak nor how they speak (Dowling & Krause, 2018). Nonetheless, the standard language becomes an unmarked and unnamed resource that is seen to be functioning in the service of ideas and meaning (Davila, 2016).

As indicated earlier, the principal at our school is guided by similar assumptions about the standard languages and criticises his teachers for overstepping language boundaries in their practices:

they tend to teach Maths in Xhosa, because they are Xhosa people. They tend to teach English in Xhosa. That's why we have problem with our children, because they mustn't code-switch, we call it a code-switching. They must teach English even Grade 4. They must be taught the language of the lesson, of the learning area. All the learning area, the language of the learning area is English. Only Xhosa as a learning area that must be taught in Xhosa. And it's not happening, that's why we have problems. And we know that not to happen, we know that a failure of the teachers, because the teachers think they have, they got a sympathy for the children, they undermine the knowledge of the children. They also think that children will not be able to understand them. Now they want to get onto the level of the children [by code-switching], the time is going. That's why we have a problem.

Teachers – despite feeling bad about their translingual practices in class, knowing they are 'overstepping' instructions from the top, nevertheless argue for the function of translanguaging in the classroom, like this Grade 4 Geography in interview:

So if... I said... 'umlambo', then translate 'umlambo' to 'a river', in English, I'll rather do that. Rather than just speaking English, leaving them behind. Because if they don't understand, if a learner doesn't understand the first word in a sentence, she or he won't understand the whole sentence and then they become bored. That is why you have to mix, especially in Grade 4.

His specific reference to Grade 4 comes from the fact that this is the first year that students are instructed through and expected to write in Standard English, coming from 3 years of learning reading and writing in Standard Xhosa. The same teacher who made concessions for translanguaging in oral classroom interactions tells us, however, that students are not allowed to write fluidly across designated languages when written work is submitted under test conditions:

T: In Geography there must be, all the things must be in English.

L: Mhm so when they answer in Xhosa you gonna mark it wrong?

T: Yes.

L: So even the content if it's correct?

T: It's correct but it's, it's wrong.

The ideological status of literacy as the highest form of language use causes what flexibility and fluidity there is in classroom languaging to disappear when the administrative grid of standard and centralised testing is applied. Street described this construction of literacy as *scriptism* – a belief in the superiority, in various respects, of written languages over spoken languages, accompanied by the widely-held view that some forms or uses of language are more ‘context-dependent’ or ‘objective’ than others (Street, 1984; Prinsloo & Street, 2014). The status of written, standardised, centralised testing in organising the outcomes of mass schooling continues to perpetuate this myth, while marginalising new forms of written engagement which are prevalent outside of schooling, on screens and mobile phones where fluid languaging and multimodal communication thrive.

The assumption on the part of central testers of a common testing procedure across schooling contexts is contradicted by the actual events of testing in schools, as we now describe briefly from our data from one school, where localising of standard practises takes place, both as a kind of simultaneous resistance and a compliance with the requirements from the top and centre (see also Prinsloo & Krause, in press). The arrival of the physical exam paper at the school induces a series of re-shaping processes aimed at making it possible for students to pass or nearly pass, and to not get their teachers into trouble. In the extract below, the researcher asks the teacher about a comment she heard the teacher make in a class when a centralized test was to be written:

R: Mhm because sometimes I’ve heard you say that you’ve said: “We’ve read this story four times, two or three times, before we writing the exam and you still don’t understand.”

T: Yes.

R: So when did you do that reading?

T: When the paper comes, when I receive the paper on Friday, then I make the copy of the story. We’ll read the paper during the reading time.

R: On a Monday?

T: On the same day. Then we read it again on Monday.

R: And again on Tuesday.

T: And again on Tuesday, before we write it.

R: And the department wants you to do that?

T: No I chose to do it. No-one told me that I can do that. I just thought I must give them a chance to understand the story more, to see the words, to be able to understand. Because if you can come with the paper today, they are seeing the story for the first time, they will write nothing. They won’t understand at all.

This account from this township school teacher hints at a rupture in the logic of the centralized assessment system, which assumes that testing is done in the same way in all its schools. The following data piece, however, documents what

the teacher told us above: she aims to not let her students write an exam on a previously unseen passage. Below we see how she reads and explains the comprehension story that is part of the test to the students for the last time before they have to answer questions about it in the exam:

Oliver Twist passage

Teacher (reading from original passage): Oliver was even less happy in the workhouse than he had been with Mrs Mann. He now had to work, which made him even hungrier.

Teacher (explaining): It means that before Oliver went to stay at the workhouse, he first stayed with Mrs Mann. And in Mrs Mann's house he didn't have to work, but now, since he is staying at the workhouse, in the workhouse Oliver has to work now. It makes him even more hungrier. *Imlambisa ngakumbi into yokusebenza* (translation: it makes him more/especially hungry, this thing of working).

In the written task, unfamiliar terms and complex phrasing carry signals that are not grasped by students who don't have fluid access to the denotational codes of Standard English, nor to the semantic context of nineteenth-century London workhouses and orphanages. The teacher's Xhosa explanation involves more than a simple translation in that the particular syntactical resources of Xhosa are used to make sense of the textual action. Standard English of the kind written here relies on context along with syntactical signals to make meaning, whereas Standard as well as local urban Xhosa languaging operates with a detailed system of agreement markers (noun classes and verb-noun agreement rules) which allow listeners to track referents unambiguously. This agreement morphology makes it easier to grasp here that it is the 'thing of working' that causes Oliver to get even more hungry. This is a causal connection that can easily be missed by children who are just beginning to learn in standard written English, but one that is crucial for them to understand if they are to answer the exam questions successfully.

The teacher also describes some of the institutional dynamics around testing and grading that apply to schools here and further pressure her into developing mechanisms to make learners cope with centralized assessment requirements:

T: I become scared because the more learners that fail, the department is after you. So you need to try by all means, you must be able to explain the case. Because when we do the class work, the learner does good.

R: Do you know what will happen if, let's say, the department would come after you, as you said?

T: I don't know really, but I know that they need the learners to pass. You must make sure that you don't get the high number of failures.

In closing, these testing dynamics remains hidden from view if we ‘see like a state’ and do not approach such literacy events as local practices linked to contexts beyond the local. The testing and wider curriculum demands of the schooling system reduces language and literacy engagement to a rather painful parody of effective engagement, where teachers strive to perpetuate the myth that their students are coping or nearly coping with impossible expectations. As with the PIRLS tests, if the tests and outcomes are not approached as contextual literacy events and situated practices, all they do is perpetuate an established view of children in such contexts as ‘bad readers’ without starting to understand what the issues at hand are about and how to start to address them.

References

- Archer, M., Bhaskar, R., Collier, A., Lawson, T., & Norrie, A. (eds) (1998). *Critical Realism: Essential Readings*. London: Routledge.
- Archer, M., Decoteau, C., Gorski, P., Little, D., Porpora, D., Rutzou, T., Smith, C., Steinmetz, G., & Vandenberghe, F. (2016). *What is Critical Realism? Perspectives: A Newsletter of the ASA Theory Section*, Fall 2017. Retrieved from: <<http://www.asatheory.org/current-newsletter-online/what-is-critical-realism>>.
- Barton, D., & Hamilton, M. (1998). *Local Literacies—Reading and Writing in One Community*. London: Routledge.
- Bhaskar, R. (1998). Philosophy and Scientific Realism. In M. Archer, R. Bhaskar, A. Collier, T. Lawson, & A. Norrie (eds), *Critical Realism: Essential Readings* (pp. 16–47). London: Routledge.
- Blommaert, J. (2008). *Grassroots Literacy: Writing, Identity and Voice in Central Africa*. London: Routledge.
- Bohman, J. (1997). Do Practices Explain Anything? Turner’s Critique of the Theory of Social Practices. *History and Theory*, 36(1), 93–107.
- Bourdieu, P. (1977). *Outline of a Theory of Practice*. Translated by Richard Nice. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Burnett, C., Davies, J., Merchant, G., & Rowsell, J. (eds) (2014). *New Literacies Around the Globe: Policy and Pedagogy*. London: Routledge.
- Canagarajah, S. (2015). Negotiating Mobile Codes and Literacies at the Contact Zone: Another Perspective on South African Township Schools. In C. Stroud & M. Prinsloo (eds), *Language, Literacy and Diversity: Moving Words* (pp. 34–54). London: Routledge.
- Davila, B. (2016). The Inevitability of “Standard” English: Discursive Constructions of Standard Language Ideologies. *Written Communication*, 33(2), 127–148.
- Dong, J. K., & Blommaert, J. (2009). Space, Scale and Accents: Constructing Migrant Identity in Beijing. In J. Collins, M. Baynham & S. Slembrouck (eds), *Globalization and Language in Contact: Scale, Migration, and Communicative Practices* (pp. 42–61). London: Bloomsbury.

- Dowling, T., & Krause, L. (2017). "Ndifuna imeaning yakhe": Translingual Morphology in English teaching in a South African township classroom, *International Journal of Multilingualism*, doi: 10.1080/14790718.2017.1419475.
- Elder-Vass, D. (2004). Re-examining Bhaskar's Three Ontological Domains: The Lessons from Emergence. In C. Lawson, J. Latsis & N. Martins (eds), *Contributions to Social Ontology* (pp. 15–160). Abingdon: Routledge.
- Foucault, M. (2010). *The Government of Self and Others: Lectures at the Collège de France 1982–1983*, edited by Arnold I. Davidson, translated by Graham Burchell. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Gee, J. P. (1990). *Social Linguistics and Literacies: Ideology in Discourse*. London: Falmer Press.
- Harries, P. (2007). *Butterflies and Barbarians: Swiss Missionaries and Systems of Knowledge in South-East Africa*. Oxford: James Currey.
- Harris, R. (1998). *Language, Saussure and Wittgenstein: How to Play Games with Words*. London: Routledge.
- Heath, S. (1983). *Ways with Words: Language, Life and Work in Communities and Classrooms*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Howie, S., Combrinck, C., Roux, K., Tshele, M., Mokoena, G., and McLeod P. (2017). *PIRLS LITERACY 2016: South African Highlights Report*. Pretoria: Centre for Evaluation and Assessment. Retrieved from: <http://www.up.ac.za/media/shared/164/ZP_Files/epirls-2016-hl-report-1.zp136316.pdf>.
- Krause, L., & Prinsloo, M. (2016). Translanguaging in a Township Primary School: Policy and Practice. *Southern African Linguistics and Applied Language Studies*, 34(4), 347–357.
- Lewis, C., & Fabos, B. (2005). Instant Messaging, Literacies, and Social Identities. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 40(4), 470–501.
- Luke, A. (2004). On the Material Consequences of Literacy. *Language & Education*, 18(4), 331–335.
- Maybin, J. (2013). What Counts as Reading? PIRLS, EastEnders and The Man on the Flying Trapeze. *Literacy*, 47(2), 59–66.
- Mullis, I. V. S., & Martin, M. O. (eds) (2015). *PIRLS 2016 Assessment Framework* (2nd edn.). Retrieved from Boston College, TIMSS & PIRLS International Study Center website: <<http://timssandpirls.bc.edu/pirls2016/framework.html>>.
- Prinsloo, M. (1999). Behind the Back of a Declarative History: Acts of Erasure in Leon De Kock's "Civilising Barbarians: Missionary Narrative and African Response in Nineteenth Century South Africa". *English Academy Review*, 14, 32–41.
- Prinsloo, M. (2017). Sociotemporal Scales in Sociolinguistics. In S. Canagarajah (ed.). *Handbook on Language and Migration* (pp. 364–380). New York: Routledge.
- Prinsloo, M., & Krause, L. (In press). Translanguaging, place and complexity. *Language and Education*.

- Prinsloo, M., & Street, B. (2014). Literacy, Language and Development: A Social Practices Perspective. In Hamish McIlwraith (ed.). *Language Rich Africa* (pp. 65–70). London: British Council.
- Rampton, B. (2010). Speech community. In J. Jaspers, J. Östman & J. Verschueren (eds). *Society and Language Use. Handbook of Pragmatics Highlights*, Volume 7 (pp. 274–303). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Scollon, R., & Scollon, S. (1981). *Narrative, Literacy, and Face in Interethnic Communication*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Scott, J. (1998). *Seeing Like a State: How Certain Schemes to Improve the Human Condition Have Failed*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Scribner, S., & Cole, M. (1981). *The Psychology of Literacy*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Stern, D. (2000). Practices, Practical Holism, and Background Practices. In Mark Wrathall and Jeff Malpas (eds), *Heidegger, Coping, and Cognitive Science: Essays in Honor of Hubert L Dreyfus*, Volume 2 (pp. 53–69). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Street, B. (2001). Introduction. In B. Street (ed.) *Literacy and Development: Ethnographic Perspectives* (pp. 1–18). London: Routledge.
- Street, B. (1984). *Literacy in Theory and Practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Street, B. (2000). Literacy Events and Literacy Practices: Theory and Practice in the New Literacy Studies. In M. Martin-Jones & K. Jones (eds), *Multilingual Literacies: Comparative Perspectives on Research and Practice* (pp. 17–29). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company. (Republished in Prinsloo, M. & Baynham, M. (eds) (2013). *Literacy Practices. Literacy Studies*, Volume 2 (pp. 21-48). London: Sage.)
- Turner, S. P. (1994). *The Social Theory of Practices: Tradition, Tacit Knowledge, and Presuppositions*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Tyler, R., & McKinney, C. (In press). Disinventing and Reconstituting Language for Learning in School Science. *Language and Education*.
- Vigouroux, C. (2015). How One Reads Whom and Why: Ideological Filtering in Reading Vernacular Literacy in France. In C. Stroud & M. Prinsloo (eds), *Language, Literacy and Diversity: Moving Words* (pp. 92–113). London: Routledge.