SOCIOLINGUISTICS & ENGLISH LANGUAGE STUDIES

Jan Blommaert

1. INTRODUCTION

Like every disciplinary label, 'sociolinguistics' covers a tremendous variety of approaches. In some corners of sociolinguistics, it looks as very little has happened for the past couple of decades; in others however, new developments are emerging at a speed defying that of publishing, causing people to download working papers and circulate Powerpoint presentations rather than finished work. In this contribution I shall focus on the latter rather than on the former. What sociolinguistics has to offer to English Language Studies will be defined by new developments, not by older ones. The new ones challenge the study of language at a fundamental level; the questions they raise cannot be avoided.

Two major issues stand out as to their relevance for English Language Studies. The first one is the perspective of globalization. It is a commonplace to say that English is the language that defines globalization processes; public awareness that the world is globalizing is to a large extent driven by the fact that one 'sees' English all over the world nowadays. Nonnative-nonnative English encounters are now the rule for the usage of English in the world; the numbers of nonnative English language learners in countries such as China and India dwarf the so-called 'native' English-speaking communities. English is in a globalizing world essentially becoming a language defined by nonnative usage, and wherever English occurs in the world, it occurs with an accent (and this includes so-called 'accentless' varieties).

As said, all of this is commonplace by now. The effect of this is, however, often underestimated. It means that English, wherever it occurs in the world nowadays, occurs in a multilingual environment and as part of multilingual repertoires. Put simply, it means that whenever we look at English, we also need to look at the other languages with which it co-exists and co-occurs. Studying English in isolation is rapidly becoming an irrelevance, for much of what we ought to study has not much to do with English *per se*, but a lot with the multilingual contexts of which English has become a part. Another effect is that we must see languages, and certainly English, as mobile objects, no longer tied to an 'organic' speech community residing in a particular space, but moving around such places and communities in intensive ways, on the rhythm of globalizing flows of commodities, people, messages and meanings (Jacquemet 2005; Pennycook 2007; Blommaert 2010). English 'in' a certain place – say, 'English in Japan' – needs to be understood as something that is a result of highly complex patterns of mobility, as well as an instrument for mobility – for 'exporting', so to speak, Japanese messages to other parts of the world. Language is no longer a fixed thing, and our 'ecological' thinking about language in societies now demands adjustment to these new complexities.

The second point is a spin-off of the first one. There is an older tradition in sociolinguistics – the ethnographic tradition – in which 'language' itself is not the focal object, but the actual specific resources that people use in communication. The

work of Hymes (e.g. 1996) and Gumperz (e.g. 1982) is exemplary for the older tradition. Neo-Hymesian approaches have lately taken this 'resources' perspective further (e.g. Rampton 2006 Agha 2007, Blommaert 2010). Language, as we have seen, is no longer a fixed thing; it is also no longer a unified thing, and globalization processes again prompt us to take this seriously. Standard English is distributed in the world in fundamentally different ways than, say, HipHop English. Standard English orthography is also distributed in fundamentally different ways that the rapidly globalizing 'hetero-graphic' codes of mobile texting and chatting (of the type "CU@4"). So statements about 'the spread of English' to place X or Y instantly beg the question: which English? Which specific resources we associate with English are effectively being spread to X and Y? And what do people in X or Y effectively do with these resources? What are their precise functions in the multilingual contexts in which they enter, and in the multilingual repertoires of users?

One answer given by researchers to these questions is that terms such as 'English' obscure our analytic jargon and jeopardize empirical precision; instead, we should talk about 'languaging' (Jörgensen 2008) – the kind of dynamic 'bricolage' people perform when they communicate, gathering and creatively deploying any available useful communicative resource. 'Multilingualism' is equally experienced as a problematic term, given its suggestion of different 'languages' co-existing side by side; instead, scholars prefer terms such as 'transidiomatic practices' (Jacquemet 2005), 'polylingualism' (Jörgensen 2008; Blackledge & Creese 2010), 'metrolingualism' (Otsui & Pennycook 2010), 'translanguaging' (Creese & Blackledge 2010; Canagarajah 2011), 'polylanguaging' (Jörgensen et al. 2011) and 'lectal' patterns of shifting and mixing (Sharma & Rampton 2011) – terms that allow more flexible and precise descriptions of the actual work that enters into communication.

The central point to all of these attempts is that a 'language' in its actual reality only occurs in the shape of small fragments, 'features' in the terms of Jörgensen et al. (2011), as highly specialized resources that can be combined with any other available resource for the purpose of meaning making. Certain of these features are conventionally associated with (and hence indexical of) 'a language' such as English; others with 'French', 'Chinese' etc., and the conventionalized usage of such features is the enregisterment of a 'language' (Silverstein 2003, Agha 2007). The point, however, is that *all* of those features actually enter into meaning making processes, regardless of the conventional attributions we bestow on them. Meaning making, thus, should not be reduced to 'linguistic' meaning, but involves indexical, emblematic, aesthetic and other dimensions of meaning, and one should focus on the complex practices of enregisterment rather than on structures of 'language' in this process (Hymes 1996; Hanks 1996; Blommaert & Rampton 2011).

These two developments can be disturbing. The first one dislocates English, so to speak, and denies it its autonomy. Our basic imagination of 'English' should be that of a mobile object that can only be understood as to its actual function (and often also structure and patterns of occurrence) when it is considered as part of a larger set of linguistic objects. The second development further questions the nature of these objects, and suggests looking beyond 'language', at 'infra-linguistic' objects such as specific genres, registers, styles, accents, scripts and codes, as well as at the practices by means of which they are ordered as meaningful signs. Both developments dislodge

perhaps the oldest consensus in the study of language: that there is an object called 'language', that such objects come with a recognizable label (e.g. 'English') and that they can be studied as such and in isolation.

2. CRITICAL ISSUES AND TOPICS

When we now bring these issues to the study of English as a globalizing language, their dislodging effects become quite obvious. It is by now an uncontroversial assertion that the study of English as a world language has long been driven by what many see as the legacy of colonialism and imperialism projected onto an Eurocentric ideal-type of a monolingual and monocultural subject (e.g. Phillipson 1992; Canagarajah 1999, Makoni & Pennycook 2007; Kramsch 2009). The era of globalization, then, is presented as an extension of this form of imperialism, now operating by means of the widespread commodification of English across the globe (Block 2012; also Kelly-Holmes 2006, Blommaert 2009).

Since Braj Kachru's influential theses on the 'three circles' of English in the world (1990), scholars have increasingly seen English as a non-unified object, spread unevenly across the globe and appearing in a wide variety of 'Englishes'. A massive literature has emerged documenting the different varieties and different patterns of development and circulation of English(es) in the Inner, Outer and Expanding Circles of Kachru's model, pointing to the distinctive features of English in an L1, ESL and EFL context and emphasizing the specific characteristics of processes in specific areas in the world (see Bhatt 2001, Jenkins 2003). From this point onwards, and in spite of a multitude of rearguard fights, the paradigm of English in the world has become pluricentric (Bhatt 2001: 528) and non-native varieties of English have acquired both practical and scholarly respectability.

This point – the relative autonomy of non-native varieties – became central to another branch of scholarship, English as a Lingua Franca (ELF, see Seidlhofer 2005). In ELF, the perspective is that 'English is being shaped at least as much by its non-native speakers as by its native speakers' (Seidlhofer 2005: 339), and a systematic study of ELF should show the specific features and thresholds of English when used in non-native versus non-native exchanges, now no longer measured by the yardstick of the mythical native-speaker. ELF can thus be seen as a gesture towards the definitive 'decolonization' of English.

Two features need to be identified with respect to the World Englishes and ELF paradigm. One: there is a strong tendency to still see varieties of English as self-contained systems – a smaller 'language', so to speak – with finite sets of features characterizing each such variety (hence the emergence of 'Cameroonian English', 'Indian English', as well as 'Lingua Franca English', see Brutt-Griffler 2002). This tendency very much characterized the early literature on these topics and still re-emerges time and again. The second feature is the very strong focus on English language teaching permeating the scholarship on non-native varieties. The finality of identifying separate varieties of English is to improve its teaching practices around the world.

Both features have been criticized from within the tradition. Thus, authors such as

Canagarajah (2006), Baker (2009) and Seargeant (2009) emphasize the importance of local sociolinguistic and cultural features in ELF, including local language ideologies and patterns of sociolinguistic stratification; others question the definition of a unique function called 'lingua franca' applied to a multitude of speech genres (Berns 2009); still others identify a totalizing dimension in scholarship and advocate a closer integration of globalization studies and World Englishes (Dewey 2007, Pennycook 2010, Bolton, Graddol & Meierkord 2011). The absence of attention to the highly diversified and complex, as well as practice-driven nature of contemporary multilingual repertoires is a central preoccupation for Blommaert & Backus (2011). Perhaps the most trenchant critique is that of Park & Wee (2011), who emphasize the absence of attention to the actual structure of practices in ELF and who argue that what people perceive as 'English' emerges out of situated practices, not out of the linguistic system.

These critiques become inescapable as soon as work leaves formal language learning environments and enters less customary domains of language use. Kubota's studies of English in rural Japan and in informal learning and practice settings, for instance, challenges the dominant views of 'lingua franca' usage in ELF and calls for a more sociolinguistically sensitive approach (Kubota 2011; Kubota & Mc Kay 2009). Seargeant's work on new technological channels for language usage, first and foremost the Internet, documents amazing forms of creativity and complexity, defying most assumptions about stability (Seargeant & Tagg 2011, Seargeant 2009), something also observed in specific globalized cultural formats such as HipHop (Pennycook 2007) and in newly emerging 'supervernaculars' such as mobile phone texting codes (Blommaert 2011).

It is the recognition that English now penetrates potentially every aspect of social and cultural life, and spawns new and highly intricate practices of meaning-making, that creates a problem for the scope of traditional World Englishes and ELF studies, because the tremendous diversity of genres, styles and functions generated by and sustaining intensely developed informal learning environments produces a virtually infinite range of new forms of occurrence of 'English' – some minimal and almost 'homeopathic' (think of English expletives now effectively being global currency), others rather more elaborate, but all of them perpetually shifting along with extraordinarily dynamic normative complexes, and tied up with an equally dynamic range of identity opportunities (Blommaert & Backus 2011). Observe that such 'chaotic' patterns of language usage cover both the domain of spoken language and that of literacy practices, challenging the relevance of customary scholarly distinctions between both and prompting researchers to adopt a more flexible and encompassing semiotic approach (Blommaert & Rampton 2011). It is also evident that the recognition of this level of complexity invites a large number of fundamental questions, many of which have already been reviewed above. It is clear, however, that images of linguistic imperialism and neocolonialism ought to be replaced by more delicate views of sociolinguistic stratification in concrete communities, lest such images themselves become part of totalizing narratives about English in the world.

There thus seems to be a compelling case to at least complement the current studies on World Englishes and ELF with an ethnographic go-out-and-find-out approach in which little in the way of a priori assumptions is taken on board. The emergence of the vocabularyy of 'languaging', 'polylingualism' and so forth must be seen as part of

that effort, and as an illustration that researchers consciously and maximally avoid a priori assumptions that would curtail the scope of the phenomena that appear ready for investigation, and of interpretations of such phenomena. Static, absolute, decontextualized and a-temporal images of 'language' will not work, for what may appear as English in certain parts of the worlds could, after ethnographic inspection, in actual fact prove to be a form of another language that *looks like* English. Figure 1 provides an example for this.

FIGURE 1 HERE

Figure 1: 'Open', Tokyo Metro, 2009. ©Jan Blommaert

We see a publicity banner in a Tokyo Metro train. The banner contains Japanese text and one word that we can recognize as English: 'open'. In order to understand what that word actually does there – what exactly is 'open'? a shop? If so, which one? – we need to know Japanese. So here we have a small piece of 'English' for which English language competence does not help us to make sense of it; we need competence in Japanese. The single English-origin word has *emblematic* meanings: it gestures towards the indexical complex attributed to English in the peripheries of the English-using world, in which even a small dose of English signals upward mobility in a globalized world of commodities. The English here is (to quote one of Michael Silverstein's memorable phrases) 'indexical Viagra', and this emblematic meaning is part of a local, Japanese economy of signs and meanings. So linguistically, sociolinguistically, pragmatically and metapragmatically this 'English' word is, in fact, English-looking Japanese.

Needless to say that a gigantic amount of English in the world occurs in these curious forms nowadays: as an element in a peculiar 'polylingual' blend, largely detached

from its conventional functions and endowed with other functions – emblematic, iconic, aesthetic ones – for which a more refined analytical framework is required. We must realize that the core feature of globalization is mobility – of people, of bits of language, images, messages – and that mobility affects both the form and the function of the mobile objects. When English moves along the world, it is changed, even to the point where it only bears a distant family resemblance to its origins. In the study of contemporary English, such topics will not cease to gain importance, and there is little doubt that insights from work on them will provide amendments to the more established trends in English studies.

3. CURRENT CONTRIBUTIONS AND RESEARCH

Work on these topics has been underway for several years now; what is lacking at present is an integration of such work into mainstream English studies. Three bodies of particularly relevant recent work will be discussed. (a) Work on evolving contemporary urban vernaculars of 'English', often containing dense forms of 'crossing' and 'styling'. (b) Ethnographically-inspired linguistic landscaping, focused on the various ways in which 'languages' enter, affect and regulate public space, drawing on orders of indexicality in which 'English' assumes an elevated position, especially in peripheral areas of the English-using world. (c) Work on 'global flows' of popular culture using various forms of 'English': HipHop and reggae are cases in point, and the flows in which they appear are increasingly mediated by virtual environments.

3.1 Styling English

Ben Rampton's *Crossing* (1995) provoked a great amount of interest in the very unpredictable ways in which (especially young) people appropriate and deploy linguistic resources consciously in highly marked forms of identity-work called 'styling'. *Crossing* showed that identity preoccupations were a major factor animating the specific deployment of language resources, and identity opportunities were major motives for acquiring such resources. Rampton and his associates, in subsequent work, elaborated several of the major points raised in *Crossing*, and this tradition of research now stands as a neo-Hymesian, linguistic-ethnographic approach in which attention is paid to the actual situated interactional work performed by participants (Rampton 2006; Rampton & Charalambous 2010; Coupland 2007); the long and short cultural and ideological histories, notably of ethnicity and race, in which their practices need to be situated (Harris 2006); the unstable and flexible, almost 'ad lib' range of identity-styling practices young people can engage in (Bucholtz & Hall 2005; Coupland 2007); the effects of such forms of 'styling' on dominant sociolinguistic hierarchies (Jaspers 2011; Rampton 2010; Block 2012) and on dominant images of social class (Rampton 2006). Since this view 'from below' throws new light on general issues of language competence, the impact of this line of work on language teaching has also been spelled out in several papers (e.g. Harris, Leung & Rampton 2002).

As said, this body of work operates from within a linguistic-ethnographic paradigm, and the amount of spin-off work testifies to the reformulating potential of this paradigm. Several major implications can be identified. (1) From such work, we see

that many people use bits of language without 'knowing' it in the classic linguistic sense: they have no elaborate grammatical competence in the language they deploy. 'Full competence' is thus not a requirement for 'fluent' and meaningful language usage, and it is clear that both fluency and meaningfulness demand more refined definitions. This has fundamental implications for our established views of repertoires and speech communities, both foundational concepts being strongly predicated on knowledge of language. (2) People also often appear to defy existing dominant orders of indexicality in using language. Rampton described how 'white Anglo' youngsters consciously tried to acquire fluency in (little bits of) Jamaican Creole and Punjabi – stigmatized language varieties both in and out of school – because of the 'cool' such varieties tended to provide. This of course raises fundamental questions about the normativities that control sociolinguistic practices: in many parts of the world, Eminem rather than Shakespeare appears to provide the normative targets for English usage. (3) As for identities, such work has also shown that flexibility and permeability of identity boundaries appear to be the rule rather than the exception. People opt in and out of identity categories, often on the basis of topic, interlocutor or event type, deploying elements from what can best be described as an 'identity repertoire' (cf Blommaert 2005, chapter 8). (4) As for language learning, work in this tradition has demonstrated the power of informal learning environments and informal modes of language learning. People pick up small bits of language from any available source, and any such bit of language can become part of an indexical order that provides some kind of meaning.

Several of these points undoubtedly are an effect of the particular sociolinguistic intensity that characterizes multilingual communities of speakers. This is why , while the points have general validity, they have particular relevance for the study of English, for the reason given at the outset. English can no longer be seen as detached from the multilingual environments in which it operates, and the effects shown by the work discussed here are bound to appear, perhaps in different ways, elsewhere too. Their fundamental nature turns them into inescapable topics for reflection in English studies.

3.2 Ethnographic Linguistic Landscaping

The high degree of context-sensitivity articulating in the previously discussed line of work is equally present in a very recently emerging body of work, in which signs in public space are being analyzed ethnographically against the backdrop of locally prevailing linguistic, sociolinguistic and literacy economies. While this work has its origins in Linguistic Landscaping studies (e.g. Shohamy & Gorter 2009), it draws more inspiration from the seminal study of Scollon & Scollon (2003) and the work of Gunther Kress on multimodality (Kress 2010) and of Street and others on the social grounding of literacy (e.g. Street 1995). From this work, it derives a focus on detailed contextual accounts of the emplacement of public signs, the particular visual and linguistic resources that enter into it, often combining various scripts and symbol types, their local and translocal histories of distribution and use, and the specific functions such signs fulfill (Stroud & Mpendukana 2009; Pan Lin 2009, Juffermans 2010; Huang 2010, Blommaert 2010).

Thus, Huang's (2010) detailed study of London Chinatown shows how the

diachronically layered co-occurrence of Cantonese and traditional character script on the one hand, and Mandarin and simplified character script on the other, points towards a massive shift of demographic, political and economic relations inside the London Chinese community – a shift away from a largely Cantonese-dominated older diaspora towards a more recent mainland-dominated one, forcing a realignment of the older diaspora into a new sociolinguistic and cultural regime dominated by the symbols of Mainland China. Similarly, Juffermans' (2010) delicate study of public signs in urban and peri-urban contexts in Gambia was able to shed light on the different old and new patterns of distribution of linguistic and literacy resources across these communities, and on how such patterns co-occurred with larger economic and political ones. Ethnographic Linguistic Landscaping thus becomes a sensitive diagnostic tool for rapid social change, often long before such patterns of change begin to occur in demographic or other macro-sociological data.

In addition, this work begins to unravel the minutiae of written signs in public, demonstrating that writing, too, is always done 'with an accent', from the local sociolinguistic and literacy traditions, from local cultural templates, the specific patterns of distribution and access to linguistic and literacy resources, and so forth (cf Blommaert 2008; Juffermans 2010). We can see such an accent in Figure 2.

FIGURE 2 HERE

Figure 2: 'Fire exting uishr box' in the Forbidden City, Beijing, 2009. ©Jan Blommaert

In Figure 2, we see how English writing is graphically modeled upon the character writing of Chinese, leading to awkward forms of segmentation – a case of accent from

the locally dominant writing culture. Thus, apart from a more detailed and precise analysis of emplacement and function, this ethnographic approach to Linguistic Landscaping also digs into the 'small print' of written signs in public, knowing that the appearance of accents such as those in Figure 2 leads us towards histories of acquisition and learning, and so into the larger patterns of availability and accessibility of linguistic and literacy resources in certain places.

The relevance of this work is that it brings an ethnographic gaze to literacy as well as to space, denaturalizing both notions (often used as wastebasket categories) and raising questions about (1) the ways in which literacy products can (and should) be seen as part of larger sociolinguistic patterns in societies. They thus demand the full incorporation of literacy as a domain of inquiry into sociolinguistic research. (2) The structure and dynamics of communities in a particular area, the ways they cluster spatially, organize themselves and establish a politics of presence (or absence) in such areas. (3) The unpredictable (but not necessarily surprising) patterns of mixing and blending of literacy and other semiotic resources, reflecting degrees of competence, structures of repertoires, and trajectories of learning and acquisition of such resources. (4) With respect to the latter, we also see how often informal learning environments and informal learning procedures underlie the appearance of particular forms of literacy. This is worth underscoring, given the strong intuitive connection between literacy and formal learning trajectories: one normally learns how to write at school. This type of work, however, brings to the surface a wealth of literacy materials the genesis of which is a product of very much the same 'languaging' procedures as the ones discussed earlier. This, too, must have relevance for the wider field of language-and-literacy teaching and learning, if for nothing else because it can help overcome overly simplistic views of 'errors' in writing. 'Errors' are in fact very rich ethnographic objects.

As Figures 1 and 2 have shown, work on visual public inscriptions can be of significance for the study of English, since written inscriptions appear often in places where no spoken English can be heard (other, perhaps, than the urban vernaculars mentioned earlier). A great amount of English in the world these days is written and publicly displayed, and it co-occurs with other symbolic and semiotic resources. Wherever it occurs, it is integrated into locally valid semiotic systems and hierarchies. Neglecting this part of the phenomenology of English in the world is hard to motivate.

3.3 Global flows

The importance of informal learning environments becomes clearest when we start looking into the booming literature on English in the field of popular culture, now overwhelmingly mediated by technologies such as the Internet and mobile phones. Pennycook's influential (2007) study of global cultural flows provided a compelling case for taking such peer-group based learning and performance practices – often dismissed as counterproductive – seriously both as sociolinguistic phenomena of considerable importance, and for research on language teaching and learning. A similar case was made by James Gee (2003), who emphasized the pedagogical potential of video games (again, something that is very often dismissed as 'anti-learning'). The collaborative learning dimension of online activities was equally emphasized by Leppänen (2007) and Leppänen & Piirainen-Marsh (2009), and the

strongly normative (i.e. nonrandom) aspects of such processes were the focus of Varis & Wang (2011).

The latter paper, in line with Pennycook (2003, 2007), shows another phenomenon of great importance for English studies: the fact that a lot of English in the world is spread and taken up as *slang*, as a specialized 'non-standard' variety connected to the indexical appeal of particular popular culture formats such as HipHop or reggae. This point was also raised in the Ramptonian tradition discussed above; in work on new technologies and language, it becomes inescapable. What gets globalized is not just 'English with an accent', it is a complex of highly specific and specialized micro-varieties of English – 'supervernaculars' – the main function of which lies in their identity potential (cf also Cutler 2007). Such varieties are available through an expanding democratic market for language on the Internet (no fees are charged for watching Youtube clips) and their spread accounts for a vast amount of 'really existing' English in the world, often to the discomfiture of TESOL teachers. It is safe to say that the most effectively globalized varieties of English are not those of school curricula or business English training courses, but those of popular culture operating through slang varieties.

The sheer volume of material circulated and produced in these ways compels scholars of English in the world to accept this domain as a relevant field of study, the more since work on seemingly 'chaotic' varieties such as the supervernacular texting code shows that both the acquisition and the performance of such codes is subject to strict normative policing (Blommaert 2011; Velghe 2011). There is a substantial potential for comparison of formal and informal language learning practices here, with potentially relevant outcomes, for people who are extraordinarily fluent in the 'non-standard' English varieties are not always the ones with the highest marks for school English. There is also a tremendous potential for understanding the basic patterns of linguistic and cultural globalization, for while we see 'supervernaculars', their empirical reality is invariably that of a 'dialect', a locally inflected and 'accented' realization of global linguistic and cultural templates (Blommaert 2011; cf also Machin & Van Leeuwen 2003). This phenomenon should shed light on old discussions about distinctions between 'standard' and 'non-standard' varieties, and should have an influence on what one understands by 'lingua franca' in ELF.

4. FUTURE DIRECTIONS

The three bodies of sociolinguistic work discussed above all prompt a highly diversified and fragmented view of what one understands as 'English'. Rather than a 'language', we see a tremendous (and increasing) diversity-within-language. Many of these varieties circulate through and are acquired in informal learning environments such as peer groups, popular culture and new technologies. And the detailed ethnographic study of them raises fundamental questions affecting the foundations of our field.

If we take stock of these developments, we can sketch a future trajectory of sociolinguistic research, (a) in which 'English' will become an increasingly complex term begging for more nuanced descriptors, both as sociolinguistic-descriptive tools and as tools for analyzing identity processes; (b) in which both spoken and literacy

performances need to be considered in conjunction with one another, given the increasing prominence of interactive literacy media (blogs, chat, Twitter etc), and (c) in which we address 'English' from within the wider perspective of multilingual and multiliteracy repertoires, which compels us to adopt a dynamic and contextualized perspective on language and language usage.

REFERENCES

Agha, Asif

2007   *Language and Social Relations*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univesity Press

Baker, Will

2009   The cultures of English as a Lingua Franca. *TESOL Quarterly* 43/4: 567-592

Berns, Margie

2009   English as lingua franca and English in Europe. *World Englishes* 28/2: 192-199

Bhatt, Rakesh

2001   World Englishes. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 30: 527-550

Blackledge, Adrian & Angela Creese

2010   *Multilingualism: A critical perspective*. London: Continuum

Block, David

2012   Economising globalisation in Applied Linguistics in neoliberal times. In David Block, John Gray & Marnie Holborow (eds.) *Neoliberalism and Applied Linguistics*: 56-85. London: Routledge

Blommaert, Jan

2005   *Discourse: A critical introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

2008   *Grassroots Literacy: Writing, identoty and voice in Central Africa*. London: Routledge

2009   A market of accents. *Language Policy* 8/2: 243-259

2010   *The Sociolinguistics of Globalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

2011   Supervernaculars and their dialects. *Working Papers in Urban Language and Literacies*, paper 81.

Blommaert, Jan & Ad Backus

2011   Repertoires revisited: 'Knowing language' in superdiversity. *Working Papers in Urban Language and Literacies*, paper 67.

Blommaert, Jan & Ben Rampton

2011   Language and supediversity. *Diversities* 13/2: 3-21

Bolton, Kingsley, David Graddol & Christiane Meierkord

2011   Toward developmental World Englishes. *World Englishes* 30/4: 459-480

Brutt-Griffler, Janina

2002   *World English: A study of its development*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters

Bucholtz, Mary & Kira Hall

2005   Identity and interaction: A sociocultural linguistic approach. *Discourse Studies* 7/4: 585-614

Canagarajah, Suresh

1999   *Resisting Linguistic Imperialism in English Language Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press

2006   Negotiating the local in English as a Lingua Franca. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics* 26/1: 197-218

2011   Codemeshing in academic writing: identifying teachable strategies in translanguaging. *Modern language Journal* 95/3: 401-417

Coupland, Nikolas

2007   *Style: Language variation and identity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Creese, Angela & Adrian Blackledge

2010   Translanguaging in the bilingual classroom: A pedagogy for learning and teaching? *Modern Language Journal* 49/1: 103-115

Cutler, Cecelia

2007   The co-construction of whiteness in an MC battle. *Pragmatics* 17/1: 9-22

Dewey, Martin

2007   English as a Lingua Franca and globalization: An interconnected perspective. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics* 17/3: 332-354

Gee, James Paul

2003   *What Video Games have to Teach us about Learning and Literacy*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan

Gumperz, John

1982   *Discourse Strategies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Hanks, William

1996   *Language and Communicative Practice*. Boulder: Westview

Harris, Roxy

2006   *New Ethnicities and Language*. London: Palgrave

Harris, Roxy, Constant Leung & Ben Rampton

2002   Globalisation, diaspora, and language education in England. In David Block &
         Deborah Cameron (eds.) *Globalisation and Language Teaching*: 29-46.
         London: Routledge.

Huang, April

2010   *London Chinatown: A sociolinguistic ethnography of visuality.* PhD
         Dissertation, University of Jyväskylä.

Hymes, Dell

1996   *Ethnography, Linguistics, Narrative Inequality: Toward an understanding of
         voice*. London: Taylor & Francis.

Jacquemet, Marco

2005   Transidiomatic practices: Language and power in the age of globalization.
         Language and Communication 25/3: 257-277

Jaspers, Jürgen

2011   'This isn't possible anymore'. Indexical shifts in a white urban dialect.
         Working Papers in Urban Language and Literacies, paper 66.

Jenkins, Jenny

2003   *World Englishes*. London: Routledge

Jörgensen, Jens-Normann

2008   *Languaging: Nine years of polylingual development of young Turkish-Danish
         grade school students.* Copenhagen: Copenhagen Studies in Bilingualism.

Jörgensen, Jens-Normann, Martha Karrebaek, Lian Madsen & Janus Möller

2011   Polylanguaging in superdiversity. *Diversities* 13/2: 23-37

Juffermans, Kasper

2010   *Local Languaging: Literacy products and practices in Gambian society*. PhD
         Dissertation, Tilburg University

Kachru, Braj

1990   World Englishes and Applied Linguistics. *World Englishes* 9/1: 3-20

Kelly-Holmes, Helen

2006   Multilingualism and commercial language practices on the internet. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 10/4: 507-519

Kramsch, Claire

2009   *The Multilingual Subject*. Oxford: Oxford University Press

Kress, Gunther

2010   *Multimodality: A social-semiotic approach to contemporary communication*. London: Routledge

Kubota, Ryuko

2011   Learning a foreign language as leisure and consumption: enjoyment, desire, and the business of *eikaiwa*. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* 14/4: 473-488

Kubota, Ryuoko & Sandra McKay

2009   Globalization and language learning in rural Japan: The role of English in the local linguistic ecology. *TESOL Quarterly* 43/4: 593-619

Leppänen, Sirpa
2007   Youth language in media contexts: Insights into the functions of English in Finland. *World Englishes* 26: 149-169.
Leppänen, Sirpa & Piirainen-Marsh, Arja
2009   Language policy in the making: An analysis of bilingual gaming activities. *Language Policy* 8: 261-284.

Machin, David & Theo Van Leeuwen

2003   Global schemas and local discourses in *Cosmopolitan*. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 7/4: 493-512

Makoni, Sinfree & Alastair Pennycook (eds.)

2007   *Disinventing and Reconstituting Languages*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters

Otsuji, Emi & Alastair Pennycook

2010   Metrolingualism: Fixity, fluidity and language in flux. *International Journal of Multilingualism* 7/3: 240-253

Pan Lin

2009   Dissecting multilingual Beijing: The space and scale of vernacular globalization. *Visual Communication* 9/1: 67-90.

Park, Joseph Sung-Yul & Lionel Wee

2011   A practice-based critique of English as a Lingua Franca. *World Englishes* 30/3: 360-374

Pennycook, Alastair

2003   Global Englishes, Rip Slyme, and performativity. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 7/4: 513-533

2007   *Global Englishes and Transcultural Flows*. London: Routledge

2010   *Language as a Local Practice*. London: Routledge

Phillipson, Robert

1992   *Linguistic Imperialism*. London: Oxford University Press

Ramton, Ben

1995   *Crossing: Language and ethnicity among adolescents*. London: Longman

2006   *Language in Late Modernity: Interaction in an urban school.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

2010   From 'multi-ethnic urban heteroglossia' to 'contemporary urban vernaculars'. *Working Papers on Urban Language and Literacies*, paper 61.

Rampton, Ben & Costadina Charalambous

2010   Crossing: A review of research. *Working Papers in Urban Language and Literacies*, paper 58.

Scollon, Ron & Suzie Wong Scollon

2003   *Language in Place: Discourse in the material world.* London: Routledge

Seargeant, Philip

2009   *The idea of English in Japan*: *ideology and the evolution of a global language*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters

Seargeant, Philip & Caroline Tagg

2011   English on the internet and a 'post-varieties' approach to language. *World Englishes* 30/4: 496–514.

Seidlhofer, Barbara

2005   English as a lingua franca. *ELT Journal* 95/3: 339-341

Sharma, Devyani & Ben Rampton

2011   Lectal focusing in interaction: A new methdology for the study of superdiverse speech. *Working Papers in Urban Language and Literacies*, paper 79.

Shohamy, Elana & Durk Gorter (eds.)

2009   *Linguistic Landscape: Expanding the scenery*. London: Routledge

Silverstein, Michael

2003   Indexical order and the dialectics of sociolinguistic life. *Language and Communication* 23: 193-229

Street, Brian

1995   *Social Literacies: Critical approaches to literacy in development, ethnography and education*. London: Longman

Stroud, Christopher & Sibonile Mpendukana

2009   Towards a material ethnography of linguistic landscape: Multilingualism, mobility and space in a South African township. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 13/3: 363-386

Varis, Piia & Xuan Wang

2011   Superdiversity on the Internet: A case from China. *Diversities* 13/2: 71-83

Velghe, Fie

2011   Lessons in textspeak from Sexy Chick: Supervernacular literacy in South African instant and text messaging. *Tilburg Papers in Culture Studies,* paper 1.