

## CHAPTER ONE

# AFRICAN LITERACY IDEOLOGIES, SCRIPTS AND EDUCATION

ASHRAF ABDELHAY,  
YONAS MESFUN ASFAHA  
AND KASPER JUFFERMANS

What is literacy? Do you mean literacy as opposed to illiteracy – not being able to read and write? So your work is about being able to read and write – about reading and writing, is that right? (an educated layperson in conversation with two of the authors, Edinburgh, January 2012)

### **Introduction: Illiteracy as an artefact of oppression**

The above words are a reaction that professional linguists quite often get from the layperson to their conceptual metaphors of the trade. Institutional and public discourses all over the world normally recognise “illiteracy” and not “literacy”. Barton (2007: 214) was right when he made the following observation in a footnote: “in everyday writing the pejorative terms illiterate and illiteracy seem more common than the positive terms literate and ‘literacy’”. Functional literacy or “Literacy” with a big L (i.e., the sort of knowledge which enables you to write your name) is relatively devalued, in Bialostok’s (2002: 348) words, as “equivalent of the poverty line” (for a discussion see Cook-Gumperz 2006; Freire 1970; Mayo 1995; Kaplan and Baldauf 1997, 2003; Stierer and Bloome 1994). Similarly Liddicoat (2004) noted that functional perspectives on literacy aim to “equip literacy learners only with sufficient competence to operate at the lowest levels of mechanical performance required to meet the demands of a print-dominated culture”. It is also (un)remarkable that hegemonic institutional discourses tend to treat literacy as a “measurable skill”. And consequently “poor/low literacy rates” have ideologically become associated with specific macro-categories of identification such as Africa.

For instance, if you search the word “literacy” on Wikipedia (a public resource of relatively regimented knowledge), you get the following one-liner statement under the sub-heading “literacy in Africa”: “Currently, Africa is the continent with the lowest literacy rate in the world.” (Wikipedia: Literacy, last accessed July 2013). Suffice it to say that this essentialising collocation (“Africa” + “the continent” + “the lowest literacy rate” + “in the world”) crafted in “the ethnographic present” is ideological from top to bottom. This widely held ideology of literacy has significantly contributed to the construction of a particular “image” of Africa (imagined by this model of literacy as a bounded continent). By focusing on the cognitive (in)ability of a person to read and write, this ideological scheme of classification constructs what counts as “a normal person” (read: “modern”) in the process. The Eurocentric image of Africa is largely constructed through the variants of this technical discourse (i.e., a monolithic discourse on “literacy in Africa”). Hence a one-size-fits-all definition of literacy is assumed regardless of the cultural context and is couched in “either/or” terms: an individual is either “literate” or “illiterate”, a society, by extension, is made up of a percentage of literates and illiterates, and regions and countries and continents can be ranked according to such numerical logics (Bhola 1990). This renders “illiteracy” as an indexical statement of “shame and blame” into a form of “symbolic violence” (Bourdieu 1991; Bartlett and Holland 2002; Carrington 2001).

It is needless to assert that the above classroom-shaped and encyclopaedic-taxonomic view of literacy has reigned supreme in and out of formal regimes of socialisation. Literacy, as both a theoretical construct and empirical phenomenon, indeed incorporates print-based activities of reading and writing, but also significantly goes beyond them. To put it in more technical terms, writing and reading are not simply, even if ideologically made to mean, cognitive skills of encoding and decoding textual messages (“letteracy” in Shankar’s 2006 sense). Rather, they are basically communicative or pragmatic processes mutually shaped by the social orders (macro-structures) in which they are conducted. Hence, text artefacts (inscriptions) as visualised products (e.g., typewritten, published, painted, etc.) are traces of broader cultural practices and complex processes. However, with the risk of indexing the crude Marxist category of ideology (as false consciousness), the layperson may react to the technical word “complexity” in the same way she or he would react to the strange species of “literacies”, let alone compound metaphors such as “multimodal literacies”, “literacy ideologies”, “livelihood literacies”, “literacy performances”, to name just a few of the concepts discussed in this volume (see also Sinfree Makoni’s commentary chapter in this volume

on this point). Commenting on a set of technical concepts developed by professional linguistics, Barbe (2001:96) noted that:

Language itself is not really complex since everybody seems to be able to use it without any trouble. Many people in this world, even the so-called uneducated, are bi- or tri-lingual. It is like saying the actions of “walking” and “eating” are very complex. The complexity only appears in the process of analysis. Perhaps we like to give ourselves a pat on the back about our ability to be complex but it seems a rather empty praise.

As shown by colonial linguistic studies, the complex multilingual realities in Africa were studied (and in the process constructed) from an enumerating linguistic ideological perspective. In doing so, the colonial “regimes of language” (Kroskrity 2000a) created an epistemological version of multilingualism which devastatingly reduced the complexity of the interactional practices to a collection of well-demarcated monolingualisms (Errington 2008; Irvine and Gal 2000; Makalela 2005; Pennycook and Makoni 2005). This linguistic ideology is more visible in the discourses on “language endangerments” backed up by language-counting institutions such as the Ethnologue database of the Summer Institute of Linguistics (SIL) (see Duchêne and Heller 2007 and the articles therein; Said 1978; Moore, Piëtikainen and Blommaert 2010).

The point here is that a historically as well as an ethnographically informed understanding of literacy practices and discourses in Africa which rightly integrate these practices into the contexts in which they are used is needed as a way of questioning the applicability of instrumentalist ideologies of language. A critical historiography of African literacies is primarily concerned with the study of issues of “voice” and power in contexts through a problematising inspection of the “natural history” (Silverstein and Urban 1996) of literacy discourses, processes, and products. As the contributions in this volume show, and others elsewhere (e.g., Adejunmobi 2008; Canut 2001, 2010; Gafaranga 2007; Lüpke 2010; Martin-Jones, Kroon and Kurvers 2011; Mbodj-Pouye 2013; Mc Laughlin 2009), everyday communicative practices in Africa and its diaspora are inherently heteroglossic and fluid. And this observation, which is still widely unrecognised by formal educational institutions, challenges the institutional view of languages as self-contained and bounded objects.

The chapters in this volume interrogate the above normative “image” of Africa through the study of colonial and postcolonial histories, scripts, ideologies, and texts deployed in specific contexts by community members as part of their everyday practice. The contributors provide situated accounts about various literacy practices in Africa to critique the hegemonic

ideologies of literacy and language which mediationaly shape our interpretations of the world. Focusing on the various cultural forms of literacy in Africa rather than on the singular-literacy-in-Africa discourse helps develop a critical sociolinguistics of literacy to understand the ways in which textual practices and their associated ideologies contribute to the production of a plurality of images of Africa and its people. And it allows us to comprehend how and why instructional regimes of knowledge legitimate only one ortho-graphic way of “reading the world” (Freire 1970). The key aim of the volume, among others, is to investigate the histories and social-cultural conditions that have informed our (mis)understanding of literacies in various contexts in Africa through a focus on specific case studies. Most of the chapters engage with the task of critically inspecting both the ideological effects and perspectives on literacy development situated within the material conditions of existence. As a disclaimer, although the book contains works from recent and ongoing research carried out in/on Africa, it makes no claim to be comprehensive or sufficiently representative for the entire “continent”, neither geographically, nor in scope of the literacy practices surveyed.

The book reveals a particular disciplinary perspective on literacy. In the various chapters, literacy is studied from a usage-, practice-, or performance-based perspective, highlighting the social, cultural, historical and ideological dimensions of literacy in context. The contributors to this book broadly subscribe to the assumptions underlying the framework of New Literacy Studies (henceforth NLS). The NLS engages with the above issues and draws on various research traditions including semiotics, social anthropology, social theory, and critical discourse analysis. The remaining part of this introduction is structured in the following way: in the next section we review the key assumptions underlying the hegemonic (skills-oriented) perspective on literacy and illiteracy, i.e., technically termed by Street (1984) an “autonomous” view of literacy. Then we discuss the conceptual model of NLS which basically emerged as a critique of the autonomous view of literacy. The final two sections provide a broad overview of a cluster of key concepts used in the field of NLS with a focus on the notions of “superdiversity” and “supervernacular”. We conclude this introductory chapter with an overview of the different contributions in this book.

Before we proceed we should flag up the following caveat. The field of literacy studies continues to be substantially updated and productively extended with the development of new conceptual tools and theories which are (being) tested with a huge amount of empirical research. It is beyond the capacity of an editorial chapter of this size to do justice to the

entire literature in the field of literacy studies. So we have settled for a broad review of key issues and themes in the field as a foundation for contextualising the contributions to the volume, revealing that this at the same time marks our limitations and biases in surveying the field.

We will begin our review with a discussion of Africa's old endogenous literacy traditions and newer script inventions.

### **Africa's script traditions and inventions**

The development of literacy in Africa seen as a whole certainly predates the histories of European colonialism and Islamic conquest. Among Africa's ancient script traditions are the world's oldest known scripts, including the Egyptian "sacred carvings", the hieroglyphs (since ca. 3000 BCE), and the other scripts and literacy/literary traditions found in the old Nile Valley civilizations, including Hieratic, Demotic, Coptic, Old Nubian, and Meroitic (Baines 1983). Those ancient scripts that are still (or again) in use today, include Ge'ez, Nsibidi and Tifinagh. In the Horn of Africa syllabic Ge'ez developed since 500 BCE as the liturgical language and holy script of the Ethiopian Orthodox Church and survived until today as the common script for Amharic and Tigrinya in Ethiopia and Eritrea (cf. Hailemariam 2002; Asfaha 2009; Ashafa, Kurvers and Kroon 2008 and in this volume). The thousand-year-old Nsibidi system of ideo- and pictographic symbols is used by the Ekoi, Efik and Igbo people in present-day Akwa Ibom and Cross River states in Southeast Nigeria (around Uyo and Calabar) and consists of common, decorative signs, "dark signs" representing danger and extremity, and the secret signs of rank and ritual known only by initiated elites (Akinasso 1996; Macgregor 1909; Nwosu 2010). There are other documented forms of proto-writing indigenous to Africa, including the Adinkra symbols of the Ashanti of Ghana (Danzy 2009) and various traditions of graphic symbols and arts in Congo (Faik-Nzuji 2000). In the Maghreb, Tifinagh (or Neo-Tifinagh), currently one of the three official scripts in Morocco, is the 20<sup>th</sup>-century revived version of the ancient syllabic script of the Phoenician-Carthaginian Empire (3rd century BCE to 3rd century CE) (see also El Aissati in this volume).

Notwithstanding these ancient literacy traditions, it was mainly the Christian and Islamic missions who actively developed vernacular literacies in the Roman and Arabic scripts associated with Christianity and Islam, respectively. These missionary views of literacy and religion not only created their own versions of social reality, they also invested the Latin and Arabic script (and their orthographies) with specific indexicalities or cultural images of "modernity", "clarity", "reason", as opposed to pre-

Christian and pre-Islamic belief and knowledge systems. In other words, missionary literacy planning succeeded in the creation of “standard images” of African linguistic continua, either as delineated and compartmentalised African languages modelled after European nation-statism accomplished in Bible translations, or as vernacular scribal practices existing in the shadow of the sublime Classical Arabic of the untranslatable Qur’an, but destroyed the local cultures once integrated with local ways of speaking (Barton 2007; Canut 2001; Pennycook and Makoni 2005; Sanneh 1989).

This point needs to be nuanced. For the Ethio-Eritrea region at least, Christianity and Islam, and their Ge’ez and Arabic literacy practices, pre-date European missionaries and colonialism by at least a 1000 years. Protestant and Catholic missionaries came to the region to convert Copts and Muslims and tried to shake the existing traditions in these two communities by for example writing the Bible in local languages undermining the authority of the Orthodox Church only much later. So Christianity does not necessarily equate with European colonialism in this part of Africa, because Christianity was already present and what European missionaries sought to do was “modernize” the Orthodox Church by local language Bible translations.

Colonialism has made an impact on Africa’s language and literacy ecology not only by importing scripts and traditions from elsewhere, but equally in the indigenous creative reactions it triggered. Within the historical conditions of, but also in response to, colonialism, and as part of local religious practices and spiritual movements, a series of indigenous African writing systems were developed in the 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> centuries, particularly in West Africa, but also in other parts of the continent (see Dalby 1967, 1968, 1969; Mafundikwa 2004; Rovenchak 2010; Slager 2008).

Cooper (1991), with reference to Dalby (1967, 1968, 1969), points out that the writing systems that emerged in colonial West Africa commonly derived their legitimacy from divine revelation and inspiration. This is the case, for instance, for the Loma of Liberia and Guinea, whose script was revealed in the 1930s to inventor Wido Zobo in a dream. On Wido Zobo’s request, God granted the power of writing (exclusively to men) on the condition that his people would respect their traditions and the secrets of initiation. A similar myth is reported for the Vai syllabary, which was developed a century earlier (around 1830) and is the oldest and perhaps most well-known of the modern invented indigenous West African scripts. This is also the script that features in Scribner and Cole’s (1981) classic study on the psychology of literacy. The Vai script was revealed to inventor Momolu Duwalu Bukele of Jondu in spiritual revelation.

Following the invention of the Vai script by a century, other notable indigenous writing systems that were developed in the same region, i.e. the region formed by current states of Liberia, Sierra Leone, Côte d'Ivoire and Guinea, include the Mende (1921), Bambara Masaba (1930), Kpelle (1930s), and Bété (1950s) syllabaries and the Bassa Vah (1920) and N'ko (1949) alphabets.

Elsewhere, in the Cameroonian Grassfields, the pictographic-syllabic scripts of Bamum and Eghap/Bagam – the latter considered “lost” until recently (Tuchscherer 1999) – were devised and in use for only a few decades around 1900 (1896-1931 for Bamum). At the same time in the Horn of Africa, around 1920, the Osmanya alphabet for Somali was devised, the first and most widely used of three scripts proposed by members of different clans – the others being Borama (ca. 1933) and Kaddare (ca. 1952). Another idiosyncratic form of literacy is informed by the functional need to identify livestock (particularly camels). Drawing on literacy work created by the local Sudanese in the 1950s, the Summer Institute of Linguistics (SIL) developed a script built around a sampling of the markings on livestock in western Sudan and eastern Chad, the so-called Zaghawa Beria or “camel” script (see SIL International 2006). Examples of scripts devised around independence include the Garay alphabet for Wolof (1961), the Nwagu Aneke Igbo syllabary (1960), the Ba and Dita alphabets for Fula developed in Mali (1963 and 1958-1966).

More recently in Central Africa, in the D.R. Congo, the Mandombé script was invented by Wabeladio Payi in the Lower Congo in 1978 after it was revealed to him, also in a dream, by the then already deceased Simon Kimbangu, founder and prophet (“*envoyé spécial de Jésus Christ*”) of the Kimbanguist Church. Yet other more recently invented scripts include the Mwangwego alphabet for Malawian languages (developed by Nolence Mwangwego since 1979 and officially “inaugurated” in 1997, see <http://mwangwego.com>, last accessed November 2013). Even more recently in West Africa, the Adlam script was created in 1987 in N'Zérékoré (south Guinea) by the brothers Abdoulaye and Ibrahima Barry. It is an alphabetic script influenced by N'ko and reported to be used for dialects of Pular. There are a couple of primers published for the Adlam script and there is a website dedicated to the script and related education and literacy promotional activities: <http://windenjangen.org>. (Davydov, in press; Dmitry Bondarev, personal communication). The website, operated from the organisation's headquarters in New York City, gives the following pragmatic account of the genesis of the script:

My brother and I were in the habit of reading the letters that were sent to my Dad after he had finished reading them. Therefore we experienced

firsthand the challenge of reading these letters [written in Pular using the Arabic script] that we found amusing at the end. We got so good at reading them or more like guessing them that my Dad finally preferred to hand me or my brother the letters to read to him. It was in this context that one day we asked our Dad if the Fulbhe had their own alphabet and he responded no. On that day we promised him that we will invent our Alphabet to make reading letters and communication much easier between the Fulbhe. ([http://windenjangen.org/what\\_is\\_adlam](http://windenjangen.org/what_is_adlam)).

The most recent African script invention known to us is the Miriden alphabet for Maninka. Strongly influenced by N'ko, Miriden (meaning “fruit of mind”, lit. “thought-child”) is a one-user script created in 2011 by Yacouba Diakité in the town of Siguiri in northeast Guinea. Although Diakité published an ABC-primer in Miriden, he is reported (by Davydov, in press) to be the only user of his script (Bondarev, personal communication).

The majority of scripts devised in the early 20th Century have not proven to be very viable alternatives for the great imperial script traditions transplanted to Africa as part of European colonialisms and the spread of Islam. Unseth (2011: 27) notes that most of the (West) African invented scripts are unsuccessful, “failed scripts”. Rovenchak (2012) even maintains that “in most cases new scripts can be classified as ‘individual writing systems’ rarely expanding beyond a closed circle of friends and relatives”. It is not clear how widely King Ibrahim Njoya’s invention, the Bamum script, was used since its invention in 1896, but it apparently ceased to be used when Njoya was exiled in 1931 and died two years later; Romanised Wolof and Wolofal (Wolof transcribed in Ajami) are much more generally used in Senegal today than Garay; in Somalia none of the three indigenous scripts, but Latin, has been promoted for Somali literacy since 1972. Today, only Ethiopia, Eritrea and Morocco have granted official status to (languages making use of) scripts other than Latin and Arabic, i.e. to Ge’ez or Ethiopic for Amharic and Tigrinya and Tifinagh for Berber respectively. In fact, it remains to be seen if the more recent African script inventions such as Mwangwego and Adlam will be able to acquire and maintain large and sustainable communities of users and generate a diversified range of contexts for its use. Meanwhile, the only two more successful modern invented scripts are Vai and N’ko.

N’ko is a special case as this alphabet, modelled after Arabic in 1949 by Souleyman Kanté in Kankan, Guinea, has been disseminated beyond the original Maninka speaking area in northeast Guinea, into Dyula and Bamanankan (Bambara) speaking communities in Côte d’Ivoire and southern Mali respectively. The social movement of N’ko (meaning “I say” in the various Manding language varieties) promotes N’ko as a script



for the whole Manding cluster, as a harmonised literary koiné that unites the scattered Manding peoples across state borders and Anglo- and Francophone divides, and reconnects with their common, precolonial past (Oyler 2005; Wyrod 2008).

Dalby (1969: 180; cited in Unseth 2011) points out that

Many – if not all – of the inventors were impelled by the desire to demonstrate the ability of Africans to create their own forms of writing, independent of either European or Arabic systems. In this respect, the scripts have a motivation that is comparable to that of the indigenous African churches. This search for African “independence” is reflected in the way that Kantè maintains the independence of his script from either the occidental or oriental influence ... and by the claim that both [these scripts] are suitable for writing *all* African languages.

These invented scripts were developed, mostly not out of practical considerations given that other scripts were already available and firmly established, but out of ideological considerations, as “efforts to strengthen ethnic identities” (Unseth 2011: 23). Coupled with strong claims of identity and dignity, these scripts can be seen as articulations of ethnic and/or pan-Africanist revival, as projects developing intellectual independence and autonomy in reaction to European colonisation. No invention, however, happens in isolation of earlier inventions, in absence of inspiration from what has gone before. And indeed, like all other scripts, the African script inventions were inspired by, or modelled after existent scripts, including Arabic and Latin. As Unseth, again citing Dalby (1968: 160), notes, “all creators of WAIS [West African invented scripts] had previously been exposed to linear writing in the Arabic and/or Roman alphabets” and “were aware of the Vai script, and often one of the other WAIS that it had inspired.” Vai, in its turn, may have been inspired by the Cherokee syllabary, brought to Liberia from the US by Cherokee emigrant Austin Curtis who may have explained its basic workings, directly or indirectly, to inventor Bukele (Tuchscherer and Hair 2002).

Collins (2006: 251) notes that “orthographies (systems of inscription) are never neutral phenomena. They are instead often the object of sharp controversy over the best (i.e., the most authentic or scientific) way to represent a given language”. These debates passionately run through the histories of the African invented script. However, it is literacy in ex-colonial languages that prevailed in postcolonial Africa. Even N’ko, with Vai, one of the most successful African scripts remains relatively marginalised:

Since ... speakers of Mande languages maintain a significant presence throughout West Africa, Mande language literacy in N’ko cannot be

considered a minority language phenomenon. However, the institutional dominance of European language literacy and Latin-based literacy has subjected N'ko to a kind of marginalization akin to that of a minority language. (Wyrod 2008: 31)

However, we should note that although there have been indigenous literacy traditions in Africa, the concept of “indigeneity” cannot always be unproblematically interpreted as “local” (read: non-Western). On the contrary, in some African contexts, western discourses on language and literacy rights were enforced through what is perceived as local practice (see Abdelhay 2010a, and in this volume).

### **Monoglossic ideologies of language and literacy**

Cook-Gumperz (2005, 2006) argued that literacy as a sociocultural phenomenon should be regarded as part of an ideology of language. Language ideologies are defined from a linguistic anthropological perspective as “sets of beliefs about language articulated by the users as a rationalization or justification of perceived language structure and use” (Silverstein 1979: 193; for a detailed discussion see the volumes by Blommaert 1999; Joseph and Taylor 1990; Kroskirty 2000a; Schieffelin, Woolard and Kroskirty 1998). The anthropological work of Sapir (1921) and Whorf (1956) on non-Anglo-Saxon cultures provided the foundational insights for much of this ideological frame which was based on the premise that “the way people who speak a certain language form an ideology of reference, an understanding at the conceptual level of how their language represents ‘nature’” (Silverstein 1979: 202). The ultimate aim is “to capture the ideological structuring of society in and through language and discourse” (Mertz and Yovel 2000: 5). In other words, the objective is to understand the ways in which the wider social structure is reproduced, maintained or resisted in and through actual social practices. Kroskirty (2000b) suggested that language ideologies as a meta-level metaphor should be treated as a cluster concept with four related aspects: (a) as a socially-shared perception of language and discourse constructed to serve the interests of a specific community; (b) as profitably multiple as an effect of the plurality of meaningful social differentiation (e.g. class, gender); (c) as an articulated metapragmatic awareness with varying degrees, and (d) as a nexus of social structures and forms of speech.

The focus on language ideologies with respect to literacies should allow us to highlight issues of agency, power relations and social inequality. Most important, the concept of language ideology as theorised by linguistic anthropology is employed to link micro-interactive events

with macro-social structures such as identity and power. For example, Woolard (1998a: 3) stated that

Ideologies of language are not about language alone. Rather, they envision and enact ties of language to identity, to aesthetics, to morality, and to epistemology. Through such linkages, they underpin not only linguistic form and use but also the very notion of the person and the social group, as well as such fundamental social institutions as religious ritual, child socialization, gender relations, the nation state, schooling, and law.

As we detail in the next section, the NLS as a research strand to literacy views the acts of reading and writing as fundamentally social practices that embody “nonobservable ideologies” (Bialostok 2002: 348) or “a cognitive-ideological dimension” (Collins 2006: 247) of what counts as writing and reading. Asfaha, Kurvers and Kroon in this volume situate their study on literacy instruction in Eritrea within this perspective by viewing literacy not only as a social practice rooted in the cultural practices of the communities under study but also as cognitive processes of learning codes among school children. Ideologies of language and literacy are also profitably multiple as a result of the plurality of the interested positions. Language ideologies are inherently implicated in the temporality of social existence in that as historical products, they structure and shape the ways in which communicative practices are interpreted. Hence, language ideologies are basically cultural models of temporalities (Eisenlohr 2004).

Harmonising ideologies of language (Bakhtin’s 1981 “monoglossia”) are constructed to ensure verbal and social unification. Variation or difference (Bakhtin’s 1981 “heteroglossia”) which is a micro-interactional reality often manifested in a single utterance is valued by these macro-centralising frames as a problem (Kamberelis and Scott 1992). Hegemonic ideologies conceptualise language and literacy as, among others, uniform, autonomous, permanently fixed, invariably stable, regardless of the context in which they are used (Street 1984; also García and Torres-Guevara 2010). The point here is that human language viewed as a concrete cultural practice is “polyglot from top to bottom” (Bakhtin 1981: 291). Yet, the view of language and literacy as monolithic is an “invention” (Makoni and Pennycook 2007) through processes of nation-state ideologies aiming at the creation and maintenance of an “imagined community” (Anderson 1991). That is, the trajectory that led to the emergence of the autonomous view of literacy is the 19th-century ideology of nationalism (Gal and Irvine 1995; Heller 2007; Joseph and Taylor 1990). In their critical historiographical study of a local literacy movement

in the Nuba Mountains of Sudan, Abdel Rahim Mugaddam and Ashraf Abdelhay in this volume exemplify how colonial (missionary) activities used “Romanisation” as a discursive strategy of social differentiation between the Arabised groups and the Nuba.

The European (missionary) colonial project in Africa and other parts of the world text-artefactualised local speech (languages converted into “things” through inscription), creating in the process “an official image” of linguistic pluralism and social categories incommensurable with the reality on the ground (Errington 2008; Blommaert 2008b; Irvine and Gal 2000; Makoni and Pennycook 2007; Said 1978; Mugaddam and Abdelhay in this volume). Collins (2006: 252) stated that an “artefactualized language is subject to different dynamics of accumulation and distribution than nonartefactualized language, with different potentials for ideological articulation and institutional consolidation”. The reification of literacy is evidenced in the use of metaphors which treat literacy as a “skill” that can be broken down into a set of sub-skills, and which in turn can be possessed and transferred (thus “transferrable skills”, Barton 2007). In the context of Pacific countries, Mühlhäusler (1996) contended that the reification of literacy has transformed communicative practices into objects we now call “language”. He argued that “the reification of language is basically a result of literacy” (1996: 238; for a discussion see Charpentier 1997; Crowley 1999, 2000; Siegel 1997). It is remarkable that most of campaign-based literacy programmes deploy metaphors of eradication (Kaplan and Baldauf 1997, 2003; Liddicoat 2004; Cushman et al. 2001). Slogans such as “stamp out illiteracy” (rendered literally, for example, in Arabic as *maḥw al-ummiyya*) conceptualise “illiteracy” as a thing to be “erased/eradicated”. So what is ideologically reified here is the absence of alphabetic literacy. The point here is that local literacy programmes should go beyond this “minimalised functionalist concept of literacy” (Agnihotri 1994) to engage with wider issues such as inequality and power relationships in a society (see Freire 1970; Lankshear 1993; Levine 1982; Papen 2001; Tollefson 1996). As Liddicoat (2004) showed, this functionalist view of literacy ignores the construction of emancipatory practices.

The point is that colonialism and imperialisms have political, religious and linguistic components and that contemporary literacy practices and traditions reflect these multilayered histories (see Abdelhay 2010b; Abdelhay et al. 2011). Lüpke and Bao Diop in this volume discuss West Africa’s literacy tradition as exographic, i.e., imported (see also Lüpke 2011). For example, the Roman script was brought along with Christianity and Western-modelled state apparatuses. The Arabic script was brought to larger parts of Africa as a result of immigration and the religious

imperative to spread Islam and its Qur'an which was revealed in Arabic – the variety then spoken in the Arabia peninsula where Islam originated (in Western scholarship it is categorised as “classical/Qur'anic Arabic”). These foreign interventions left an infrastructure of language and literacy that is largely endorsed and normalised by postcolonial governments (on the effect of colonialism on local language policies in North Africa, see Bassiouney 2009). Some social ecologies in Africa, however, have creatively appropriated, incorporated and integrated foreign traditions of learning into their own. Yet, what remains to be known is not just the historical genealogy of literacy traditions in Africa (i.e., whether they are “indigenous” or “imported”), but how, and for whom, they are organised and valued in the given sociolinguistic system. The 19<sup>th</sup>-century modernist project has reduced the diverse multiple literacy practices at the pedestrian-scale level to one monolithic “literacy” at the official, nation-state scale level; hence literacy or a “named language” has been turned into an instrument of semiotic governance and control with serious consequences (Rockhill 1987; Bauman and Briggs 2003). Blommaert and Rampton (2011: 4) noted that the orthodox concept of “a language” is an “ideological artifact with very considerable power – it operates as a major ingredient in the apparatus of modern governmentality”. This resonates with Romaine's (1994: 84) argument:

The very concept of discrete languages is probably a European cultural artefact fostered by procedures such as literacy and standardization. Any attempt to count languages will be an artefact of classificatory procedures rather than a reflection of communicative practices.

Foucault's (1981) concept of “governmentality” allows us to focus on the ways in which socially constructed categories of interaction (“language”, “dialect”, “ethnicity”, “literacy”, etc.) are deployed in practice to establish particular hierarchical regimes of knowledge and power in which linguistic usage is regulated and controlled. Viewed from this epistemological perspective, language and literacy development take place within dynamic social contexts saturated with power and conflict (García 2009a; García and Torres-Guevara 2010). However, literacy and language education are mechanically defined from the perspective of the state “school” as a technology that can be taught and understood independently of social ecologies of use.

Another monoglossic feature of this literacy paradigm is that it correlates alphabetic literacy with cognitive development (García 2009b; del Valle 2005). It is this ideology of scriptal inscription which is strongly promoted by the school. Here we are talking not just about a particular

form of literacy, but we are talking about a particular “state ideological apparatus” (Althusser 1971) or a regime of contemporary power of identity formation through the authorisation and circulation of “correct” practices of writing and reading (Baquedano-López 1997; Collins 2006; Collins and Blot 2003; Hornberger 2002; Jaffe 1999; Lemke 2002; Rex and Green 2008; Varenne and McDermott 1998; Street 1993; Wang, Juffermans and Du 2014). Hence, out-of-school empirical phenomena such as bilingualism, grassroots literacies, and other globalised semiotic resources are invalidated as “abnormal”, “deviant”, or “incorrect”. Print-based literacy, by contrast, is associated with cognitive development, rationality, and progress, etc. Graff (1979) termed these taken-for-granted beliefs as “literacy myth”.

The functionalist model frames literacy in a-historical and technological terms effecting the social stratification of groups into “illiterate vs. literate” (though the academic discourse contrasts “literacy” with “orality/oracy”; on the archaeology of the term “literacy” see Barton 2007 and Bartlett 2008). Social differentiation is a fundamental process through which this model of literacy officially operates. Further, this “monoglot” (Silverstein 1996) ideology of literacy holds that a person should learn to read and write in “a language” (Barton 2007). This social restriction is explicitly exercised by national examinations of functional literacy or citizenship tests which allow exams to be conducted in specific languages and not others (see e.g., Extra, Spotti and Van Avermaet 2009). Inspecting institutional or normative restrictions on literacy is key to understanding how literacies are socially patterned and organised (Barton 2007), how literacies dominate, disempower and marginalise, how they can be “powerful” (Crowther, Hamilton and Tett 2001).

Moreover, literacy is treated narrowly as a discrete variable whose effects on the individual and society can be deduced from its intrinsic segregationable structure (Harris 1981) from the context in which it is used. Thus literacy is conceptualised by researchers such as Goody (1968: 40) as “an autonomous mode of communication”. Ong (1982: 132) provided a canonical stance when he noted that “by isolating thought on a written surface, detached from any interlocutor, making utterance in this sense autonomous and indifferent to attack, writing presents utterance and thought as uninvolved in all else, somehow self-contained, complete.” A final remark about this monoglot ideology of literacy is that it views literacy as an abstract cognitive instrument with functional neutrality. For example, Olson (1988: 28), a proponent of this view, held that

When writing began to serve the memory function, the mind could be redeployed to carry out more analytic activities such as examining

contradictions and deriving logical implications. It is the availability of an explicit written record and its use for representing thought that impart to literacy its distinctive properties.

The above perspective on literacy was subjected to intense criticism particularly by social anthropologists who problematised, among other things, the literacy-orality divide. The ethnographic work of Heath (1983), Street (1984), Finnegan (1988), among others, are the classic critiques (see Collins and Blot 2003 for a discussion). Street (1984, 1995) has provided the most influential rebuttal of the above approach to literacy which he termed the “autonomous model of literacy”. Liddicoat (2004: 8) noted:

In an autonomous literacy model, the purpose of literacy learning is to imbue an acceptance of the dominant ideologies and to enhance the economic productivity of the nation. The model is therefore oriented to the development of human capital, in which intellectually trained workers are central to the functioning of the workforce and economy, and knowledge becomes a commodity with economic value.

Street’s (1984, 1995) alternative is called the “New Literacy Studies” (NLS) which is fundamentally developed as an ethnographic critique (with an interventionist agenda) of the autonomous approach to literacy. Generally, sociolinguistic and ethnographic discourse analytic studies of literacy are intended to “reconstitute” (Makoni and Pennycook 2007) the above sketched linguistic view of “literacy”. In the next section, we broadly review the ideological agenda of the NLS.

### **The end of “Literacy”: A sociolinguistic reconstitution of the field**

Ethnographic sociolinguistic insights have shifted the focus on literacy viewed as “autonomous” skill to the actual practices and ideological conceptions of reading and writing (Al-Kahtani 1996; Street 1984, 1993, 1995). In other words, literacy is taken as a “social practice” rather than an individual-psychological skill (Street 1984; Collins 2006; Papen 2005). The NLS as a broad conceptual framework informed by these insights assumes that understanding literacy requires an ethnographic perspective which provides detailed accounts of literacy practices in different social contexts (Street 1993, 2011).

Street’s (1984) concept of literacy practices is patterned on and provides an extension of Heath’s (1983) widely celebrated notion of “literacy event” (more on this term below). Heath (1982: 50) identified “literacy

events” as “occasions in which written language is integral to the nature of participants’ interactions and their interpretive processes and strategies”. Literacy practice is employed in the NLS to refer to two interrelated levels of cultural analysis: at one level it refers to the observable and documentable situated events mediated by literacy resources (e.g., texts) and at another higher-level of generalisation it refers to cultural models or socially recognisable patterns of interaction which are sedimented or traceable from observed literacy practices, i.e., texts are instances of cultural practice (Baynham and Prinsloo 2009; Kell 2011; Rowsell and Pahl 2007; Street 1984; Tusting, Wilson and Ivanič 2000). Thus, the field of NLS goes beyond mere documentation of literacy practices to recognise the role of institutional power embedded in activities (Street 1993). This means that “new literacies” in the NLS are also taken seriously to refer to non-Western, unrecognised, subaltern or grassroots genres and complex patterns of inscription used in and outside the monoglot settings of the nation-state (Blommaert 2008a; Street 1993). The model attempts to relate acts of writing and reading to wider cultural conceptions which provide the normative frame of interpretation for these acts (Collins and Slembrouck 2007). The NLS uncompromisingly operates with an explicit ideological agenda. Street (1993: 7-8) argues that

Since all approaches to literacy in practice will involve some such bias, it is better scholarship to admit to and expose the particular “ideological” framework being employed from the very beginning: it can then be opened to scrutiny, challenged and refined in ways which are more difficult when the ideology remains hidden.

Street deployed the term “ideology” not in its old-fashioned Marxist sense of “false consciousness”, but rather in the linguistic-anthropological sense reviewed in the previous section. Ideology is a site of conflict between power and resistance which is articulated through a variety of cultural practices including language and literacy (Street 1993: 8). Yet, by adopting an overt ideological position on literacies, the NLS does not deny the technical or the cognitive aspects of reading and writing but rather situates them within cultural contexts and structures of power. The point here is that the issue of discursive variation and choice cannot be adequately grasped without the interpretive plane of language ideologies.

Street (1993: 2) argued that “the acquisition, meaning and use of different literacy practices have ideological character” which was disrecognised by the autonomous approach to literacy. Treating literacy as socially constructed phenomenon, socio-cultural approaches to literacy reject the “segregationist” (Harris 1981) assumptions underpinning “school



literacies” (e.g., “English literacy”) with significant implications for understanding other sociolinguistic phenomena such as “bilingualism”, “literacy development”, and “language-in-educational planning”. The shift from the “linguistic” to the “sociolinguistic” view of literacy is aimed to focus on the cultural events and practices through which various forms of literacy are differentially valued and ranked (Cook-Gumperz 2006; Street 1984; Banda 2003; Cook 2009, see also Openjuru’s chapter in this volume).

A linguistic approach to literacy views (named) languages and literacies as self-contained entities used as a “conduit” (Reddy 1979) for information transaction, while a sociolinguistic perspective stresses the situated use of these resources. There has certainly been a paradigm shift (Kuhn 1996) in the study of literacy (Barton 2007; Mühlhäusler 2000). The ethnographic perspective on the study of literacy and language requires: 1) examining the material context of production, reproduction and socialisation into various cultural practices; 2) constructing reflexive theories and critical methods of analysis that are interested not in literacy and language as predetermined categories but rather as a product of interactional practices, and 3) focusing on history and power through a perpetually dynamic analysis of speech repertoires and registers deployed in interaction, 4) viewing repertoires of cultural meanings (the totality of semiotic resources available to a community’s member) as always unfinished business and developing across the lifespan (Hymes 1996; Gumperz 1972; Blommaert and Backus 2011; Busch 2012; de Bot and Makoni 2005).

The ideological and methodological undertaking to make sense of literacy practices as anchored to economies of production, circulation and uptake at various scales is the cornerstone of the paradigm of the NLS. Recognising diversity in literacy practices as the starting point and endorsing a social-practice perspective, NLS interrogates what “counts” as literacy by posing key questions such as “whose literacies” are dominant and whose are peripheralised or resistant, and how they are conducted and judged (Collins and Blot 2003; Street 2006, 2012). To attend to these key questions, researchers have developed a number of approaches to recognise the plurality of literacy. Whether the emphasis is on various cultures (e.g., Street 1984) or semiotic modes of communication (e.g., Kress 2002), all these perspectives agree that school-based literacy is just one among many and itself multimodal (Kress and Leeuwen 2001). This can be illustrated by mentioning some of the conceptual approaches and tools NLS has brought about: “literacy practices” and “multiple literacies” (Street 1984), “literacy ecologies” (Barton 1994), “local literacies” (Barton

and Hamilton 1998), “situated literacies” (Barton, Hamilton and Ivanič 2000), “multiliteracies” (Cope and Kalantzis 2000; New London Group 1996), “pluriliteracies” (García, Bartlett and Kleifgen 2007), “multilingual literacies” (Martin-Jones and Jones 2000), “multimodal literacies” (Jewitt 2008; Kress and Van Leeuwen 1996), “continua of biliteracy” (Hornberger 2003), “indigenous literacies” (de Souza 2003), “emergent metaliteracies” (Lotherington 2004), “grassroots literacy” (Blommaert 2008a), “hybrid literacies” (de la Piedra 2009), “transcultural literacy” (Adejunmobi 2008), “translocal literacies” (Coetzee 2012), “spatial literacies” (Comber et al. 2006) and, in this volume, “vernacular literacy” (Mugaddam and Abdelhay), “supervernacular literacy” (Velghe), “portable literacies” (Dyers and Slemming), “livelihood literacies” (Openjuru) and “multilayered literacy” (Bondarev and Tijani). It can be said that these concepts are intended to “disinvent” (Makoni and Pennycook 2007) the monolithic notion of “literacy” and reconstitute it with an inclusive and culturally integrated view of literacy and language. In the NLS, literacy is seen not as external skill but as an embodied practice. Drawing on Bourdieu’s work, Carrington (2001: 274) argued that

School literacy is concerned with the construction of a particular kind of bodily hexis as the body is trained to display and perform the practice of a literate student. These physical displays include extended and attentive sitting, turn-taking, voice modulation, and appropriate forms of eye-contact.

A strand of ethnographic research explores how linguistic ideologies and structural inequalities, as enacted in interaction, produce uneven distribution and access to valued resources for “voice” (Bakhtin 1981; Blommaert 2005; Creese and Blackledge 2012; Hymes 1996; Juffermans and Van der Aa 2013; Kamberelis and Scott 1992; Scollon et al. 1998). Focusing on the ideological dimension of literacy, the NLS research attempts to account for why some texts and their associated practices are institutionally endowed with supernatural or divine powers in some societies (Collins 2006; Omoniyi 2010; Sawyer 1999, 2006; Probst 1993). Religion is one influential institution of ideological ordering of literacy and language (see Poveda et al. 2005). This is the case with sacred or religious languages including Classical Arabic in Islam (Haeri 2003), Hebrew in Judaism (Elwode 2001), and Sanskrit in Hinduism (Pollock 2006). In the context of India, King (1998: 84) noted that

Communal hatreds between Muslims and Hindus cannot be simply wished away by pretending that the scripts used to write their language are devoid of evoked meaning. The power of language as icon must never be

underestimated. Like it or not, the Urdu script means Muslim, the Devanagari script means Hindu.

As the case of Classical/Qur'anic Arabic clearly illustrates, it is the ideological (sacred) dimension which predominates over the communicative in the sociolinguistic practice of religion (see Liddicoat 2012). Any attempt to reform the Arabic script in which the divine discourse of “truth” is enshrined is considered by (the majority of) Muslims in (North) Africa and the Arab World as an attack on Islam itself (Suleiman 2011). This linguistic orthodoxy has a normative effect on literacy in other languages:

The spread of Islam throughout Africa and Asia is another example of the negative effect a religion can have on the spread of literacy. Since Arabic was the language in which the word of God was revealed, Muslim law forbade the translation of the Qur'an into the vernacular and vigorously promoted the teaching of Arabic in preference to any other language. (Sawyer 2006: 524)

However, as Lüpke and Bao Diop in this volume show, it is the ideological link between script and religion that enabled Ajami (Arabic-based scripts) to survive in Africa. Despite being (near to) invisible to educators, language planners and development activists, a pre-colonial literacy tradition continues to be practiced throughout those areas of Africa that are in the sphere of influence of Islam. This writing tradition uses Arabic-based scripts for the writing of African languages. The historical role of the most influential Ajami scripts – e.g., for Hausa, Fula, Soninke, Kanuri/Kanembu, Swahili, and Wolof – is well-documented. Their contemporary weight is less well understood, partly because of their survival in informal and religious contexts only, and partly because of dominant ideologies of missionaries, language planners and official bodies that insist on literacy in Roman scripts (see Pasch 2008 and Diallo 2012 for good overviews).

Another strand of research with its origin in bi/multilingualism studies has seriously problematised and dismantled the self-contained notions of “language” and “literacy” (see Blackledge and Creese 2010a; Weber and Horner 2012 for introductions). The list of concepts suggested in the sociolinguistic literature that intend to reconstitute the established notions of language and literacy as processes include: “translanguaging” (García 2009c; Blackledge and Creese 2010b; Li Wei 2011); “linguaging” (see e.g., Becker 1991; Mignolo 1996; Møller and Jørgensen 2009; Shohamy 2006; also Juffermans 2011); “polylinguaging” (Jørgensen 2008; Jørgensen et al. 2011); “metrolingualism” (Otsuji and Pennycook 2010); “crossing”

and “stylisation” (Rampton 2005, 2006); “codemeshing” (Canagarajah 2013); “resemiotisation” (Iedema 2001); “enregisterment” (Agha 2003, 2007); and “entextualisation” (Silverstein and Urban 1996). Since most of these terms are closely related, let us focus on “translanguaging”.

It is generally observed that multilinguals normally translanguage or navigate through multiple semiotic resources that transcend bounded languages (see Gafaranga 2007). Translanguaging goes beyond code-switching which structurally focuses on bounded “languages”, towards situated speakers and communication (cf. Woolard’s 1998b “bivalency”). In other words, the concept of translanguaging shifts the focus from “languages” to histories and discourses, and ideologies which shape semiotic resources available to community members (Creese and Blackledge 2010). These concepts focus on the complex and integrated nature of practices of language and literacy development in multilingual societies (not just in schools). García (2009b) noted that much bilingual acquisition takes place without the intervention of formal schooling. This is almost typical of vernacular literacies (or non-elite literacies) which are integrated with other daily social activities. The learning and use of these forms of literacy, as the work of Barton and Hamilton (1998) on “local literacies” and Blommaert (2008a) on “grassroots literacies” among others showed, is voluntary and normally occurs outside school (see Stroud, 2001, 2009; Stroud and Heugh 2004; Williams and Stroud 2013). However, these community literacy resources may be negotiated and deployed strategically by students in schools (see Blackledge and Creese 2010a; McCarty 2005; McGlynn and Martin 2009). Heath (1982, 1983, 2012) has shown how some of the middle-class children in US encounter school-based literacy even before they go to school, hence literacy is not a matter of transition from the modality of orality to that of literacy, but rather a process of socialisation into the economy of literacy practices. In a recent study examining the cultural models of literacy in America, Bialostok (2002) found that middle-class literacy practices remain the standard in and out of schools (cf. Barton and Hamilton 1998; Barton, Hamilton and Ivanič 2000; Cushman et al. 2001; Rogers 2001; Hull and Shultz 2002; Schieffelin and Ochs 1986; Taylor 1983; Taylor and Dorsey-Gaines 1988). Cairney and Ashton (2002: 305) who studied multiple discourse practices (not just the school-oriented literacy practices) deployed by some school children and their families in the western suburbs of Sydney cautioned:

If we focus purely on pedagogic practices there is a danger of perceiving families as deficit in literacy understanding and in turn, creating an agenda for schools which seeks to address this by conforming family literacy practices to a narrow range of reproducible school literacy practices.

In South Africa, Williams and Stroud (2013) used the perspective of “linguistic citizenship” to study the ways in which local heteroglossic practices and their indexical meanings are deployed in hip-hop performances in local popular spaces. As suggested by Blommaert (2012), Rampton’s (2010) concept of “contemporary urban vernaculars” and Otsuji and Pennycook’s (2010) notion of “metrolingualism” can be viewed as the concrete result of (trans)linguaging.

As we mentioned in the previous section, language policies in Africa are constructed from a “colonialist” perspective that framed semiotic resources as countable and self-sufficient codes, the practical reality on the ground is at variance with this structuralist view. For instance, one way of studying the ideology-practice link is through the ethnographic observation and analysis of the ways in which landscapes are semiotically structured and regulated (Appadurai 1996; Agha 2005; Crang 1998; Crang and Thrift 2000; Hassa 2012; Jaworski and Thurlow 2011; Poveda 2012; Shohamy 2006; Scollon and Scollon 2003; Stroud and Mpendukana 2009; and see the chapters in this volume by Juffermans; Openjuru; and Lüpke and Bao Diop for various approaches to linguistic landscaping).

To bring the threads of the discussion together, Street (2006) warned that the NLS should not be viewed as “anti-school” critique celebrating “small-scale literacies of resistance”. The field has now moved beyond critique towards intervention by empirically examining how the in-and-out of school literacies can be bridged and how the mainstream education system can draw on the insights provided by various community literacy practices (e.g., Gebre et al. 2009; Hawkins 2013; Hull and Shultz 2002; Larson 2001; Pahl and Rowsell 2006; Prinsloo 2004; Street 2005; Openjuru in this volume). However, a number of researchers have pointed to gaps in the model of NLS (see Brandt and Clinton 2002; Collins 2006; Jahandarie 1999; Kim 2003; Collins and Blot 2003; Parry 2012). One of the key problems or challenges confronting the field is the problem of context, which we broadly review in the next section.

### **Beyond the “literacy event”: a toolbox of diverse concepts**

The critical sociocultural approaches to literacy are concerned with the social meanings of practices in various cultural contexts. The canonical ethnographic studies of literacy dealt with the problem of context using Heath’s (1983) concept of “literacy event” as a unit of analysis (Baynham 2004; Kell 2011). Kell (2011: 607) stated:

The idea of the literacy event is pivotal to the NLS: it is the unit of analysis

that places literacy firmly in the realm of everyday, observable moments, tied to the life world and study-able through ethnography. Starting off with the disciplined description of events ensures that the researcher cannot be making normative, a priori claims about literacy and its consequences.

As she notes, the notion of “literacy event” implies a local context with established boundaries. And the notion of the “localness” is itself taken as a “given”. And this makes it difficult to employ the concept in its traditional meaning to research on, for example, digital texts or texts in digital spaces travelling across multilayered contexts (see Androutopoulos 2011; Coiro et al. 2008; Fabricio 2012; Sharma 2012). In other words, the critique’s key tools “literacy events” and “practice” have successfully destroyed the autonomous-cognitive view of literacy; however, it failed to account for the capacity of texts to endure, mediate, move, and connect multiple contexts together (Brandt and Clinton 2002). The linguistic anthropological view of communication takes context as a serious claim to be accounted for empirically. The field of NLS is continuously developing sophisticated tools or reworking existing concepts to do justice to what Silverstein (1985) called the “total linguistic fact” (more on this term below). The list of concepts deployed in NLS research includes, but is not restricted to, “communicative practices”, “orders of discourse”, “hybridity”, “intertextuality”, “discourse”, “indexicality”, “genre”, “resources”, and “communities of practice”. Let us broadly review how they are handled in relation to literacies.

Drawing on Hymes’ (1968, 1974) model of “ethnography of speaking”, Grillo (1989: 15) conceptualised “communicative practices” as a “multifocal concept” in the following way:

- (a) The social activities through which language or communication are produced.
- (b) The way in which these activities are embedded in institutions, settings or domains which in turn are implicated in other, wider, social, economic, political and cultural processes.
- (c) The organisation of the practices themselves, including their labelling.
- (d) The ideologies, which may be linguistic or other, which guide processes of communicative production (This is close to what Bourdieu calls “relation to language”).
- (e) The outcome – utterances and sequences of utterances, texts and sequence of texts.

Another related ethnographic concept which should be invoked is the notion of “community of practice”. The readily observable hybrid communicative practices of multilinguals violate not just traditional

notions of “literacy” and “language” but other cognate categories of interaction such as “native speaker” (Davies 2003; Leung, Harris and Rampton 1997), “mother tongue” (Kroon 2003; Stroud 2001; Henriksen in this volume) and “speech community” (Irvine 2006; Rampton 1998). For example, one of the now widely used methodological concepts is “community of practice”, originally formulated by Lave and Wenger (1991) as part of their theory of learning as legitimate peripheral participation. This theory reversed the traditional understanding of learning as mental acquisition or transfer of knowledge into a practice-based view of learning as gradual integration into socially and historically situated ways of knowing and acting in participant frameworks. This view does not locate forms of knowledge within individuals but rather situates individuals, peripherally (learners) or more centrally (experts) within bodies of knowledge organised as communities of practice. The notion of the “community of practice” focuses on ways of acting, ideologies, values, and power relations through which an aggregate of people are linked (Eckert and McConnell-Ginet 1992; Lave and Wenger 1991). In other words, it stresses the meaning-creating processes of connectedness – without the assumption of physical proximity or kinship ties. The empirical aim is to capture the individual’s varied linguistic resources in the form of differentially shared styles, registers, and repertoires, etc. which they have learned or unlearned during the course of their life histories. Giddens (1984: 15) provided the following definition of “resources” which is generally appropriated by ethnographic sociolinguistic studies of language and globalisation (e.g., Duranti 1997): “resources (focused via signification and legitimation) are structured properties of social systems, drawn upon and reproduced by knowledgeable agents in the course of interaction”. Thus the sociological construct of “resources” in Giddens’s (1984) structurationist theory is a middle-range concept integrating agency and structure. Heller (2007: 15) has brought these elements (resources, agency, structure) together in her definition of “languages”:

Sets of resources called into play by social actors, under social and historical conditions which both constrain and make possible the social reproduction of existing conventions and relations, as well as the production of new ones.

Through empirical inquiry, the NLS engages with the issue of authority, distribution and access to material and cultural resources. And literacies (when de-singularised) are viewed as social resources with layered sociolinguistic values (e.g., literacy in the national language, grassroots

literacies, etc.). Notwithstanding the flexible deployment of literacy practices particularly outside formal schools, literacy practices are patterned by power relations and social institutions, thus some literacies are more hegemonic and powerful than others (Barton 2007; Crowther et al. 2001). El Aissati's chapter in this book focuses on how literacy practices and the discourses organising them are tied with competing macro-ideological positions and presents a site of "power struggle" that cuts deep into national and transnational Moroccan politics and academia. We are reminded by Rockhill (1987: 165) that "the construction of literacy is embedded in the discursive practices and power relationships of everyday life – it is socially constructed, materially produced, morally regulated, and carries a symbolic significance which cannot be captured by its reduction to any one of these". The point is that all these metaphors address not the "whole units of code" (Heller 2007:1) but the normative uses of language or literacy: what "counts" as literacy or language in a given context. Thus the reflexive questioning of normativities or the situated "shouldness" (Freiberg and Freebody 1997: 267) of actions and agency is taken very seriously in critical literacy studies.

The concept of "genre" (among others such as styles, register, etc.) is used in ethnographic research to study "ways of speaking" (Hymes 1996); the embodied resources of meaning making. In this strand of research "genre" is used to refer to historically situated conventions which guide the ways in which authors compose discourse and audiences interpret it (Collin 2013; Hanks 1987: 668). Thus the structural notions such as genre, language ideologies, history, power, intertextuality can only be grasped through a mutual focus on "linguistic practices" (the actual ways of acting and interacting). Blackledge and Creese (2010a: 29) expressed this two-way relationship in that "linguistic practice can only be understood in relation to histories, power, and social organization. Conversely, structural analysis must include accounts of actual linguistic practices, which at times may differ from those we might expect". This means the notion of "social practice" incorporating linguistic practice is sociolinguistically theorised as an interface concept linking the macro-sociological categories of identification with the individual's style of speaking. Eckert (2008: 463) noted:

It is in the links between the individual and the macrosociological category that we must seek the social practices in which people fashion their ways of speaking, moving their styles this way or that as they move their personae through situations from moment to moment, from day to day, and through the life course.



Since the metaphor “resources” has an economic ring, Mühlhäusler (2000: 312) cautioned that:

language is metaphorically talked about in terms of an economic resource. This discourse is particularly dangerous for linguistic diversity as small languages count as scarce resources only when they are deemed to have economic value. Many smaller languages are scarce but their economic value is not considered in economic calculations.

To drive the point home, the traditional notions of “language”, “literacy”, “bilingualism”, “multilingualism” among other essentialising constructs, are no longer (if they ever were) valid. Silverstein (2005: 118) reminds us that what looked like

speciation of distinct languages and cultures are not, as it were, ‘natural’ facts. They are, first, sociocultural facts. Second, they are therefore facts of normativities that underlie meaning-in-praxis, relative to which groupness is constituted, maintained and transformed.

Drawing on Foucault’s (1981) notion of “order of discourse”, the New London Group (1996) appropriated the concept to study how schools regulate access to networks of power (Chouliaraki and Fairclough 1999; García, Bartlett and Kleifgen 2007; Jewitt 2008). The New London Group (1996: 74) provides the following definition of an “order of discourse”:

An order of discourse is the structured set of conventions associated with semiotic activity (including use of language) in a given social space – a particular society, or a particular institution such as a school or a workplace, or more loosely structured spaces of ordinary life encapsulated in the notion of different lifeworlds. An order of discourse is a socially produced array of discourses, intermeshing and dynamically interacting.

The concept of “orders of discourse” is fundamentally intended to rethink the traditional notion of “context” conceptualised as horizontally linear and purely spatial. Although the CDA-based definition of “orders of discourse” is criticised for postulating the text-context relationship (see, e.g., Blommaert and Bulcaen 2000), Collins and Slembrouck (2007) noted that the concept of “orders of discourse” is based on three productive assumptions: (a) that social reality involves genre expectations and as such it involves power and inequality, (b) that hybridity is a feature of order; and (c) that institutionalised positions are enacted through language users. Discursive practices not just presuppose but also entail (or create) different worlds (Agha 2007; Duranti 1997; Freire 1970; Martin-Jones and Jones

2000; Silverstein 1976, 2003; Wortham 2008). Silverstein and Urban's (1991) concepts of entextualisation (or decentring, removing text from context) and (re)contextualisation (or reorientation, insertion of text into context) are designed to highlight not just the emergence of context in interaction but also the trajectories of texts (their "natural history" in the writers' words) across various contexts (Bauman and Briggs 1990). However, as a number of researchers noted, entextualising processes should not be viewed mechanically as involving the "autonomous" mechanism of "decontextualisation" (Brandt and Clinton 2002; Hanks 2000; Kell 2009, 2011; Poveda 2012).

Keane (1997: 63) noted that "the concept of entextualization means that context is not the court of final appeal for any analysis, or something residual that must only be taken into account. Rather, what is relevant to context – and even whether context is to be considered relevant – is the result of ongoing social processes, genre expectations, and language ideologies". This semiotic consideration of context-text relation for literacy research means that the analysis should focus on what Silverstein (1985: 220) called "the total linguistic fact":

The datum for a science of language is irreducibly dialectic in nature. It is an unstable mutual interaction of meaningful sign forms contextualized to situations of interested human use, mediated by the fact of cultural ideology.

To incorporate micro-real time events and macro-social categories, analysis should focus on this intersection of relations across various scales or "indexical orders" (Silverstein 2003) between linguistic structure, pragmatic usage, and language ideologies. As Blommaert and Rampton (2012) noted, this guiding analytic principle is rooted in a serious commitment to ethnographic description of the who, what, when, where, how, and why of discursive practice. Thus in this model, structural categories of interaction and their ideologies do not have uniform effects on meaning-making actions because the indexical meaning, though orderable, is viewed as mobile, processual and contextual (Collins and Slembrouck 2007; Wortham 2008). Bringing this semiotic-anthropological view of context to literacy research means that any act of reading or writing should be situated at this indexical constellation. It is these semiotic processes which make possible the creation of durable texts such as ritual/religious practices (Keane 1997). They also facilitate the transportability of discursive resources across variously indexical contexts. For example, in a study of shop signs in a neighbourhood in Ghent, Collins and Slembrouck (2007) showed how the interviewees made

various ideologically informed judgments of the “same” linguistic shop signs evoking in the process macro-sociological categories and scales such as countries of origin, Diaspora, and neighbourhood. A reading practice is not just “reading” in a given abstract language, but rather a complex interpretive and indexical process linking micro-interactional events with macro-sociological categories. In other words, literacy resources are inherently indexical complexes.

Indexicality is also basically a theory of context (Collins, Slembrouck and Baynham 2009; Silverstein 2003). It is a relational concept which describes the social use of signs to invoke or create social relations; the association between linguistic forms and social categories such as race and gender (Agha 2007; Agha and Wortham 2005; Collins and Slembrouck 2007; Keane 1997; Silverstein 2003; Wortham 2008). Extending the ethnomethodological principle of indexicality, Shuman (1986: 119) argued that any inscribed text has (potentially) multiple interpretations because “the indefiniteness of context is an especially important consideration for written texts” (cf. Eckert 2008 “indexical field”; Garfinkel 1967). However, only one interpretation through institutionalised recognition becomes authoritative (cf. Bourdieu’s 1991 “symbolic power”). Collins (2006: 247) argued that:

The theoretical recognition of indexicality, and the practical possibility of multiple interpretations of text, means that there can in principle be no strict line between text, context, and interpretation. The point is not simply that multiple interpretations are possible, which is true but uninteresting in itself. Rather, it is that which interpretations gain authority is a matter of social dynamics, involving actors and institution-based understandings, as well as inscriptions.

Intimately related to the concept of indexicality are the notions of “scale” and “rescaling” with their origins in critical geography and political economy (Brenner 2001; Herod 1991; Jimenez 2005; Jones 1998; Smith 1984; Swyngedouw 1996; Swyngedouw and Swyngedouw 2009; Uitermark 2002). The theory of the politics of scale holds that “global”, “local”, and/or “regional” scales are not given but rather socially and strategically produced. More significant, the anti-essentialising critique focuses on how our “voices” are socially produced through complex processes of scale production and rescaling (Marston 2000). Social identities are fundamentally multiscalar in the sense that groups and individuals can construct multiple “relations of engagement” (Cox 1998). That is, they can engage in multiscalar networks that transcend the boundaries of their local-scale physical geographies. For example,

powerless groups can “jump scales” (Smith 1984) – up or down – to forge solidarity with other groups sharing or subscribing to similar ideological projects. Hence, it is the agenda or interests which explain jumps or shifts in scales. As such, scales constitute and are constituted in social struggle. Regulatory practices including discursive actions relatively fix scalar orders or arrangements (Gough 2004; Marston 2000).

The theoretical and empirical insights provided by the political economic theory of scale have been productively appropriated by sociolinguistic studies of globalisation (Arnaut 2005, 2012; Blommaert 2007; Blommaert, Collins and Slembrouck 2005a, 2005b; Canagarajah 2013; Collins, Slembrouck and Baynham 2009). The politics of scale conceptualises the “global” and the “local” as intersections of mobile yet relatively fixed, dynamically layered and stratified relations of different socio-economic interests. Hence a context-sensitive analysis should be multi-scalar (Collins 2011; Collins, Slembrouck and Baynham 2009; Swyngedouw 1996; Wallerstein 1998). The concept of scaling allows us to make sense of hybrid identities and practices.

The concept of “hybridity” views culture as a process and emphasises contextual creativity through the re-articulation of established practices and conventions within and between different modes of communication (New London Group 1996: 82). “Intertextuality” refers to “the potentially complex ways in which meanings are constituted through relationships to other texts (real or imaginary), text types (discourse or genres), narratives, and other modes of meaning (such as visual design, architectonic or geographical positioning)” (New London Group 1996: 82). Central to the conceptual notion of intertextuality is the concept of “historicity”: “Any text can be viewed historically in terms of the intertextual chains (historical series of texts) it draws upon, and in terms of the transformations it works upon them” (New London Group 1996: 82). “Discourse” (in capital D) is used to refer to the “identity kit” in Gee’s (1996: 127) sense: distinctive ways of acting, interacting (e.g., reading, writing, etc.), and being in the socially constructed world. Thus this wider definition of “Discourse” includes verbal exchanges, or “discourse” in lower case.

In short, the field of NLS has developed and used a number of concepts to deal with the problematic of emerging, dynamic and multi-scaled contexts. The rationale for their development is that globalisation and mass migration have resulted in the emergence of new forms of communication. In the next section we focus on the concepts of “superdiversity” and “supervernacular” which have recently been developed

in the literature to understand how globalised communicative activities are conducted.

### **Globalisation, mobility and the new critical sociolinguistics?**

The emergence of global systems of production and exchange is not in itself a new phenomenon since it is part of the project of modernity as embodied in the capitalist world economy that has its roots in the sixteenth century (Wallerstein 2000; Vigouroux and Mufwene 2008). However, what is felt new today, particularly in western societies, is the gradual undermining of the homogenising ideologies of distinct languages and bounded social categories such as “language” and “culture” as an effect of intensified migration of people and linguistic resources across national borders and rapid development of technological mode of information (Castles and Davidson 2000). Social anthropological studies of literacy have alerted us to the fact that textual artefacts and their indexical values and ideologies are recontextualised or moved by people across spatio-temporal scales, and this mobility contributes to emergence of hybrid styles of communication and subjectivity (e.g., Barton and Hamilton 2005; Blommaert 2010; Collins, Slembrouck and Baynham 2009; Jacquemet 2005; Lam and Warriner 2012; Rampton 2005; Silverstein 1985; Wortham 2008). Using the perspective of World-System analysis to study the ways migrants’ heterographic texts are evaluated, Blommaert (2010) showed that communicative resources that move across contexts are made to lose their value as a result of being judged by monoglot ideologies of literacy; and consequently a semiotic difference is converted into social inequality (see Maddox, Aikman, Rao and Robinson-Pant 2011 and the articles there).

Focusing on the UK, Vertovec (2007, 2009) has described this emergent multicultural phenomenon as “superdiversity”. Superdiversity is characterised by “a dynamic interplay of variables among an increased number of new, small and scattered, multiple origin, transnationally connected, socio-economically differentiated and legally stratified immigrants who have arrived over the last decade” (Vertovec 2007: 1024). The core of Vertovec’s argument is that processes of globalisation and transnationalisation have seriously shaken the once-long-established Western notion of “multiculturalism” with significant sociological effects. Superdiversity as proposed by Vertovec is not a mere descriptor for the “diversification of diversity” in statistics of arrivals and other population characteristics, but also a new social scientific paradigm that proclaims the

end of, and offers an embryonic alternative for, policies and politics of multiculturalism of the past (Vertovec 2009). In a paper subtitled “superdiversity and the end of identity politics in Britain”, Fanshawe and Sriskandarajah (2010: 11) argued:

We believe that this super-diversity presents a fundamental challenge to the way we categorise people. And if the groupings that we often use (black, Christian, gay, and so on) to identify people who are disadvantaged or being discriminated against are not sound, then the whole process of promoting equality is undermined.

The core of Fanshawe and Sriskandarajah’s argument is that in the context of superdiversity “you cannot liberate people unless you liberate the language in which you talk about them” (2010: 30), and this means that “we need a new way of talking about diversity” (2010: 33). Superdiversity is characterised, among other things, by polycentric and transitional sources of social identification. The concept of “transnational” should not imply the existence of “nationalities/ethnicities” as fixed givens, or as essential interpretive backdrop to the analysis of multiculturalism. Vertovec (2006: 1) has cautioned that restricting the analytic gaze to “ethnicity” (or its bureaucratic confusing synonym “country of origin”) as a singular index for understanding the complex current version of multiculturalism provides “a misleading, one dimensional appreciation of contemporary diversity”. He has added that “a simple ethnicity-focused approach to understanding and engaging minority groups in Britain, as taken in many models and policies within conventional multiculturalism, is inadequate and often inappropriate for dealing with immigrant’s needs or understanding their dynamics of inclusion or exclusion” (Vertovec 2006: 17). This can be accounted for by the fact that within “countries of origin” various people subscribe to communities of religious, linguistic, regional, and local practices (“communities of practice”). Creese and Blackledge (2010: 552) noted that “certainly it is no longer (if ever it was) sufficient to view diversity simply in terms of “ethnicity” or country of origin (cf. Harris 2006). Other factors which come into play include, inter alia, differential immigration statuses, gender, age, economic mobility, social class/caste, locality, and sexuality”. The same phenomena extend to the mapping or the necessary anchoring of cultural behaviours (including linguistic registers) to specific places “within” a country (see Dong 2011 for the case of China, and Dyers and Slemming for South Africa in this volume).

Dahinden (2009: 1367) rightly contends that “the literature on transnationalism still suffers notably from asymmetry, focusing solely on

migrants and ignoring non-migrants, although they too might also be involved in transnational activities". Carling (2002) has in this context characterised our times as the age of "involuntary immobility", signifying that while many persons these days aspire to emigrate, restrictive immigration policies in the EU and the US in particular actually, significantly hinder great numbers of people in their ability to do so. In this interpretive framework, a Diaspora is an instance of a transnational community. A Diaspora refers to a network of people scattered over a wide area of the world, yet still claims membership in a particular ethnic community (Appadurai 1996; Gilroy 1997; Suleiman 2011). Examining the creation of Palestinian nationalism in the context of "statelessness" and migration to Sydney, Cox and Connell (2003: 330) argued that the "idea of Diaspora challenges essentialist notions of identity based solely on genealogy and not on geography, since place identity is never entirely lost". However, the narrative of "long-distance nationalism" (Anderson 1998; Glick-Schiller, Basch and Blanc-Szanton 1995) is constantly reimagined in the diaspora effecting in the process situated interpretations of the "canons" of shared memories (cf. Vertovec's 2009 "multicultural habitus"; Said 2000). For Creese and Blackledge (2010: 552) the construction of transnational identities should be understood not as a linear series of unmediated transmission, rather as that which takes place within stratified cultural orders of meaning-making:

At the very least, in attempting to make sense of intergenerational post-migration experience, we should be sensitised to situated dimensions of time and space, to stratified social systems, and to different patterns and nuanced practices of negotiation, as the sons and daughters, grandsons and grand-daughters, and great-grandsons and great-grand-daughters of migrants shape and re-shape their worlds.

The above sketch of the current reality of multiculturalism in western societies is in stark contrast to the official "monoglot ideology" (Silverstein 1996) which reductively imagines the phenomenological orders as harbouring a patch of isolated/isolating self-contained monolingual and monocultural fragments. Most important, the essentialising social scientific paradigms which study (structured) diversity on the basis of bounded units as "ethnicity" run the risk of reducing the dialogical and interactional nature of multicultural societies as the exclusive property of the "Other" (e.g., Muslims, immigrants). Undoubtedly, understanding the dynamic of the complexly layered multiculturalism as a natural order of things has significant implications and ramifications not just for state-policy formation but also for the "disinvention" and reconstituting of the "liberal-

humanist” epistemological and conceptual paradigms (Block, Gray and Holborow 2012; Hymes 1996; Makoni and Pennycook 2007). This requires a ground-up understanding of how multiculturalism and multilingualism actually works in practice through the investigation of specific case studies. And this is exactly what Blackledge and Creese, among other researchers, have inspected when they have investigated multilingual practices in complementary schools in the UK (e.g., Blackledge and Creese 2010a). Complementary schools are pedagogic sites for validating subjugated knowledge and hidden histories (Mirza and Reay 2000). The empirical investigation of translanguaging practices in these community schools is aimed at understanding the ways in which linguistic resources (English, Punjabi, Chinese, etc.) are learned and deployed as part of a semiotic complex to do sociolinguistic identity work by students. Their work has shed a significant critical light on the complex nature, range and social functions of the social practices in complementary schools located within the larger sociolinguistic context of superdiversity (Creese and Blackledge 2010). Simpson and Whiteside (2012) have similarly argued that the ESOL establishment should take the context of superdiversity into consideration and incorporate a “pedagogy of translanguaging”.

Rather than focusing on “linguistic imperialism” (Phillipson 1992) by world languages as such, the sociolinguistics of globalisation (or its companion “sociolinguistics of superdiversity”) inspects local interactions within the sociolinguistic scales of globalisation. The paradigm conceptualises (geopolitical) spaces through which linguistic resources are mobilised not as a horizontal plane over which linguistic variation is distributively fixed, but rather as dynamic yet vertically stratified. Drawing on Foucault’s (1981) “order of discourse” and Silverstein’s (2003) “indexical order”, Blommaert called these semiotic ecologies of evaluation “orders of indexicality” (Blommaert 2010). For example, in relation to linguistic landscapes, signs (e.g., street signs) are produced and interpreted within an authoritative frame for inscription and interpretation or order of indexicality (Collins 2006; Collins and Slembrouck 2007).

Focusing on the semiotic effects of superdiversity, ethnographic sociolinguists (e.g., Blommaert 2013) have argued that diversified flows of migration to the west have resulted in the emergence of complex forms of diversity beyond multiculturalism yet with normatively ordered patterns of communicative and literacy practices. To capture the functions and effects of economic and geocultural globalisation (Wallerstein 2000), sociolinguists particularly in the ethnographic mode problematised existing constructs (e.g., “speech community”) and called for the development of new



theoretical and methodological ones. Liddicoat (2004: 1) noted that in the context of cultural and economic globalisation language planning for literacy has to acknowledge that “there are now emerging new literacies prompted by communication change, which are both contrasted with and additional to, the old literacies associated with more traditional communicative practices”. Focusing on online literacy practices of adolescents, Leander and McKim (2003) contended that we should abandon geography-based ethnography and develop instead interpretive methodologies that can trace the flows of texts, objects and bodies across fields of social relations (cf. Marcus 1995; Gille 2001; Arnaut 2005). Blommaert (2012: 2) argued:

An older theoretical and methodological vocabulary, building on an imagery of relatively stable, resident and non-dynamic communities using languages, lacks both the empirical accuracy and the analytical clarity required for addressing the often messy and incomplete phenomena we witness and try to understand. What is needed is a vocabulary that underscores, and allows us to better imagine, the sociolinguistic world as made up of dynamic, mobile, unstable, yet ordered processes of phenomena, messy and unpredictable at the surface but understandable at a deeper level.

This task is taken on in this volume, among others, by Dyers and Slemming whose chapter aims to understand literacy under conditions of mobility and migration, and the translocal flows as well as the community networks people are implicated in. They argue that literacy and community resources are portable to some extent, and shared or shareable in systems of community support.

For Arnaut (2012), the new critical sociolinguistics of diversity that he sees emerging in the disciplinary frontier of anthropology and sociolinguistics must as a first step “set off from super-diversity’s transgressive moment, which consists of discarding the false certainties of multiculturalism and its endorsement of established differences and hierarchies” – i.e., from the project of disinvention in Makoni and Pennycook’s (2007) terms. As a second step it must radically open up to complexity, unpredictability and “the unexpected” as well as the transient and emergent as empirical (descriptive) and theoretical challenges, and recognise the mediated agency of participants in communication to transcend given relations between ways of speaking and predetermined social categories, and so trace semiotic practices in a two-way interaction of language and society. Thirdly, a critical sociolinguistics of diversity, Arnaut argues, consists in a focus on subalternity, on the counter-

discourses or the “weapons of the weak” (Scott 1985) and all the *bottom-up* and underground processes and dynamics that escape and so reconstitute established or recognised social and linguistic categories.

One central theoretical construct theorised within superdiversity as an emergent perspective is the concept of “supervernacular” and its associated “supergroups”. Blommaert (2012: 1) provides the following definition of a supervernacular:

The term “supervernacular” [is used] as a descriptor for new forms of semiotic codes emerging in the context of technology-driven globalization processes. Supervernaculars are widespread codes used in communities that do not correspond to “traditional” sociolinguistic speech communities, but are deterritorialized and transidiomatic communities that, nonetheless, appear to create a solid and normative sociolinguistic system.

Rephrased in another technical way, the concept of a “supervernacular” refers to “the imagined stability of sociolinguistically ordered resources” (Blommaert 2012: 4). In other words, it refers to the englobalised guiding template and its locally encountered myriad practices. Blommaert (2012: 4) explained: “when members of new supergroups deploy the resources of their supervernaculars, they activate a vernacularized form of the “ideal” code, which is therefore flexible, evolving and open for creative experimentation”. Supervernacular as an imaginatively organising normative “standard” is always an unfinished process; what we can empirically observe is a localising or “deglobalising” actualisation of an imagined ideological register within the affordances and constraints of local political economies of language (Blommaert 2012). In other words, when different groups orient their linguistic behaviours to a globalised “standard”, the outcome of their actual performance is genred instances or “dialects” of a supervernacular (i.e., “accented” or “inflected”, occurring indexical forms). Blommaert’s definition of “supervernacular” reveals the paradoxical nature of “global languages”. The global can only be materially witnessed through the positioning phenomenological processes of localisation: it can only be understood in its localised version (cf. Agha’s 2007 “enregisterment” and Pennycook’s 2010 notion of language as a local practice). Blommaert (2012) argued that the operation of language ideologies should be understood through the analysis of the effect of this dual phenomological interplay between the processes of “englobalisation”, making an object global, and “deglobalisation”, the instant adaptation of englobalised resources (cf. Ikuta 2010).

As Blommaert (2012) noted, the difference between the (super)vernaculars and commonly known “languages” is sociolinguistic and not linguistic:

linguistically they share the features we generally assign to “named languages”, but sociolinguistically they operate with a different logic determined by information-technological rules of appropriateness and indexicality. Focusing on late-modern Cape Town and taking a critical self-reflexive perspective on ethnography as a dialogic learning process, Velghe in her chapter in this volume, provides a clarifying illustration of this globalisation phenomenon with a focus on mobile texting codes and shows how a globalised set of mobile phone messaging codes (textspeak) has been used as a supervenacular creating in the process “super-communities”.

The theories informing notions of superdiversity and supervenacular are not totally immune from criticism. Pennycook (2011: 886) argued that

The focus on SUPER-DIVERSITY as a new condition brought about by changing patterns of migration and mobility potentially overemphasizes current forms of diversity at the expense of a need to see diversity as the human and historical, rather than the contemporary, condition. This draws attention to current realities at the expense of the need to investigate the means by which diversity has been perceived. It is not so much that sociolinguistics got it right in the past when it described languages and people as fixed because they were indeed fixed, but rather that the particular ideological formations that produced our thinking framed language and people in these terms. (emphasis in original)

In a recent paper entitled “not so super: the ontology of ‘supervenaculars’”, Orman (2012) attacked the ontological assumptions underlying the theoretical concept of supervenacular. Orman (2012: 349) contended that “despite the superficial terminological innovation, the concept of ‘supervenaculars’ rests on a quite orthodox ontology of language and communication”. Orman (2012: 349) explained that the concept of supervenacular “posits abstract artefactual entities existing over and above individual communicational situations and affirms a code-based view of language”. Thus, in Orman’s (2012: 349) view, the construct of supervenacular cannot provide a satisfactory conceptual model to deal with “mixed” language use in specific modern communicative contexts. In his commentary chapter in this volume, Sinfree Makoni will return to these ontological and epistemological problems of the so-called new critical sociolinguistics.

## Contents of this book

The contributions in this book address literacy practices within and beyond the discursive surveillance of the various, partly overlapping and competing schools of thought outlined above. The contributors subscribe to the assumptions underlying the framework of New Literacy Studies.

This volume is a culmination of a productively long dialogical process among the editors, the contributors and some reviewers. Their formative trajectories apart, the chapters were invited to broadly accord with the theme “African literacies”. However they do not operate with a singular meaning of “literacy” or “language” or even “Africa”. It should be remarked that the early African linguistic studies (particularly in the philological mode) focused almost exclusively on the “sub-Saharan” region to ensure the “Africanness” of scholarship, and consequently what is deleted from the scope was not just “North Africa” and Arabic (in its various “-lects”) and other Semitic associates which were or have been ideologically associated with Islam, the Indian Ocean or the Arab World, but most important how African language and literacy practices themselves were shaped by Arabic and Islamic discourses. Irvine (2008: 326) noted:

The massive language shift that accompanied Islam’s historical sweep across North Africa has often been ignored in an Africanist linguistics that looked primarily to sub-Saharan Africa for its core subject matter. Ironically, however, the Africanist scholarship that excluded Arabic also erased from its view those African scribal traditions that relied on Arabic language or Arabic script.

At least four contributions in this volume directly tackle the above lacuna (i.e., el Aissati's chapter on Berber/Amazigh in Morocco, Bondarev and Tijani's chapter on Tarjumo in the Lake Chad region, Lüpke and Bao-Diop's chapter on Ajami in West Africa, and Muggaddam and Abdelhay's chapter on the Nuba Mountains in Sudan). These four chapters exemplify how Islam or Arabic-based African practices are eclipsed by European ideologies of literacy which championed a Roman script, and how the Arabic-Islam ideological link may dictate the terms on which language-right/script-choice debates are conducted in North, West and Northeast African contexts.

For example, firmly based on fieldwork in Senegal, Guinea and Cameroon, Friederike Lüpke and Sokhna Bao-Diop’s chapter provides a detailed study of the historical role and functions of Ajami (Arabic-based scripts used in the writing of Hausa, Swahili, Wolof and many other

African languages). Lüpke and Bao-Diop showed that these Arabic-based scripts are now restricted to unofficial or religious contexts due largely to the hegemonic ideologies of the missionaries and postcolonial language planning bodies that preferred the “Roman script”. They demonstrated “how Ajami writing becomes visible as soon as a Eurocentric perspective on reading and writing is abandoned”.

Following the constitutional declaration of Berber as an official language – and as a language, we might add – in 2011, Abderrahman El Aissati (in this volume) shows that the question of script choice becomes a site of intense ideological conflict between those who prefer the Arabic script and others who support the Tifinagh or Latin scripts. As El Aissati shows, this “language ideological debate” (Blommaert 1999) occupies all echelons of Moroccan society and the diaspora, from the King's speech to online discussion fora, and contain recurrent tropes that accord with the various macro-ideological positions or cultural ideo-logics available in Moroccan society, including anti-colonialism, pan-Arabism, pan-Islamism and Amazighism. Ironically, the debate itself, is more a debate about Berber/Amazigh than it is a debate in Berber/Amazigh (in any script) as that which is said, is being said in either French or Arabic.

Abdel Rahim Mugaddam and Ashraf Abdelhay, on a study of a local literacy movement in the Nuba Mountains of Sudan, showed how colonial (missionary) activities used “Romanisation” as a discursive strategy of social differentiation between the Arabised groups and the Nuba. The postcolonial governments embraced Arabicisation and Arabic-script as an official policy and “national script” respectively. And consequently, the Nuba and other groups feel marginalised and excluded from circles of power. Thus the Nuba (who do not see themselves as Arab) strategically campaigned for literacy in the “Roman script” in order to differentiate themselves from the exclusive ideologies of Arabicisation which conceptualise local languages as “rutanat” or mere vernaculars. Besides, writing their local speech “Tima” in the Roman script could confer on it the status of “a language proper”. Thus the indexicalities or cultural values associated with scripts shift according to the dynamic of the struggle and balance of power. For example, the Roman script as deployed by the Tima community does not index Christianity because the community is predominantly Muslim. In contexts of conflict such as the Nuba Mountains, the politics of literacy is a serious politics because in this context a script is a resource through which a non-Arab identity is staked.

Dmitry Bondarev and Abba Tijani's chapter provides a useful situated account about a form of language called Tarjumo which can only be used in an integrative mode with other resources. They showed that Tarjumo is

always embedded within “another language”. Bondarev and Tijani demonstrated that Tarjumo, which lacks the key functions of a “language proper”, is used as an indispensable bridge between the written Classical Arabic of the religious texts (the Qur’an and the Tafsir) and modern spoken Kanembu. Tarjumo therefore is an intermediate discourse embedded within other discourses. Here we do not witness the whole language, but only restricted fragments of an ancient language that has only partly survived into modern times. Tarjumo is exclusively used in the context of multilayered exegetic performance of the Kanuri Muslim scholars in northern Nigeria. The sociolinguistic restriction governing the use of Tarjumo is that it cannot be directly applied to the Qur’an but rather it needs to be mediated by the Tafsir which gives a normative interpretation of the Qur’an. These social conditions on the use of Tarjumo have resulted in the emergence of a class of authorised interpreters and readers.

As good examples of the emerging range of concepts expanding the NLS theoretical reach, the chapters by Fie Velghe and Charlyn Dyers and Fatima Slemming employ “supervernacular” and “portable literacies” to describe literacy practices in two separate contexts in Cape Town, South Africa. Velghe’s study focuses on mobile texting codes and shows how a globalised set of mobile phone messaging codes (textspeak) has been used as a supervernacular creating in the process “super-communities”. Through analysis of some exchanged messages between her and a female resident in a post-apartheid township in South Africa, Velghe has analytically displayed that “textspeak” as a form of supervernacular is shaped by the local sociolinguistic resources available to Lisa, producing in the process a “dialect of a supervernacular”. As Velghe has noted, textspeak as a supervernacular problematises the traditional notion of “language” as strictly correlated with stable (though never static) speech communities. However, textspeak is still norm-governed with linguistic and sociolinguistic rules of conduct that have to be “learned” in order to be part of the “supergroup”. Velghe’s chapter, for instance, shows how text messages and instant messaging in either Afrikaans or English in a South African township index the same subject position of its author as a savvy, modern, urban single mother who orients not to official norms of Afrikaans or English in her digital literacy practices, but to the unscripted norms of the englobalised register of “supervernacular” textspeak. Afrikaans here is the localising accent of this supervernacular literacy norm. Again what we are observing here is not whole languages, but fragments or shapes of language, emerging from genred interaction.

Dyers and Slemming’s chapter addresses the question of how in post-apartheid Cape Town literacy resources move across spaces, and how

mobile, shifting contexts are mediated in a community of rural Coloured women who have immigrated to Wesbank, the "township of migrants" where their study is based. Seriously marginalised and challenged by high unemployment and poverty rates, the women in Dyers and Slemming's study are shown to be resourceful ("neither helpless nor hopeless") in the positive transformation of their lives through collaborative literacy mediation in a range of literacy genres (financial, religious, organisational) in the community. The literacy practices these women engage in are conceptualised by Dyers and Slemming in terms of multimodal and portable knowledge resources that are transferable across contexts in the lives of mobile people. Such portable literacies are communally situated and integrated in traditional support systems and shareable means of self-expression and participatory citizenship and ways of navigating new urban modes of life.

Coming from a similar theoretical background but set in an urban West African context, Kasper Juffermans' chapter discusses how the English monolingualism of the Gambian postcolony is complemented, in bottom-up inscriptions in the linguistic landscape of commercial and residential areas, with the use of images as a fully elaborated additional mode of communication, as well as with emblematic bits and pieces of Wolof which break through the English matrix. The unmonitored and unedited grassroots literacy practices his paper describes defy school-normative forms of language and literacy and present flexible and fluid language practices that challenge received notions of languages as discrete, bounded, segregationable entities in the social world, hence the proposed practice-based view of language in terms of "imaging", "Englishing" and "local languaging".

Three of the contributions in this book deal with language and literacy and its direct relation with the institutional setting of education. In attempting to combine a literacy practices approach with linguistic and cognitive analyses, Yonas Mesfun Asfaha, Jeanne Kurvers and Sjaak Kroon used insights from ethnographic study of classroom practices and the historical analysis of literacy education in Eritrea to understand differences in literacy development in two of the country's languages that use Roman scripts but diverge on the linguistic size emphasised in literacy instruction in the classrooms. The divergence in methods of instruction corresponds with ideological views of educators in the Kunama language who consider "phonics" based teaching as best suited to their language versus those educators in the Saho language who sought to incorporate Qur'anic based teaching of syllabic-alphabetic letters.

In her chapter Sarita Monjane Henriksen adopts a particular sociolinguistic approach which allowed for the employment of social psychological questions of attitudes on languages and literacy in an effort to explore ideologies of language and bilingual education in the nexus of primary education in Mozambique. Through the voices of pupils and their parents and teachers involved in Portuguese-Xirhonga bilingual and monolingual Portuguese classes, we gain a nuanced understanding of how language choices are experienced on the ground, and how policies are understood, supported, implemented, negotiated and/or challenged by those who undergo them. Such research on language attitudes and ideologies is important to understand the sustainability of bilingual education in African countries. While her democratic, bottom-up approach allows Henriksen to formulate a series of practical recommendations and to feed back into Mozambican decision-making processes in developing an inclusive language and education policy for Mozambique, it also illustrates the pervasiveness and institutionalisation of (post)colonial language ideologies and the hegemony of Portuguese in educational life.

Equally concerned with questions of relevance and quality in adult literacy and non-formal education curricula, George Openjuru's chapter explores the existing vernacular literacy and numeracy practices as part of the daily informal economic transactions of rural dwellers in a north Ugandan context. These "rural livelihoods literacies" as Openjuru calls them, i.e., the literacies that are tied to earning a living, can be used and expanded on for developing locally relevant pedagogies for adult literacy programmes and bridging informal, non-formal and formal modes of education (cf. Rogers 2004). Specialised knowledge resources and a range of everyday reading and writing practices indeed exist in local communities that literacy programme designers can draw on. Such practices, Openjuru suggests, are no less complex and sophisticated as those found in large metropolises in the West.

This volume is concluded by a critical commentary by Sinfree Makoni.

## Conclusion

A final remark is needed before we can begin our journey criss-cross through the African continent, from South Africa over Senegal and Cameroon to Nigeria and Morocco, to Sudan and The Gambia, Uganda, Mozambique and Eritrea and back to South Africa.

As you, the reader, may have noticed, we have so far strategically avoided defining Africa in generic formulations such as "the number of languages in Africa is x". The figures for the "African languages"



provided by various institutions (e.g., SIL International, Christian missionaries, etc.) as well as the historical-linguistic classifications of these “languages” into neatly divided families or groups have painted a uniquely multilingual cartography “for” Africa. In this scheme of imagination, Europe is deceptively portrayed as the “monolingual” benchmark. However, this commonly established view of linguistic diversity cannot indiscriminately sustain the ethnographic test of the full range of the complex sociolinguistic realities not just within a single nation-state but often even within a single community, neighbourhood, family, person, event. Blommaert (2007b: 124) rightly noted that

Figures on language or bland statements about language typology are poor indicators of actual communicative practices. In the case of Africa, they yield an image of stunning multilingualism with associations of insurmountable communication problems across typologically incompatible languages. Multilingualism, to be sure, is the norm everywhere, and in Africa like elsewhere, people in actual practice find pragmatic solutions to communication difficulties. So the figures are figures, not suggestive of anything more than of a relative density of multilingualism.

One of the objectives of this book is to demonstrate that Africa is more than the continent with the lowest literacy rates in the world, as one reads on Wikipedia, perhaps also the continent with the greatest diversity and complexity in its literacy practices.

## References

- Abdelhay, Ashraf (2010a). A critical commentary on the discourse of language rights in the Naivasha language policy using habitus as a method. *International Journal of Sociology of Language* 206: 21–45.
- . (2010b). The politics of writing tribal identities in the Sudan: The case of the colonial Nuba policy. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 31, 2: 201–213.
- Abdelhay, Ashraf, Busi Makoni, Sinfree Makoni, and Abdel Rahim Mugaddam (2011). The sociolinguistics of nationalism in the Sudan: The Arabicisation of politics and the politicisation of Arabic. *Current Issues in Language Planning* 12, 4: 457–501.
- Adejunmobi, Morawedun (2008). Intercultural and Transcultural Literacy in Contemporary Africa. *Language and Intercultural Communication* 8: 72–90.

- Agha, Asif (2003). The social life of cultural value. *Language & Communication* 23, 3: 231–273.
- . (2005). Voice, footing, enregisterment. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 15, 1: 38–59.
- . (2007). *Language and Social Relations*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Agha Asif and Stanton Wortham (2005). Discourse across speech–events: intertextuality and interdiscursivity in social life. Special issue, *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 15, 1: 1–150.
- Agnihotri, R.K. (1994). Campaign–based literacy programs: The case of the Ambedkar Nagar experiment in Delhi. *Language and Education* 8, 1–2: 47–56.
- Akinnaso, F. Niyi (1996). Vernacular literacy in modern Nigeria. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 119: 43–68.
- Al-Kahtani, Abdallah (1996). Literacy from a linguistic and a sociolinguistic perspective. *International Review of Education* 42, 6: 547–562.
- Althusser, Louis (1971). Ideology and ideological state apparatuses: Notes toward an investigation. *Lenin and Philosophy and other Essays*. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Anderson, Benedict (1991). *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. London: Verso.
- . (1998). *The Spectre of Comparisons: Nationalisms, Southeast Asia, and the World*. London: Verso.
- Androutopoulos, Jannis (2011) From variation to heteroglossia in the study of computer–mediated discourse. *Digital Discourse: Language in the New Media*, eds. Crispin Thurlow and Kristine Mroczek, 279–198. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Appadurai, Arjun (1996). *Modernity at Large: Cultural Dimensions of Globalization*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Arnaut, Karel (2005). “Our Baka borther obviously do not speak French”: Siting and scaling physical/discursive movements in post–colonial Belgium. *Language & Communication* 25, 3: 217–235.
- . (2012). Super–diversity: elements of an emerging perspective. *Diversities* 14, 2: 1–16.
- Asfaha, Yonas Mesfun (2009). *Literacy Acquisition in Multilingual Eritrea: A comparative study of reading across languages and scripts*. Amsterdam: Aksant.
- Asfaha, Yonas Mesfun, Jeanne Kurvers and Sjaak Kroon (2008). Literacy and script attitudes in multilingual Eritrea. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 12, 2: 223–240.

- Baines, John (1983). Literacy and Ancient Egyptian society. *Man* 18, 3: 572–599.
- Bakhtin, Mikhail (1981). *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Banda, Felix (2003). A survey of literacy practices in Black and Coloured communities in South Africa: Towards a pedagogy of multiliteracies. *Language, Culture and Curriculum* 16, 2: 106–129.
- Baquedano-López, Patricia (1997). Creating social identities through ‘Doctrina’ narratives. *Issues in Applied Linguistics* 8, 1: 27–45.
- Barbe, Katharina (2001). The dilemma with dichotomies. *Language & Communication* 21: 89–103.
- Bartlett, Lesley (2008). Literacy’s verb: Exploring what literacy is and what literacy does. *International Journal of Educational Development* 28: 737–53.
- Bartlett, Lesley and Deborah Holland (2002). Theorizing the space of literacy practices. *Ways of Knowing* 2, 1: 10–22.
- Barton, David (2007 [1994]) *Literacy: An Introduction to the Ecology of Written Language*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- Barton, David and Mary Hamilton (1998). *Local Literacies. Reading and Writing in One Community*. London: Routledge.
- . (2005). Literacy, reification and the dynamics of social interaction. *Beyond Communities of Practice*, eds. David Barton and Karin Tusting, 14–35. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Barton David, Mary Hamilton and Roz Ivanič, eds. (2000). *Situated Literacies: Reading and Writing in Context*. London: Routledge.
- Bassiouny, Reem (2009). *Arabic Sociolinguistics: Topics in Diglossia, Gender, Identity, and Politics*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.
- Bauman Richard and Charles Briggs (2003). *Voices of Modernity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Baynham, Mike (2004). Ethnographies of literacy: introduction. *Language and Education* 18, 4: 285–290.
- Baynham, Mike and Mastin Prinsloo (2009). *The Future of Literacy Studies*. London: Palgrave.
- Becker, A.L. (1991). Language and languaging. *Language & Communication* 11: 33–35.
- Bhola, Harbans S. (1990). An overview of literacy in Sub-Saharan Africa: Images in the making. *African Studies Review* 33: 5–20.
- Bialostok, Steven (2002). Metaphors for literacy: A cultural model of white, middle-class parents. *Linguistics and Education* 13, 3: 347–371.

- Blackledge, Adrian and Angela Creese (2010a). *Multilingualism: A critical perspective*. London: Continuum.
- . (2010b). Translanguaging in the bilingual classroom: A pedagogy for learning and teaching? *The Modern Language Journal* 94, 1: 103–115.
- Block, David, John Gray and Marnie Holborow (2012). *Neoliberalism and Applied Linguistics*. New York: Routledge.
- Blommaert, Jan, ed. (1999). *Language Ideological Debates*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- . (2005). *Discourse: A Critical Introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- . (2007a). Sociolinguistic scales. *Intercultural Pragmatics* 4: 1–19.
- . (2007b). Linguistic diversity: Africa. *Handbook of Language and Communication: Diversity and change*, eds. Marlis Hellinger and Anne Pauwels, 123–149. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- . (2008a). *Grassroots Literacy: Writing, Identity and Voice in Central Africa*. London: Routledge.
- . (2008b). Artefactual ideologies and the textual production of African languages. *Language & Communication* 28: 291–307.
- . (2009) Language, asylum, and the national Order. *Current Anthropology* 50, 4: 415–441.
- . (2010). *The Sociolinguistics of Globalisation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- . (2012). Supervernaculars and their dialects. *Dutch Journal of Applied Linguistics* 1: 1–14.
- . (2013). *Ethnography, Superdiversity and Ethnographic Landscapes: Chronicles of Complexity*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Blommaert, Jan, and Ad Backus (2011). Repertoires Revisited: Knowing Language in Superdiversity. *Working Papers in Urban Language & Literacies*, 67.
- Blommaert, Jan and Chris Bulcaen (2000). Critical discourse analysis. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 29, 447–66.
- Blommaert, Jan, James Collins and Stef Slembrouck (2005a). Spaces of multilingualism. *Language & Communication* 25, 3: 197–216.
- . (2005b). Polycentricity and interactional regimes in global neighbourhoods. *Ethnography* 6: 205–235.
- Blommaert, Jan and Ben Rampton (2011). Language and superdiversity. *Diversities* 13, 2: 1–21.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. 1991. *Language and Symbolic Power*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

- Brandt, Deborah and Katie Clinton (2002). Limits of the local: expanding perspectives on literacy as a social practice. *Journal of Literacy Research* 34, 3: 337–356.
- Brenner, Neil (2001). The limits to scale? Methodological reflections on scalar structuration. *Progress in Human Geography*, 25, 4: 591–614.
- Busch, Brigitta. (2012) The linguistic repertoire revisited. *Applied Linguistics* 33, 5: 503–23.
- Cairney, Trevor and Jean Ashton (2002). Three families, multiple discourses: Parental roles, constructions of literacy and diversity of pedagogic practice. *Linguistics and Education* 13, 3: 303–345.
- Canagarajah, Suresh (2013). *Translingual Practice: Global Englishes and Cosmopolitan Relations*. London: Routledge.
- Canut, Cécile (2001). A la frontière des langues. Figures de la démarcation. *Cahiers d'Études Africaines* 163–4: 443–63.
- . (2010). De l’afrique des langues à l’afrique des discours. Les voix du langagiaire. *Cahiers d'Études africaines* L2–4: 1163–89.
- Carling, Jørgen (2002). Migration in the age of involuntary immobility: Theoretical reflections and Cape Verdian experiences. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 28: 5–42.
- Carrington, Victoria (2001) Literacy instruction: A Bourdieuan perspective. *Difference, Silence, and Textual Practice: Studies in Critical Literacy*, eds. Peter Freebody, Sandy Muspratt and Bronwyn Dwyer, 265–86. Cresskill: Hampton.
- Castles, Stephen and Alastair Davidson (2000). *Citizenship and Migration: Globalization and the Politics of Belonging*. London: Macmillan Press.
- Charpentier, Jean-Michel (1997). Literacy in a pidgin vernacular. *Vernacular Literacy: A Re-evaluation*, eds. Andrée Tabouret-Keller, Robert B. Le Page, Penelope Gardner-Chloros and Gabrielle Varo, 222–45. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Chouliaraki, Lilie and Norman Fairclough (1999). *Discourse in Late Modernity*. Edinburgh: University of Edinburgh Press.
- Coetzee, Frieda (2012). *Local and Translocal Literacies in an Urban 'Village': A Sociolinguistic Study*. MA Thesis, University of Cape Town.
- Coiro, Julie, Michael Knobel, Colin Lankshear and Donald Leu, eds. (2008). *Handbook of Research on New Literacies*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Collin, Ross (2013). Revisiting Jack Goody to rethink determinisms in literacy studies. *Reading Research Quarterly* 48, 1: 27–38.

- Collins, James (2006). Literacy practices in sociocultural perspective. *Encyclopaedia of Language and Linguistics*, ed. Keith Brown, 246–255. Amsterdam: Elsevier.
- . (2011). Literacy as social reproduction and social transformation: The challenge of diasporic communities in the contemporary period. *International Journal of Educational Development* 31: 614–622.
- Collins, James and Richard Blot (2003). *Literacy and Literacies: Text, Power and Identity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Collins, James and Stef Slembrouck (2007). Reading shop windows in globalized neighbourhoods: Multilingual literacy practices and indexicality. *Journal of Literacy Research* 39, 3: 335–356
- Collins, James, Stef Slembrouck and Mike Baynham, eds. (2009). *Globalisation and Language in Contact*. New York: Continuum.
- Comber, Barbara, Helen Nixon, Louise Ashmore, Stephen Loo and Jackie Cook (2006). Urban renewal from the inside out: Spatial and critical literacies in a low socioeconomic school community. *Mind, Culture, and Activity* 13, 3: 228–246.
- Cope, Bill and Mary Kalantzis (2000). *Multiliteracies: Literacy Learning and the Design of Social Futures*. London: Routledge.
- Cook, Susan E. (2009). Street Setswana vs. school Setswana: Language policies and the forging of identities in South African classrooms. *The Languages of Africa and the Diaspora: Educating for Language Awareness*, eds. JoAnne Kleifgen and George C. Bond, 96–116. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Cook-Gumperz, Jenny (2005). The pragmatics of literacy. *Handbook of Pragmatics*, eds. Jef Verschueren et al. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- . ed. (2006). *The Social Construction of Literacy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cooper, Robert L. (1991). Dreams of scripts: Writing systems as gifts of God. *The Influence of Language on Culture and Thought: Essays in Honor of Joshua A. Fishman's Sixty-Fifth Birthday*, eds. Robert L. Cooper and Bernard Spolsky. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 219–226.
- Cox, Kevin (1998). Spaces of dependence, spaces of engagement and the politics of space, or: looking for local politics. *Political Geography* 17, 1: 1–23.
- Cox, Jeremy and John Connell (2003). Place, exile and identity. The contemporary experience of Palestinians in Sydney. *Australian Geographer* 34, 3: 329–343.
- Crang, Mike (1998). *Cultural Geography*. London: Routledge.
- Crang, Mike and Nigel Thrift (2000). *Thinking Space*. London: Routledge.

- Creese, Angela and Adrian Blackledge (2010). Towards a sociolinguistics of superdiversity. *Zeitschrift für Erziehungswissenschaft* 13: 549–572.
- . (2012). Voice and meaning-making in team ethnography. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly* 43, 3: 306–324.
- Crowley, Terry (1999). Linguistic diversity in the Pacific. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 3, 1: 81–103.
- . (2000). The consequences of vernacular (il)literacy in the Pacific. *Current Issues in Language Planning* 1, 3: 368–388.
- Crowther, Jim, Mary Hamilton and Lyn Tett, eds. (2001). *Powerful Literacies*. Leicester: National Institute of Adult Continuing Education.
- Cushman, Ellen, Eugene R. Kintgen, Barry M. Kroll, Mike Rose, eds. (2001) *Literacy: A Critical Sourcebook*. Boston: Bedford/St. Martin's.
- Dahinden, Janine (2009). Are we all transnationals now? Network transnationalism and transnational subjectivity: the differing impacts of globalization on the inhabitants of a small Swiss city. *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 32, 8: 1365–1386.
- Dalby, David (1967). A survey of the indigenous scripts of Liberia and Sierra Leone: Vai, Mende, Kpelle, and Bassa. *African Language Studies* 8:1–51.
- . 1968. The indigenous scripts of West Africa and Surinam: their inspiration and design. *African Language Studies* 9:156–197.
- . 1969. Further indigenous scripts of West Africa: Manding, Wolof, and Fula alphabets and Yoruba holy-writing. *African Language Studies* 10:161–191.
- Danzy, Jasmine (2009) *Adinkra Symbols: An Ideographic Writing System*. MA thesis, Stony Brook University.
- Davydov, Artem (in press). Мириден и адлам – два новых алфавитных письма для языков манинка и фула в Гвинее. Provided by Dmitry Bondarev with a brief summary (personal communication).
- Davies, Allan (2003). *The Native Speaker: Myth and Reality* (2nd ed.). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- de Bot, Kees, and Sinfree Makoni (2005). *Language and Aging in Multilingual Contexts*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- del Valle, Jose. (2005). Monoglossic policies for a heteroglossic culture: Misinterpreted multilingualism in modern Galicia. *Language and Communication*, 20: 105–132.
- de la Piedra, María (2009). Hybrid Literacies: The Case of a Quechua Community in the Andes. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly* 40: 110–28.
- de Souza, Lynn Mario T. Menezes (2003) Voices on paper: Multimodal texts and indigenous literacy in Brazil. *Social Semiotics* 13, 1: 29–42.

- Diallo, Ibrahima (2012). Qur'anic and Ajami Literacies in Precolonial West Africa. *Current Issues in Language Planning* 13: 91–104.
- Dong, Jie (2011). *Discourse, Identity, and China's Internal Migration: The Long March to the City*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Duchêne, Alexandre and Monica Heller, eds. (2007). *Discourses of Endangerment: Ideology and Interest in the Defence of Languages*. New York: Continuum.
- Duranti, Alessandro (1997). *Linguistic Anthropology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Eckert, Penelope (2008). Variation and the indexical field. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 12, 4: 453–476.
- Eckert, Penelope and Sally McConnell-Ginet (1992). Think practically and look locally: Language and gender as community-based practice. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 21: 461–490.
- Eisenlohr, Patrick (2004). Temporalities of community: Ancestral language, pilgrimage, and diasporic belonging in Mauritius. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 14, 1: 81–98.
- Elwode, John F. (2001). Hebrew, Biblical and Jewish. *Concise Encyclopedia of Language and Religion*, eds. John F.A. Sawyer and J.M.Y. Simpson, 191–196. Amsterdam: Elsevier.
- Errington, Joseph E. (2008). *Linguistics in a Colonial World: A Story of Language, Meaning, and Power*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Extra, Guus, Massimiliano Spotti, and Piet Van Avermaet, eds. (2009). *Language Testing, Migration and Citizenship: Cross-National Perspectives on Integration Regimes*. London: Continuum.
- Fabrizio, Branca Falabella (2012). Trajectories of socialization in school transcontexts: Discourse journeys on gender and sexuality. London: *Working Papers in Urban Language and Literacies*, 94.
- Faik-Nzuji, Clémentine (2000). *Arts africains: signes et symboles*. Louvain-la-Neuve: De Boeck & Larcier.
- Fanshawe, Simon and Dhananjayan Sriskandarajah (2010). “You can’t put me in a box”: Super-diversity and the end of identity politics in Britain. Institute for Public Policy Research.
- Finnegan, Ruth. (1988) *Literacy and Orality: Studies in the Technology of Communication*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Foucault, Michel (1981). The order of discourse. *Untying the Text: A Post-Structuralist Reader*, ed. Robert Young, 48–78. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Freiberg, Jill and Peter Freebody (1997). Critical order and change in the literacy classroom: Response to Carolyn D. Baker. *Constructing Critical Literacies: Teaching and Learning Textual Practice*, eds.



- Sandy Muspratt, Alan Luke, and Peter Freebody, 263–272. Kresskill: Hampton Press.
- Freire, Paulo (1970). *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. London: Penguin.
- Gafaranga, Joseph E. (2007). *Talk in Two Languages*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Gal, Susan and Judith T. Irvine (1995). The boundaries of languages and disciplines: How ideologies construct difference. *Social Research* 62, 4: 967–1001.
- García, Ofelia (2009a). *Bilingual Education in the 21st Century: A Global Perspective*. Oxford: Wiley–Blackwell.
- . (2009b). ‘Bilingualing’ without schooling. The role of comprehensive education. *Theoretical Perspectives on Comprehensive Education: The Way Forward*, eds. Herve Varenne and Edmund Gordon, 187–216. Lewiston: The Edwin Mellen Press.
- . (2009c). Education, multilingualism and translanguaging in the 21st century. *Multilingual Education for Social Justice: Globalising the local*, eds. Ajit Mohanty, Minati Panda, Robert Phillipson and Tove Skutnabb–Kangas, 128–145. New Delhi: Orient Blackswan.
- García, Ofelia, Lesley Bartlett and JoAnne Kleifgen (2007). From biliteracy to pluriliteracies. *Handbook of Applied Linguistics*. Vol. 5: *Multilingualism*, eds. Peter Auer and Li Wei, 207–228. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- García, Ofelia and Rosario Torres–Guevara (2010). Monoglossic ideologies and language policies in the education of U.S. Latinas/os. *Handbook of Latinas and Education: Research, theory and practice*, eds. Enrique Murillo, Sofía Villenas, Ruth Trinidad Galván, Juan Sánchez Muñoz, Corinne Martínez and Margarita Machado–Casas, 182–194. Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Garfinkel, Harold (1967). *Studies in Ethnomethodology*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice–Hall.
- Gebre, Alemayehu Hailu, Alan Rogers, Brian V. Street and George L. Openjuru (2009). *Everyday Literacies in Africa: Ethnographic Studies of Literacy and Numeracy Practices in Ethiopia*. Kampala: Fountain.
- Gee, James Paul (1996). *Social Linguistics and Literacies: Ideology in Discourses* (2nd ed.). London: Taylor and Francis.
- Giddens, Anthony (1984). *The Constitution of Society: Introduction of the Theory of Structuration*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Gille, Zsuzsa (2001). Critical Ethnography in the Time of Globalization: Toward a New Concept of Site. *Cultural Studies <> Critical Methodologies* 1: 319–34.

- Gilroy, Paul (1997) Diaspora and the detours of identity. *Identity and Difference*, ed. K. Woodward, 299–343. London: Sage.
- Glick-Schiller, Nina, Linda Green Basch, and Cristina Blanc-Szanton (1995). From immigrant to transmigrant: Theorizing transnational migration. *Anthropology Quarterly* 68: 48–63.
- Goody, Jack (1968). *Literacy in Traditional Societies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gough, Jamie (2004). Changing scales as changing class relations: Variety and contradictions in the politics of scales. *Political Geography* 23: 185–211.
- Graff, Harvey J. (1979). *The Literacy Myth: Literacy and Social Structure in the 19th Century City*. New York: Academic Press.
- Grillo, Ralph D. (1989). *Dominant Languages: Language and Hierarchy in Britain and France*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gumperz, John J. (1972). *Directions in Sociolinguistics: The Ethnography of Communication*. London: Blackwell.
- Haeri, Niloofar (2003). *Sacred Language, Ordinary People: Dilemmas of Culture and Politics in Egypt*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Hailemariam, Chefena (2002). *Language and Education in Eritrea: A Case Study of Language Diversity, Policy and Practice*. Amsterdam: Aksant.
- Hanks, William F. (2000). *Intertexts: Writings on Language, Utterance, and Context*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Harris, Roy (1981) *The Language Myth*. London: Duckworth.
- Harris, Roxy (2006). *New Ethnicities and Language Use*. Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Hassa, Samira (2012). Regulating and negotiating linguistic diversity: top-down and bottom-up language planning in the Moroccan city. *Current Issues in Language Planning* 13, 3: 207–223.
- Hawkins, Margaret (2013). *Framing Languages and Literacies: Socially Situated Views and Perspectives*. New York: Routledge.
- Heath, Shirley Brice (1982). What no bedtime story means: Narrative skills at home and school. *Language in Society* 11, 1: 49–76.
- . (1983). *Ways with Words: Language, Life, and Work in Communities and Classrooms*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- . (2012). *Words at Work and Play: Three Decades in Family and Community Life*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Heller, Monica. (2007). Bilingualism as ideology and practice. *Bilingualism: A Social Approach*, ed. Monica Heller. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

- Herod, Andrew (1991). The production of scale in United States' labour relations. *Area* 23 1: 82–88.
- Hornberger, Nancy H. (2002). Multilingual language policies and the continua of biliteracy: an ecological approach. *Language Policy* 1, 1: 27–51.
- , ed. (2003). *The Continua of Biliteracy: A Framework for Educational Policy, Research and Practice in Multiple Settings*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Hull, Glynda and Katherine Shultz (2002). *School's Out! Bridging Out of School Literacies with Classroom Practice*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Hymes, Dell H. (1968) The ethnography of speaking. *Readings in the sociology of language*, ed. J. Fishman, 99–138. The Hague: Mouton.
- (1974). *Foundations in Sociolinguistics: An Ethnographic Approach*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- (1996). *Ethnography, Linguistics, Narrative Inequality: Toward an Understanding of Voice*. London: Taylor and Francis.
- Iedema, Rick A. (2001). Resemiotization. *Semiotica* 137, 1/4: 23–39.
- Ikuta, Hiroko (2010). Eskimo language and Eskimo song in Alaska: A sociolinguistics of deglobalisation in endangered language. *Pragmatics* 20: 171–89.
- Irvine, Judith T. (2006). Language and speech community. *Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics*, ed. Keith Brown (2nd ed.), 689–698. Amsterdam: Elsevier.
- (2008). Subjected words: African linguistics and the colonial encounter. *Language & Communication* 28: 323–343.
- Irvine, Judith T. and Susan Gal (2000). Language ideology and linguistic differentiation. *Regimes of Language: Ideologies, Politics and Identities*, ed. Paul V. Kroskrity. Santa Fe: Advanced School Press.
- Jacquemet, Marco (2005) Transidiomatic practices: Language and power in the age of globalization. *Language and Communication* 25, 3: 257–277.
- Jaffé, Alexandra (1999). *Ideologies in Action: Language Politics on Corsica*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Jahandarie, Khosrow (1999). *Spoken and Written Discourse: A Multidisciplinary Perspective*. Stamford: Ablex.
- Jaworski, Adam and Crispin Thurlow, eds. (2011). *Semiotic Landscapes: Language, Image, Space*. London: Continuum.
- Jewitt, Carey (2008). Multimodality and literacy in school classrooms. *Review of Research in Education* 32, 1: 241–267.

- Jimenez, Alberto Corsín (2005). Changing scales and the scales of change: Ethnography and political economy in Antofagasta, Chile. *Critique of Anthropology* 25: 157–76.
- Jones, Katherine (1998). Scale as epistemology. *Political Geography* 17, 1: 25–28.
- Joseph, John E. and Talbot Taylor, eds. (1990). *Ideologies of Language*. London: Routledge.
- Jørgensen, Jens Normann (2008). Polylingual languaging among children and adolescents. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 5, 3: 161–176.
- Jørgensen, Jens Normann, Lian Malai Madsen, Martha Sif Karrebæk and Janus Spindler Møller (2011). Polylinguaging in superdiversity. *Diversities* 13, 2: 22–37.
- Juffermans, Kasper (2011). The old man and the letter: Repertoires of languaging and literacy in a Gambian village. *Compare: A Journal of International and Comparative Education* 41, 165–180.
- Juffermans, Kasper and Jef Van der Aa (2013). Introduction to the special issue: Analysing voice in educational discourses. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly* 44, 2: 112–123.
- Kamberelis, George and Karla Scott (1992). Other people's voices: The coarticulation of texts and subjectivities. *Linguistics and Education* 4: 359–403.
- Kaplan, Robert B. and Richard B. Baldauf (1997). *Language Planning: From Practice to Theory*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- . (2003) *Language and Language-in-Education Planning in the Pacific Basin*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Keane, Webb (1997). Religious language. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 26: 47–71.
- Kell, Catherine (2011). Inequalities and crossings: Literacy and the spaces-in-between. *International Journal of Educational Development* 31, 6: 606–613.
- . (2009). Literacy practices, text/s and meaning making across time and space. *The Future of Literacy Studies*, eds. Mike Baynham and Mastin Prinsloo, 75–99. New York: Palgrave.
- Kim, Joyce (2003). Challenges to NLS: Response to “what's new in New Literacy Studies”. *Current Issues in Comparative Education* 5, 2: 118–121.
- King, Robert (1998). *Nehru and the Language Politics of India*. Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- Kress, Gunther (2002). *Literacy in the New Media Age*. London: Routledge.

- Kress, Gunther, and Theo van Leeuwen (1996). *Reading Images: The Grammar of Visual Design*. London: Routledge.
- . (2001). *Multimodality*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Kroon, Sjaak (2003). Mother tongue and mother tongue education. *World Yearbook of Education 2003: Language Education*, eds. Jill Bourne and Euan Reid, 35–47. London: Kogan Page.
- Kroskirty, Paul V., ed. (2000a). *Regimes of Language: Ideologies, Politics, and Identities*. Santa Fe: School of American Research Press.
- . (2000b). Regimenting languages: Language ideological perspectives. *Regimes of Language: Ideologies, Politics, and Identities*, ed. Paul V. Kroskirty, 1-34. Santa Fe: School of American Research Press.
- Kuhn, Thomas (1996). *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions* (3rd ed.). Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Lam, Wan and Doris S. Warriner (2012). Transnationalism and Literacy: Investigating the Mobility of People, Languages, Texts, and Practices in Contexts of Migration. *Reading Research Quarterly* 47, 2: 191–215.
- Lankshear, Colin (1993) Functional literacy from a Freirean point of view. *Paul Freire: A Critical Encounter*, eds. Peter McLaren and Peter Leonard, 90–118. London: Routledge.
- Larson, Joanne, ed. (2001). *Literacy as Snake Oil: Beyond the Quick Fix*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Lave, Jean and Etienne Wenger (1991). *Situated Learning: Legitimate Peripheral Participation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Leander, Kevin and Kelly McKim (2003). Adolescents on the internet: A strategic adaptation of ethnography across online and offline spaces. *Education, Communication & Information* 3, 2: 211–240.
- Lemke, Jay L. (2002). Ideology, intertextuality, and the communication of science. *Relations and Functions in Language and Discourse*, eds. Peter H. Fries, Michael Cummings, David Lockwood and William Spruiell, 32–55. London: Cassell.
- Leung, Constant, Roxy Harris and Ben Rampton 1997. The idealised native speaker: reified ethnicities and classroom realities. *TESOL Quarterly* 31, 3: 543–560.
- Levine, Kenneth (1982). Functional literacy: Fond illusions and false economies. *Harvard Educational Review* 52: 249–66.
- Li Wei (2011). Moment analysis and translanguaging space: Discursive construction of identities by multilingual Chinese youth in Britain. *Journal of Pragmatics* 43, 5: 1222–1235.
- Liddicoat, Anthony (2004). Language planning for literacy: Issues and implications. *Current Issues in Language Planning* 5, 1: 1–17.

- . (2012) Language planning as an element of religious practice. *Current Issues in Language Planning* 13, 2: 121–144.
- Lotherington, Heather (2004). Emergent metaliteracies: What the Xbox has to offer the EQAO. *Linguistics and Education* 14: 305–319.
- Lüpke, Friederike (2010). Multilingualism and language contact in West Africa: Towards a holistic perspective. *Journal of Language Contact* 3: 1–11.
- . (2011). Orthography development. *The Cambridge Handbook of Endangered Languages*, eds. Peter Austin and Julia Sallabank. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Maddox, Brian, Anna Robinson–Pant, Sheila Aikman and Nitya Rao (2011). Literacy Inequalities and Social Justice. *International Journal of Educational Development* 31: 577–79.
- Macgregor, J.K. (1909). Some notes on Nsibidi. *Journal of the Royal Institute of Africa* 39: 209–219.
- Mafundikwa, Saki (2004). *Afrikan Alphabets: The Story of Writing in Afrika*. Brooklyn: Mark Batty.
- Makoni, Sinfree and Alastair Pennycook (2007). *Disinventing and Reconstituting Languages*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Makalela, Leketi (2005). ‘We Speak Eleven Tongues’: Reconstructing Multilingualism in South Africa. *Languages of African Emancipation: Focus on Postcolonial Contexts and Considerations*, eds. Birgit Brock–Utne and Rodney Kofi Hopson, 147–174. Dar es Salaam: Mkuki na Nyota.
- Marcus, George E. (1995). Ethnography in/of the World System: The emergence of multi–sited ethnography. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 24: 95–117.
- Marston, Sallie (2000). The social construction of scale. *Progress in Human Geography* 24, 2: 219–242.
- Martin–Jones, Marilyn and Kathryn Jones, eds. (2000) *Multilingual Literacies: Reading and Writing Different Worlds*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Martin–Jones, Marilyn, Sjaak Kroon and Kurvers, Jeanne (2011). Multilingual literacies in the global south: language policy, literacy learning and use. *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education* 41, 2: 157–164.
- Mayo, Peter (1995). Critical literacy and emancipatory politics: The work of Paulo Freire. *International Journal of Educational Development* 15, 4: 363–379.
- Mbodj–Pouye, Aïssatou (2013). *Le fil de l’écrit. Une anthropologie de l’alphabetisation au Mali*. Lyon: ENS Editions.

- McCarty, Teresa, ed. (2005). *Language, Literacy, and Power in Schooling*. Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- McGlynn, Caroline, and Peter Martin (2009). 'No Vernacular': Tensions in Language Choice in a Sexual Health Lesson in the Gambia. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* 12: 137–55.
- Mc Laughlin, Fiona, ed. (2009). *The Languages of Urban Africa*. London: Continuum.
- Mertz, Elizabeth and Jonathan Yovel (2000). Metalinguistic Awareness. *Handbook of Pragmatics*, eds. Jan–Ola Östman and Jef Verschueren, 1–26. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Mignolo, Walter D. (1996). Linguistic maps, literary geographies, and cultural landscapes: Languages, languaging, and (trans)nationalism. *Modern Language Quarterly* 57: 181–96.
- Mirza, Heidi, and Diane Reay (2000) Spaces and places of black educational desire: rethinking black supplementary schools as a new social movement. *Sociology* 34, 3: 521–544.
- Moore, Robert E., Sari Piëtikainen, and Jan Blommaert (2010). Counting the Losses: Numbers as the Language of Language Endangerment. *Sociolinguistic Studies* 4: 1–26.
- Møller, Janus Spindler, and J. Normann Jørgensen (2009). From language to languaging: Changing relations between humans and linguistic features. *Acta Linguistica Hafniensia* 41: 143–66.
- Mühlhäusler, Peter (1996) *Linguistic Ecology: Language Change and Linguistic Imperialism in the Pacific Region*. London: Routledge.
- . (2000): Language planning and language ecology, *Current Issues in Language Planning* 1, 3: 306–367.
- New London Group (1996). A pedagogy of multiliteracies: Designing social futures. *Harvard Educational Review* 66: 60–92.
- Nwosu, Maik (2010). In the name of the sign: The nsibidi script as the language and literature of the crossroads. *Semiotica* 182: 285–303.
- Omoniyi, Tope, ed. (2010) *The Sociology of Language and Religion: Change, Conflict and Accommodation*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Ong, Walter J. (1982). *Orality and Literacy: The Technology of the World*. New York: Methuen.
- Olson, David (1988). Mind and media: The epistemic functions of literacy. *Journal of Communication* 38, 3: 27–36.
- Orman, Jon (2012). Not so super: The ontology of “supervernaculars”. *Language & Communication* 32: 349–357.

- Otsuji, Emi and Alastair Pennycook (2010). Metrolingualism: Fixity, fluidity and language in flux. *International Journal of Multilingualism* 7, 3: 240–254.
- Oyler, Dianne White (2005). *The History of the N'ko Alphabet and its Role in Mande Transnational Identity: Words as Weapons*. Cherry Hill: Africana Homestead Legacy Press.
- Pahl, Kate, and Jennifer Rowsell (2006). *Travel Notes from the New Literacy Studies: Instances of Practice*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Papen, Uta (2001). 'Literacy – your key to a better future'? Literacy, reconciliation and development in the national literacy programme in Namibia. *Literacy and Development: Ethnographic Perspectives*, ed. Brian V. Street, 40–60. London: Routledge.
- . (2005). *Adult Literacy as Social Practice: More than Skills*. London: Routledge.
- Parry, Kate (2012). What is literacy? A critical overview of sociocultural perspectives. *Journal of Language and Literacy Education* 8, 1: 50–71.
- Pasch, Helma (2008). Competing scripts: The introduction of the Roman alphabet in Africa. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 191: 65–109.
- Pennycook, Alastair (2010). *Language as a Local Practice*. London: Routledge.
- . (2011). The sociolinguistics of globalization (review). *Language* 87, 4: 884–887.
- Pennycook, Alastair and Sifree Makoni (2005). The modern mission: The language effects of Christianity. *Journal of Language, Identity, and Education* 4, 2: 137–155.
- Phillipson, Robert (1992). *Linguistic Imperialism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Pollock, Sheldon (2006). *The Language of the Gods in the World of Men: Sanskrit, Culture, and Power in Pre-modern India*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Poveda, David (2012). Literacy artifacts and the semiotic landscape of a Spanish secondary. *Reading Research Quarterly* 47, 1: 61–88.
- Poveda, David, Ana Cano and Manuel Palomares-Valera (2005). Religious genres, entextualization and literacy in Gitano children. *Language in Society* 34, 1: 87–115.
- Prinsloo, Mastin (2004). Literacy is child's play: Making sense in Khwezi Park. *Language and Education* 18, 4: 291–303.



- Probst, Paul (1993). The letter and the spirit. *Cross-Cultural Approaches to Literacy*, ed. Brian Street, 198–220. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rampton, Ben (1998). Speech community. *Handbook of Pragmatics*, eds. Jef Verschueren, Jan Ola Ostman, Jan Blommaert and Chris Bulcaen. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- . (2005 [1995]). *Crossing*. Manchester: St. Jerome.
- . (2006). *Language in Late Modernity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- . (2010). From “multi-ethnic urban heteroglossia” to “contemporary urban vernaculars”. *Working Papers in Urban Language and Literacy*, 61.
- Reddy, Michael (1979). The conduit metaphor: A case of frame conflict in our language about language. *Metaphor and Thought*, ed. Andrew Ortony, 285–324. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rex, Lesley A. and Judith L. Green (2008). Classroom discourse and interaction: reading across the traditions. *Handbook of Educational Linguistics*, eds. Bernard Spolsky and Francis Hult, 571–84. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Rockhill, Kathleen (1987). Gender, language and the politics of literacy. *British Journal of Sociology of Education* 8, 2: 153–167.
- Rogers, Alan (2004). Looking again at non-formal and informal education: towards a new paradigm. *Informal Education Encyclopaedia* (infed.org).
- Rogers, Rebecca (2001). Between contexts: A critical discourse analysis of family literacy, discursive practices, and literate subjectivities. *Reading Research Quarterly* 37, 3: 248–277.
- Romaine, Suzanne (1994). *Language in Society: An Introduction to Sociolinguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Rovenchak, Andrij (2010). Development of fonts for African scripts: Using computer technologies to preserve Africa’s written heritage. *Afrikanistik Online*.
- . (2012). Writing in indigenous African scripts: from satschrift to alphabet. Abstract for a workshop in Paris, *The Idea of Writing*.
- Rowell, Jennifer, and Kate Pahl (2007). Sedimented identities in texts: Instances of practice. *Reading Research Quarterly* 42, 3: 388–404.
- Said, Edward (1978). *Orientalism*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- . (2000). Invention, memory and place. *Critical Inquiry* 26: 175–92.
- Sanneh, Lamin (1989). *Translating the Message: The Missionary Impact on Culture*. Maryknoll: Orbis Books.

- Sapir, Edward (1921). *Language: An Introduction to the Study of Speech*. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Co.
- Sawyer, John F.A. (1999). *Sacred Languages and Sacred Texts*. London: Routledge.
- . (2006). Religion and literacy. *Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics* (2nd ed.), ed. Keith Brown, 522–525. Amsterdam: Elsevier.
- Scribner, Sylvia and Michael Cole (1981). *The Psychology of Literacy*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Schieffelin, Bambi B. and Elinor Ochs, eds. (1986). *Language Socialization across Cultures*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Schieffelin, Bambi B., Kathryn Woolard and Paul V. Kroskrity, eds. (1998). *Language Ideologies: Practice and Theory*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Scollon, Ron and Suzie Wong Scollon (2003). *Discourses in Place: Language in the Material World*. London: Routledge.
- Scollon, Ron, Wai Tsang, David Li, Vicki Young, and Rodney Jones (1998). Voice, appropriation and discourse representation in a student writing task. *Linguistics and Education* 9, 3: 227–250.
- Scott, James C. (1985). *Weapons of the Weak: Everyday Forms of Peasant Resistance*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Shankar, Tara (2006). Speaking on the record: A theory of composition. *Computers and Composition* 23: 374–393
- Sharma, Bal Krishna (2012). Beyond social networking: Performing global Englishes in Facebook by college youth in Nepal. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 16, 4: 483–509.
- Shohamy, Elana (2006). *Language Policy: Hidden Agendas and New Approaches*. London: Routledge.
- Shuman, Amy (1986). *Storytelling Rights: The Uses of Oral and Written Texts by Urban Adolescents*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Siegel, Jeff (1997) Review of P. Mühlhäusler, *Linguistic Ecology: Language Change and Linguistic Imperialism in the Pacific Region*. *Australian Journal of Linguistics* 17, 2: 219–44.
- SIL International (2006). Zaghawa Beria font. <http://scripts.sil.org> (last accessed July 2013)
- Silverstein, Michael (1976). Shifters, linguistic categories, and cultural description. *Meaning and Anthropology*, eds. Keith H. Basso and H.A. Selby. New York: Harper & Row.
- . (1979). Language structure and linguistic ideology. *The Elements: A Par session on Linguistic Units and Levels*, eds. Paul R. Clyne, William F. Hanks and Carol L. Hofbauer, 193–247. Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society.

- (1985). Language and the culture of gender: at the intersection of structure, usage and ideology. *Semiotic Mediation: Sociocultural and Psychological Perspectives*, eds. Elizabeth Mertz and Richard Parmentier, 219–59. New York: Academic.
- (1996). Monoglot “standard” in America: Standardization and metaphors of linguistic hegemony. *The Matrix of Language: Contemporary Linguistic Anthropology*, eds. D. Brenneis and R. Macauley, 284–306. Boulder: Westview Press.
- (2003). Indexical order and the dialectics of sociolinguistic life. *Language & Communication*, 23:193–229
- (2005). Languages/cultures are dead: Long live the linguistic-cultural! *Unwrapping the Sacred Bundle: Reflections on the Disciplining of Anthropology*, eds. Daniel A. Segal and Sylvia J. Yanagisako, 99–125. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Silverstein, Michael and Greg Urban, eds. (1996). *Natural Histories of Discourse*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Simpson, James, and Anne Whiteside (2012). Politics, policy and practice: ESOL in the UK and the USA. *Working Papers in Urban Language & Literacies*, 87.
- Slager, Tim (2008). A Brief Summary of Liberian Indigenous Scripts. Document, available at Christian Education Foundation of Liberia website (<http://cefliberia.org>)
- Smith, Neil (1984). *Uneven Development*. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.
- Stierer, Barry and David Bloome (1994). *Reading Words: A Commentary on Key Terms in the Teaching of Reading*. Sheffield, NJ: National Association for the Teaching of English.
- Street, Brian V. (1984). *Literacy in Theory and Practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- , ed. (1993). *Cross-Cultural Approaches to Literacy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- (1995). *Social Literacies: Critical Approaches to Literacy in Development, Ethnography and Education*. London: Longman.
- , ed. (2005). *Literacies Across Educational Contexts*. Philadelphia: Caslon.
- (2006). Reading and multiliteracies. *Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics* (2nd ed.), ed. Keith Brown, 369–373. Amsterdam: Elsevier.
- (2011). Literacy inequalities in theory and practice: The power to name and define. *International Journal of Educational Development* 31, 580–586.
- (2012). Society reschooling. *Reading Research Quarterly* 47, 2: 216–227.

- Stroud, Christopher (2001). African mother tongue programs and the politics of language: Linguistic citizenship versus linguistic human rights. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 22, 4: 339–355.
- . (2009). Towards a postliberal critique of language rights: towards a politics of language for a linguistics of contact. *International Perspectives on Bilingual Education: Policy, Practice and Controversy*, ed. John E. Petrovic, 191–218. New York: Information Age Publishing.
- Stroud, Christopher and Kathleen Heugh (2004). Linguistic human rights and linguistic citizenship. *Language Rights and Language Survival: A Sociolinguistic Exploration*, eds. Donna Patrick and Jane Freeland, 191–218. Manchester: St Jerome.
- Stroud, Christopher and 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.
- Suleiman, Yasir (2011). *Arabic, Self, and Identity: A Study in Conflict and Displacement*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Swyngedouw, Erik (1996). Reconstructing citizenship, the re-scaling of the state and the new authoritarianism: Closing the Belgian mines. *Urban Studies* 33: 1499–1521.
- Swyngedouw, Eva and Erik Swyngedouw (2009). The Congolese diaspora in Brussels and hybrid identity formation: Multiscalarity and diasporic citizenship. *Urban Research & Practice* 2: 68–90.
- Taylor, Denny (1983). *Family Literacy: Young Children Learning to Read and Write*. Portsmouth: Heinemann.
- Taylor, Denny and Catherine Dorsey–Gaines (1988). *Growing Up Literate: Learning from Inner City Families*. Portsmouth: Heinemann.
- Tollefson, James W. (1996). *Planning Language, Planning Inequality: Language Policy in the Community*. London: Longman.
- Tuchscherer, Konrad (1999). The lost script of the Bagam. *African Affairs* 98: 55–77.
- Tuchscherer, Konrad and P.E.H. Hair (2002). Cherokee and West Africa: examining the origins of the Vai script. *History in Africa* 29: 427–486.
- Tusting, Karen, Anita Wilson and Rosalind Ivanič (2000). New literacy studies at the interchange. *Situated Literacies: Reading and Writing in Context*, David Barton, Mary Hamilton and Roz Ivanič. London: Routledge.
- Unseth, Peter (2011). Invention of scripts in West Africa for ethnic revitalization. *Handbook of Language and Ethnic Identity: The*

- Success–Failure Continuum in Language and Ethnic Identity Efforts* (Vol 2), eds. Joshua A. Fishman and Ofelia García, 23–32. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Uitermark, Justus (2002). Re–scaling, scale fragmentation and the regulation of antagonistic relationships. *Progress in Human Geography* 26: 743–65.
- Varenne, Hervé and Ray McDermott (1998). *Successful Failure: The School America Builds*. Boulder: Westview.
- Vertovec, Steven (2006). The emergence of super–diversity in Britain. *Compas Working Paper*. Oxford: Center of Migration, Policy and Society.
- (2007). Super–diversity and its implications. *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 30, 6: 1024–1054.
- (2009). *Transnationalism*. New York: Routledge.
- (2010). Towards post-multiculturalism? Changing communities, conditions and contexts of diversity. *International Social Science Journal* 61, 199: 83–95.
- Vigouroux, Cécile B. and Salikoko S. Mufwene, eds. (2008). *Globalization and Language Vitality: Perspectives from Africa*. London: Continuum.
- Wallerstein, Immanuel (1998). The time of space and the space of time: The future of social science. *Political Geography* 1: 71–82.
- (2000). *The Essential Wallerstein*. New York: The New Press.
- Wang, Xuan, Kasper Juffermans and Caixia Du (2014). Harmony as language policy in China: An internet perspective. *Language Policy* 13, in press.
- Weber, Jean–Jacques and Kristine Horner (2012). *Introducing Multilingualism: A Social Approach*. London: Routledge.
- Whorf, Benjamin Lee (1956). *Language, Thought and Reality: Selected Writings of Benjamin Lee Whorf*, ed. John Carroll. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Wikipedia: Literacy. [last accessed July 2013]
- Williams, Quentin and Christopher Stroud (2013). Multilingualism in transformative spaces: Contact and conviviality. *Language Policy* 12, 4: 289–311.
- Woolard, Kathryn (1998a). Introduction: Language ideology as a field of inquiry. *Language Ideologies: Practice and Theory*, eds. Bambi B. Schieffelin, Kathryn Woolard, and Paul V. Kroskrity, 3–47. New York: Oxford University Press.
- (1998b). Simultaneity and bivalency as strategies in bilingualism. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 8, 1: 3–29.

- Wortham, Stanton (2008) Linguistic anthropology of education. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 37:37–51
- Wyrod, Christopher (2008). A social orthography of identity: The N'ko literacy movement in West Africa. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 192, 27–44.