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Introduction

Dear Reader,

This FreeBook contains selected chapters from four key titles that highlight and showcase the broad and interesting range of our publications within applied linguistics.

First is a chapter from Suresh Canagarajah’s Translingual Practices, an incisive and ground-breaking book which has won three professional awards, namely MLA’s Shaughnessy Award, and the best book awards from the British and American Associations for Applied Linguistics (BAAL and AAAL). The book engages with the changes underway in communication in the context of globalization, mobility, and new technology and introduces a new way of looking at the use of English within a global context.

Our second excerpt is from The Routledge Handbook of Language and Identity edited by Sián Preece. This book provides a clear and comprehensive survey of the field of language and identity from an applied linguistics perspective and contains forty-one chapters written by specialists from around the world.

Our third chapter is from another new and key handbook, The Routledge Handbook of English for Academic Purposes edited by Ken Hyland and Philip Shaw. This is an accessible, authoritative and comprehensive introduction to English for Academic Purposes which covers the main theories, concepts, contexts and applications of this fast growing area of applied linguistics.

Our final chapter is written by Stanton Wortham and Angela Reyes from their book, Discourse Analysis beyond the Speech Event. This innovative work introduces a new approach to discourse analysis and argues that discourse analysts should look beyond fixed speech events and consider the development of discourses over time.

Below you will find some words from our authors and editors regarding the chapters in this FreeBook and what these chapters tell us about their books as a whole:

**Translingual Practices: Global Englishes and Cosmopolitan Relations (2013)**

Suresh Canagarajah is Edwin Erle Sparks Professor of Applied Linguistics and English at Pennsylvania State University:

“Chapter 4, included in the FreeBook, demonstrates the implications for learning and using English language in the context of these changes. After discussing the contributions of different schools in developing an appreciation for the diversity of English, it shows how we might take this orientation further. It demonstrates how interlocutors develop situated grammatical norms and meanings as they engage in communication across language and cultural boundaries. It presents the intriguing possibility that interlocutors may establish shared norms and meanings even though they might start with nothing in common, as it
occurs frequently in global contact zones.”

**The Routledge Handbook of Language and Identity (2016)**

Siân Preece is Senior Lecturer in Applied Linguistics and TESOL at UCL Institute of Education:

“This chapter exemplifies language and identity research in applied linguistics in a number of ways. Theoretically well grounded and well argued, it highlights the importance of a multidimensional view of identity and intersectionality for applied linguists. Precise data analysis illustrates how to put intersectionality into practice in language and identity studies, and the authors illustrate how to include data extracts in the original language with an English translation; these examples can be used as a model of good practice in English language publications. Finally, the focus on a non Anglophone setting is refreshing, as it creates space in applied linguistics for voices and ways of thinking from the non-English dominant world.”


Ken Hyland is Professor of Applied Linguistics at Hong Kong University and Philip Shaw is Professor Emeritus at Stockholm University:

“This chapter addresses a long-running debate about the character of EAP and helps to set the scene for discussions about EAP which recur through the volume. It accounts for the macro social and theoretical context without neglecting micro classroom reality, and reflects the key features of the book itself. Oriented to practice, it raises current issues of debate without dogmatic answers and adopts a global rather than parochial view.”

**Discourse Analysis beyond the Speech Event (2014)**

Stanton Wortham is Judy & Howard Berkowitz Professor at Pennsylvania University and Angela Reyes is Associate Professor of Linguistics at Hunter College, City University of New York:

“The introductory chapter lays out the rationale behind the new method of discourse analysis we propose. Many central human processes — like learning, socialization and social identification — take place across events, as signs, individuals and objects move along pathways. In order to study discursive aspects of these processes, we need discourse analytic methods that can systematically trace such pathways across events. The chapter provides an example of such analyses and sketches the conceptual background behind our methodological approach.”
CHAPTER 1

English as Translingual
Chapter 1: English as Translingual

English has always been a contact language. In recent contexts of post-colonialism and postmodern globalization, English has been undergoing further changes in relation to the diverse new languages and communities it has been coming into contact with. Many scholars are addressing the changes English is going through as it travels beyond its traditional homes and speakers. The models of World Englishes (WE), English as an International Language (EIL), and English as a Lingua Franca (ELF) are some of them. These models offer useful insights into how English has to be understood differently when it comes into contact with other languages and develops hybrid grammars. And yet, they are significantly different from the translingual approach developed in this book. It is important to understand the differences, as I proceed to define English as a form of translingual practice.

To begin with, these models define the emergent varieties largely in terms of form, constituting each into a separate system. They provide greater importance to grammar as giving coherence and identity to these varieties. These models also treat these varieties as having separate identities, which are located in unique speech communities. As a result, they run into many limitations. The most important of these is the proliferation of varieties of English, an unending compendium of regional national, subnational, ethnic, and pidgin and creole varieties. I will demonstrate that orientating to the global spread of English as a translingual practice enables us to address the common processes underlying these diverse and emergent varieties. A focus on the products of these common underlying processes can be misleading. These models end up reifying each variety, limiting further changes, and preventing us from being open to studying further diversification. The focus on the product also takes away our attention from the processes of contact, mobility, and sedimentation that underlie these varieties. It also prevents us from understanding the dynamics of meaning-making practices, as we are made to focus on the superficial outward manifestations of the form.

To adopt terms coined by Halliday (2002) we can say that the dominant models of global Englishes focus more on glossodiversity and not much on semiodiversity. While the former approach focuses on the emergence of form and language varieties, the latter focuses on meaning changes. There are important processes in semiodiversity relating to global Englishes that require more analysis, as other scholars have also argued (Kramsch, 2006; Pennycook, 2010). In fact, semiodiversity can take place even without changes in form. We should not consider the diversity and appropriation of English in instances of form changes only. The same word or grammatical item can be made to index new values and meanings as it travels through diverse spatio-temporal contexts. I am not arguing that glossodiversity should be discounted. However, there is a danger in treating it as the primary resource for meaning and not focusing on the...
semiotic practices that engender new meanings. Furthermore, the dominant models treat the patterns and systems which they see at the level of form as being stable and originary. These patterns are ever-changing, and they do so because practice is primary. The norms at the level of glossodiversity, then, are always in a state of becoming. Moreover, these models recognize varieties when they reach a status of stability and regularity after much sedimentation. However, the practice-based perspective considers emergent forms at different levels of stabilization as still being meaningful. Since it is not form but practices that generate meaning, forms that are idiosyncratic can still contribute to semiodiversity. In fact, even violations of the system or norms can be meaningful and can contribute to semiodiversity. Though there are different levels of formal patterning at the level of glossodiversity (i.e., pidgins, creoles, dialects, genres, and discourses; native versus non-native varieties of English), and there is value in considering their relationship, we mustn’t treat any of them as deficient or ignore the underlying practices that explain their emergence and meaning-making potential.

Furthermore, we must develop an orientation to English as having been already always diverse. It hasn’t become translilingual or hybrid only because of its flows outside its traditional homeland or native speaker communities. Native speaker communities also engage in translilingual practices. Not surprisingly, the dominant models of global Englishes leave out native speakers and their communities from their analyses. The diversification of English seems to matter only in cases of its use by multilinguals or non-native communities. However, the position adopted in this book is that no community is homogeneous. While the “community” itself embeds a lot of diversity (not only in cultural terms, but also in terms of gender, class, region, and lifestyle choices), it is open to interactions with other communities all the time. I therefore consider translilingual practice as the process whereby native speaker varieties have also been developing. A consideration of translilingual practice enables us to see the practices that underlie all forms of glossodiversity.

There are also questions about communication beyond the varieties of each community that the dominant models are unable to explore effectively. How do diverse people represent their own identities, negotiate unequal power relationships, and still manage to use English to get their inter-community relationships accomplished? These models have to resort to positing a common variety beyond the local varieties to facilitate communication between communities. The translilingual approach makes a neutral variety unnecessary. People adopt negotiation strategies to retain their difference and still communicate with each other. Therefore it provides a more satisfying explanation, in my view, on how complex personal, cultural, and ideological tensions are resolved in inter-community contact.

It is important to review the assumptions of the dominant models about the nature of
language, community, competence, and meaning in order to understand their conception of English. I must acknowledge that it is difficult to generalize about these models, as a lot of rethinking and retheorizing is taking place among their proponents. Yet, making their differences clear and their theoretical assumptions explicit will help us to engage with the full implications of a practice-based translingual perspective.

**World Englishes**

The World Englishes (WE) model is among the earliest and most popular in addressing the ways in which the usage of English is changing in contact with other languages and communities. It demonstrated that the English language is not monolithic, but a changing complex of multiple varieties. It put forth the argument that the indigenization of English in diverse communities was leading to local varieties that have their own system and norms. In this sense, they are not broken Englishes or deficient, simply different from native speaker norms.

Kachru's (1986) original formulation of the "three circles model" is now well known. The circles are defined according to the historical spread and social functions of the varieties. The Inner Circle is called "norm providing" and constitutes the "owners" of this language, who largely use English as their first and often sole language for their social interactions. It is their norms that are treated as having spread to other communities. The Outer Circle constitutes post-colonial communities which have adopted English as a second language for intranational uses. Because they have developed their own norms over time, in relation to their own languages and values, this circle is called "norm developing." Kachru's main contribution was in establishing the legitimacy of these post-colonial varieties of English. Indian English was valid for Indians, and Nigerian English for Nigerians, just as British English for the British. The Expanding Circle constitutes countries that didn't come under British colonization, but are using English as a foreign language for contact with other similar countries. Since they are not assumed to have internal uses of the language, they were labeled "norm dependent." The norms which they were supposed to adopt are those of the Inner Circle.

Despite its radical outcome of achieving acceptance for newly emerging varieties of English, WE doesn't go far enough in pluralizing English or reflecting the dynamic changes in communicative practices. The construction of this model in terms of nation-states ignores many currently existing and still evolving varieties of English. The move to posit a community to anchor each variety is perhaps a gesture in the direction of the monolingualist orientation. WE scholars are now acknowledging diverse varieties within the nation-state, such as: the subcultural and social varieties in the Outer Circle
(i.e., Campus Kiswahili in Tanzania) and immigrant second language varieties in the Inner Circle (Chicano English in the USA). However, calling them “local varieties” as some scholars do (see Kirkpatrick, 2010, p. 32) is still an acknowledgement of the nation-state as the frame of reference. There are other varieties being identified at transnational levels, positing communities of other scale levels—Asian Englishes (Bolton, 2008), ASEAN English (that of the Association of South East Asian Nations—Kirkpatrick, 2010), and Chinese Englishes (Bolton, 2003; based on a transnational speech community of Chinese speakers). WE scholars are also unclear about the place of pidgins and creoles. These were not included in Kachru’s original formulation. This omission is motivated by the “creole exceptionalism” (DeGraff, 2003) shared by the other models of global Englishes also. Pidgins and creoles are treated as inferior or deficient forms of communication, as they arise in unequal contact among less privileged communities. However, these forms participate in the same creative meaning-making processes of translingual contact. They are now included in a model that supersedes WE, and named “English Language Complex” by Mesthrie and Bhatt (2008). Though it is salutary that other varieties beyond and beneath the nation-state are being recognized, this proliferation of new varieties can be potentially unending. Based on the scale level one adopts, one might identify features that make up a new pattern of usage. Pennycook calls such obsession with identifying new varieties an “enumerative strategy” (Pennycook, 2010, p. 82) that will initiate an endless race to identify more and more varieties. A more productive undertaking is to identify the processes underlying the construction of all these varieties, that is, the translingual practice—as I have articulated above. It is better to treat contact and practices as more primary and varieties as always emergent and changing at diverse levels of localization.

The normative orientation of WE models also leads to some limitations. Though it pluralizes English, WE still anchors the emergent varieties and their functions in terms of one set of norms or another. The Outer Circle norms are this model’s unique contribution. Kachru asserts that the English as spoken in Outer Circle communities is not deficient, but is systematic in its own way. To appreciate this fact, we have to stop comparing these post-colonial uses of English with native speaker norms. Though this point is extremely significant, the normed nature of local varieties excludes many domains and varieties of English within these countries. Blommaert (2005) shows many uses of English in rural and urban contexts in Tanzania (an Outer Circle country) that may not be treated as part of Tanzanian English. Others like Parakrama (1995), and Bhatia and Ritchie (2004) show examples for Sri Lanka and India, respectively, which also may not be included in standardized local varieties. They are often treated as “uneducated” varieties, revealing the bias against them (see Kandiah 1984 for more on educated and uneducated varieties of Sri Lankan English). These examples reveal that
the uses of English that are too hybrid and transitory are not treated as part of WE. The varieties recognized by WE require a level of stability that leaves out other creative and emergent uses that are still meaningful and functional in local contexts. The legitimised WE models also tolerate limited mixing from other languages, treating excessive mixing as evidence of incompetence. From this perspective, the pluralization of WE doesn’t go far enough. A more reasonable approach is to consider how people’s processes of negotiating diverse languages for their purposes lead them to adopt strategies of meaning-making and co-construction of intersubjective norms similar to translilingual practices.

The position on the norms relating to the Expanding Circle has also generated much rethinking. Empirical evidence (House, 2003; Jenkins, 2000) shows that multilingual speakers in the Expanding Circle don’t adopt Inner Circle norms for their communication. They negotiate their differences in interpersonal relationships (whatever nationality they come from) by adopting effective pragmatic strategies for the co-construction of norms that facilitate communication. More importantly, within Expanding Circle countries, there are significant uses of English. This has led many scholars to argue that intra-community patterns and norms are developing here as well (see Erling 2002 for Germany, and Clemente and Higgins 2008 for Mexico). It is a testament to globalization’s reach that no community is devoid of contact with English today.

Furthermore, WE treats Inner Circle varieties as uniform or monolithic when, in fact, there are diverse norms and uses within these countries. There are translilingual practices within Inner Circle countries, as diverse ethnic and migrant groups negotiate English in relation to their own languages. For example, WE scholars are unsure how to relate to the longstanding forms of African American Vernacular English (AAVE). Debating the extent to which they are like a creole or a decolored standard, Mesthrie and Bhatt (2008) drop AAVE from consideration in their treatment of WE. However, definitions of what is or isn’t a “variety” shouldn’t prevent us from acknowledging significant communicative practices. It is far better to acknowledge that translinguistic practice occurs within the Inner Circle communities also. No community is isolated from contact or bounded as to exclude other influences. Even “native speakers” are engaged in translinguistic practices as they use English in relation to the other languages which they come into contact with. Furthermore, language contact has been taking place in relation to Welsh, Irish, and Scots Gaelic, let alone other colonizing languages such as French and Latin, influencing English in important ways. We cannot leave the Inner Circle varieties outside the pluralization process, assuming a monolithic standard. In other words, Inner Circle Englishes are also localized varieties. The creative contact processes underlying the formation and use of the Inner Circle varieties are ignored by WE, assuming their norms and standards to be homogeneous and originary. Attitudes of
ownership and purity may inhibit NES engagement with other languages and communities, but cannot leave their competence or norms unscathed from the results of such contact.

WE perceives the local varieties in other communities as emerging from one original variety belonging to native speakers and the Inner Circle. It thus perceives the spread as centrifugal. Note, however, that the formation of English was itself fluid and hybrid. It was formed out of a confluence of tribal dialects outside what people consider as the home of English, that is, the British Isles. It is possible to see the post-colonial diversification of English arieties as also radically localized. The local initiative of Outer and Expanding Circles in appropriating English resources and giving new indexicalities appears to receive less complexity because of the centrifugal orientation that gives more importance to the native speaker varieties in language spread. Pennycook (2010) gives more importance to local initiatives by considering English “already local,” (p. 74) and not dependent on the influences or initiatives from the Inner Circle. From this perspective, there are local social practices, linguistic processes, and contact dynamics already underway in relation to diverse local languages, which English also participates in.

More importantly, the WE model leaves out a consideration of the contact between the circles, as it focuses on varieties within the three circles and nation-state boundaries. Whose norms apply when a member from the Expanding Circle talks to one from the Outer Circle? Whose norms apply when someone from the Outer Circle talks to a member from Inner Circle? Obviously, these interlocutors have to engage in situated practices of negotiation and the co-construction of meaning across local norms. In striving to establish the rule-governed nature of each nation-state’s variety, WE has left the complexities of transnational contact unaddressed.

**English as an international language**

Another set of models relating to the globalization of English, which I will call English as an International Language (EIL), addresses better the relationship between the varieties in translocal contact. I include the slightly different models of McArthur (1987), Gorlach (1990), Crystal (2004), and Modiano (2004) under this orientation. This model also makes a significant departure from WE by accommodating all varieties of English into the same non-hierarchical plane. The distinctions within the circle are functional, not hierarchical. For scholars like Crystal (2004) and Graddol (1999), the justification for this egalitarian model is purely demographic. They show that the number of people who speak English as an additional language far exceeds those who use it as their sole or first language, that is, the traditional native speakers. They
therefore argue that the time has come for speakers of all varieties to negotiate English on equal terms. Though it might be said that Inner Circle varieties enjoy more prestige in many institutional circles (e.g., schools, universities, and the media) even in multilingual communities, there are occasions in globalization when Inner Circle speakers find themselves in unprivileged situations, when they have to negotiate on equal terms with their interlocutors. But power is not dependent on the prestige of the language alone. In terms of scales such as economy, commerce, or industry, there are other communities in the Outer and Expanding Circle that wield more power these days. Besides, the nature of globalization in late modernity is such that economy, production, and even military intervention require more international collaboration and networking. In such contexts, English has to be negotiated and one's norms cannot be imposed on others. EIL models therefore place all the varieties on an equal footing.

EIL models also go beyond WE in accommodating varieties beyond and beneath the nation-state. There are slight differences in their treatment. Whereas McArthur (1987) places regional varieties (East Asian or South Asian English), subnational varieties (Inuit, Quebec, and Athabascan English within Canadian English), and pidgins and creoles in the same circle, Gorlach (1990) differentiates them according to different layers for regional, national, and subnational varieties. Despite the advances in orientating to “English as a family of languages” (Crystal, 2004, p. 40), this egalitarian model is still marked by some of the limitations discussed in relation to WE. EIL simply adds to the number of varieties in English, participating in the “enumerative strategy of counting languages” that assumes discrete language systems (Pennycook, 2010, p. 82). It is also still norms-based, as it treats grammatical norms as the criterion for identifying self-contained varieties, often in an impressionistic manner.

More interesting is the way EIL addresses the question of communication in contact situations across these varieties. For this purpose, scholars posit a neutral transnational variety of English with its own norms. It is labeled differently in different models: “World Standard Spoken English” (WSSE; Crystal, 1997), “World Standard Auxiliary English” (McArthur, 1987), “English as an International Language” (Modiano 1999), and “International English” (Gorlach, 1990). These scholars see this as another variety into which speakers will switch, away from their own varieties, when they engage in translocal communication. Crystal predicts, “It may not be many years before an international standard will be the starting-point, with British, American, and other varieties all seen as optional localizations” (Crystal, 2004, p. 40). As Crystal’s statement indicates, this common international standard is projected for the future. No empirical evidence is provided to show that it already exists. The more important point is that these scholars have to project another variety to solve the problem of global contact. They see the need for a shared uniform norm at a higher scale level so that people can engage in translocal communication and cosmopolitan relationships. As I will go on to
show below, there is evidence that when people engage in inter-community relations they maintain their own varieties of English and adopt pragmatic strategies to co-construct intersubjective norms for meaning-making. Besides, this projection of a supra-norm for cosmopolitan relationships counteracts against the democratization initiated in other ways by EIL models. Is a neutral, that is, value-free model ever possible for transnational contact? Crystal (2004) acknowledges that WSSE would be heavily influenced by the dominant varieties of British and American English. Furthermore, what happens to local and specific identities when this neutral model is adopted? That is, do speakers hold their identities in abeyance for the sake of harmony? The need for people to adopt another variety (albeit neutral) over their own raises the same questions of power and hegemony that motivated people to localize and appropriate English in the first place.

**English as a Lingua Franca**

The English as a Lingua Franca (ELF) label has been adopted by diverse scholars, with considerable debate among them on the norms and identity of the language. My discussion in this section is restricted to the influential work of Jenkins, Seidlhofer and their collaborators. I treat other scholars like Firth, Gramkow Andersen, and Meierkord as belonging to an alternative approach that I develop next. Though the ELF model of Jenkins and Seidlhofer also posits an emergent international norm that facilitates communication across communities, it doesn’t claim neutrality for this norm. The model valorizes the creativity of non-native speakers by treating this norm as a co-construction from multilingual norms. This emergent norm is constructed in opposition to NES norms. Furthermore, while EIL scholars project the uniform norm almost prophetically, ELF scholars have been engaged in the laudable project of collecting empirical data to identify the lingua franca core (LFC). Their corpus-based studies have generated an identification of core features that are claimed to be critical for intelligibility across varieties, and non-core features that are not supposed to affect intelligibility. In the beginning, LFC features were treated as providing useful pedagogical implications. The recommendation was to teach the core features and ignore the non-core features, even if they violated native speaker norms. For ELF, contact purposes justified multilinguals using their own norms and not treating NES norms as their reference point. For conversations in which native speakers didn’t participate, such a reference point was treated as unfair and irrelevant. However, almost in the manner in which Crystal envisioned WSSE, ELF posits a variety into which multi-lingual speakers can codeswitch for contact purposes. Seidlhofer argued in a state of the art essay: “The option of distinguishing ELF from ENL [i.e., English as National Language] is likely to be beneficial in that it leaves varieties of native English
intact for all the functions that only a first language can perform and as a target for learning in circumstances where ENL is deemed appropriate, as well as providing the option of code-switching between ENL and ELF” (Seidhlofer, 2004, p. 229). ENL includes all national norms, whether British or Indian English. It is evident then that ELF is being treated as a variety that could be codified in terms of linguistic features. Seidhlofer goes on to express the desire to establish ELF as a “linguistic reality, named and captured in reference works alongside ENL and Outer Circle Englishes” (Seidhlofer, 2004, p. 215). She was confident at that time that there was a “descriptive basis for an eventual codification of ELF” (Seidhlofer, 2004, p. 215). This system-building work also motivated ELF researchers to focus more on phonology and ignore writing and pragmatics. Seidhlofer argued that pragmatics “does not comprise a closed set of features for study,” and that it is “thus less constrained and thus less manageable in research” (Seidhlofer, 2004, p. 217).

The model, at least as posited in its formative period, is not immune from the questions raised against the neutral variety option of the EIL model. Scholars have asked questions about the identity and power relations implied by the LFC variety (Rubdy and Saraceni, 2006). Some scholars in the ELF tradition, such as House (2003), have projected that ELF will be a language for instrumental and not identity purposes, raising the possibility of neutrality in ELF. However, not only is it impossible to be neutral in language use, it is unnecessary to suppress identity for the sake of contact relations. More importantly, ELF is treated as a monolithic variety, similar to the EIL approach. It is a product that exists “out there.” However, evidence from other researchers casts doubt on the existence of a stable variety or commonly shared norms in multilingual contact situations. What Christiane Meierkord finds instead is a mixture of features in contact encounters, that is, “overwhelming correspondence to the rules of L1 Englishes; transfer phenomena, developmental patterns and nativised forms; simplification, regularisation and levelling processes” (Meierkord, 2004, p. 128). This finding is consistent with Sampson and Zhao (2003) who study a group of international sailors in a ship. They find complex borrowing of lexemes and grammatical structures from each other, in addition to pidgin-like simplification processes. Based on findings such as these, Meierkord treats the language of contact situations as “a variety in constant flux, involving different constellations of speakers of diverse individual Englishes in every single interaction” (Meierkord, 2004, p. 115). In other words, there is no stable variety that marks contact zone communication. Such communication works because speakers are prepared to adopt strategies to co-construct norms in situ, and achieve intelligibility through (not despite) their local varieties and identities.

To the credit of ELF scholars, they have begun to address criticism of this nature and steadily redefine and expand their analyses. In recent years, ELF scholars have favorably
cited works like Pennycook (2007) and Canagarajah (2007) on translingual practice, and given more emphasis to the exploration of pragmatic negotiations in contact situations (see Jenkins, et al., 2011, p. 9). They recognize that the practices of interpersonal negotiation that enable people to achieve intelligibility and communicative success are as important as the shared grammatical norms. In recent years, ELF has gradually moved closer to the practice-based perspective adopted in this book (see Seidhlofer, 2009 for an example). Seidhlofer mentions, “In many speech events, boundaries between languages ... seem to be perceived as fluid or irrelevant” (Seidhlofer, 2009, p. 242). Similarly, Jennifer Jenkins and her co-authors mention: “it becomes clear that ELF cannot be considered a ‘variety’ in any traditional sense of the term. Even the early language-focused ELF research had observed how ELF varied according to both speakers’ other languages/cultures and the effect of contextual factors on accommodative behaviour. And since then, the contextual element has taken centre stage in ELF research and its role found to be rather more important than originally anticipated” (Jenkins, et al., 2011, p. 9). It is implied that there is a change in the orientation of the ELF model on the relative importance of form and practice. It also appears that the mission to identify a neutral grammar or LFC is now abandoned.

Is ELF moving toward theorizing lingua franca English as a form of translingual practice? However, there are some inconsistencies in the position of ELF scholars. They have not fully transitioned to a practice-based perspective. It is important to do a close analysis of the ELF position in order to appreciate the implications of the translingual approach. To begin with, ELF scholars still retain an important place for grammatical norms, treating negotiation strategies as an add-on, perhaps of the same status as form. In the same article where Jenkins and her co-authors mention the practice-oriented shift, they still make a case for the continued importance of form in ELF research. Affirming that form serves “important purposes” (Jenkins, et al., 2011, p. 9). Jenkins and her co-authors argue that: “The empirically proven existence of these features in the speech of skilled ELF communicators enables ELF researchers to counter any claim that ELF is merely a deficient form of native English” (Jenkins, et al., 2011, p. 9). It appears that they are focused on proving ELF’s systematicity and logic based on form. Transtlingual practice focuses on accounting for communicative success based on negotiation strategies, treating form as emergent from these strategies.

Seidhlofer is similarly faced with a dilemma between form and practice as she adopts CoP as her theoretical framework for a practice-based perspective. She talks of the need to redefine the ELF community as follows: “A much more appropriate concept is that of communities of practice characterized by ‘mutual engagement’ in shared practices, taking part in some jointly negotiated ‘enterprise’, and making use of members’ ‘shared repertoire’” (Seidhlofer, 2009, p. 238). Though this is a laudable move, there are several limitations, partly resulting from the CoP model being used
uncritically. Note that a shared repertoire is treated as already existing, not co-constructed. The repertoires are not presented as emerging from practices. Finally, pre-existing repertoires are not necessarily needed for communicative success. Negotiation strategies are able to ensure intelligibility and success in a practice-based orientation. Translingual practice focuses on accounting for communicative success based on negotiation strategies, and not purely or primarily on shared form.

The need to posit a community to anchor ELF itself requires some discussion. Though foregrounding practice, ELF scholars still see a need for a community to give identity to ELF. Similar to Seidlhofer, Jenkins adds that ELF "suggests the idea of community as opposed to alienness ... and it emphasizes that people have something in common rather than their differences" (Jenkins, 2000, p. 11). Jenkins' rationale for this community orientation is that the competing model of EFL assumes that multilinguals are “foreign” speakers, thus framed as alien in relation to the community of native speakers. There is a need to posit a community in order to explain the alternate ELF norms and the possibility of intelligibility. However, translinguals are able to achieve communicative success in the contact zone without community. Community is a theoretical need ELF shares with other models of global Englishes, showing the influence of Herderian discourses that posit a community for language identity. Seidlhofer moves closer to a practice-based perspective later in her essay. She states that: "Rather than limiting itself to the identification of particular linguistic features, this research has tended to take a much more processual, communicative view of ELF, of which linguistic features constitute but a part and are investigated not for their own sake but as indications of the various functions ELF fulfills in the interactions observed" (Seidlhofer, 2009, p. 241). It is laudable that linguistic features are not taken for their own sake. However, these features are not taken to emerge from practices either. They are indications of the functions they serve. There is still a traditional bifurcation of form and function here. The practice-based view perceives form as emerging from practices, not necessarily matching with practices, as if both exist independently. As we discussed in Chapter 2, Pennycook (2010) makes a distinction between function and practice. The former assumes that there is a preconstructed form that serves some functions, after the fact. The practice-based perspective perceives form and function as emerging from practice.

Jenkins is even more clear about the status of shared norms in ELF. Although she talks about "mutual negotiation" (Jenkins, 2009, p. 201) in other places, she gives more emphasis to form when she states:

At its simplest, ELF involves both common ground and local variation. On the one hand, there is shared linguistic common ground among ELF speakers just as there is shared common ground among the many varieties of the English that are collectively referred to as "English as a native language" (ENL). ELF’s common
ground inevitably contains linguistic forms that it shares with ENL, but it also contains forms that differ from ENL and that have arisen through contact between ELF speakers, and through the influence of ELF speakers’ first languages on their English ... The common ground in ELF is being identified in the speech of proficient speakers of English.

(Jenkins, 2009, p. 201)

What we have to note is that there is a common ground hypothesized for contact situations. The common ground is defined in terms of form. The norms of the common ground belong to proficient speakers of English. The emphasis on proficient speakers shows the need to define the language norms in somewhat stable and Systematic terms. As we will see below, there is other evidence suggesting that translinguals accomplish intelligibility without common linguistic norms. That is, they are able to succeed also with unshared local norms in contact zone communication. Moreover, those who are capable of adopting effective interactional strategies are able to accomplish communicative success without advanced competence in language norms. Therefore, communicative success in contact zone communication need not be defined in terms of a common ground of language norms. The significance of lingua franca communication is that communication succeeds even when difference is the norm. Other revisions in the understanding of ELF are also significant in moving it closer to a translingual orientation. Though ELF was originally defined in relation to the neglected Expanding Circle interactions of the WE model, it has now broadened to include interactions across all three circles. During its inception, ELF left out NES from its analysis. In her 2006 state-of-the-art essay, for example, Jenkins says: “Indeed, in its purest form, ELF is defined as a contact language used only among non-mother tongue speakers” (Jenkins, 2006, p. 160). Now, there is a recognition that Inner Circle speakers too may participate in lingua franca encounters. Seidlofer notes, “Obviously communication via ELF frequently happens in and across all three of Kachru’s circles” (Seidlofer, 2009, p. 236). Despite this change, Jenkins (2009) states that only 10 percent of “native speaker” interactions are included in their corpus. The important concern even now is that NES don’t impose their norms on ELF communication. In a subtle way, however, the notion of “native speaker” still seems to influence ELF conceptualizations, limiting its relevance for contact zone interactions. The translingual orientation questions the use of NES in an essentialized manner as separated from multilinguals. I will show in the coming chapters that native speakers also have the capacity to negotiate English in contact situations through pragmatic strategies. The role of native speakers in contact zone communication is not unnatural and need not be excluded. Furthermore, NES may have other languages in their repertoire. There are also many multilinguals who boast of English as their most proficient language among a repertoire of other languages. Therefore, studying lingua
franca English in terms of nativeness is misleading. All are involved in contact zone interactions in English, regardless of their native speakerhood. Linguae francae should be studied in terms of contact practices, not of non-native speaker status. It is for this reason that I adopt the label “Global Engishes” in this book, and not “Lingua Franca English.”

There is also a move in ELF toward a “pluricentric approach” (Jenkins, 2009, p. 202) that resists the tendency to identify new and different varieties of English. Similarly, Seidlhofer speaks against talking about Engishes as “countable (proper) nouns implying separate bounded entities” (Seidlhofer, 2009, p. 242). A practice-based perspective would certainly identify the negotiation strategies underlying contact English and not focus on the sedimented forms to name new varieties of English. However, in a companion essay in the same volume of the journal World Engishes where Seidlhofer’s article appears, Jenkins considers identifying further varieties of ELF based on language norms. She finds it likely that “researchers working on ELF in different parts of the world ... will identify different branches of ELF ... and different sub-varieties within these” (Jenkins, 2009, pp. 201–2). This approach would continue the enumerative approach on global Engishes, much in contradiction to the claims made for ELF in other places.

The inconsistencies of ELF partly result from the model’s lack of philosophical clarity. The commendable empirical work that motivates its corpus research hasn’t been matched by equally sophisticated theorizing. Clarity about the theoretical underpinnings of ELF would help the model move toward a more complex practice-based orientation. How does ELF explain language, meaning, and competence in contact situations? The closest ELF scholars come to discussing such concerns is in their brief mentions of CoP (as noted above). However, the applications of this model for ELF are not fully developed. As I indicated above, the connection between repertoires and practices, and their relative significance for community formation and maintenance, are controversial. Furthermore, the implications of the model for identity representation and power negotiations, though alluded to, are not fully explicated. Beyond discussions of multicompetence and the irrelevance of native speaker norms, ELF hasn’t discussed the more subtle issues of power and difference in contact situations. How code choices and negotiation strategies of interlocutors facilitate and inform their identity and power negotiations will benefit from more explicit discussion. Bringing out the social theories and philosophical constructs underlying the model would steady ELF’s progress.

Despite the current lack of clarity and the direction of the ELF model, we must acknowledge the contributions ELF has already made toward understanding English as a contact language. ELF scholars have established the fact that Expanding Circle
speakers don’t depend on Inner Circle norms for meaning-making. They have also shown that the Englishes spoken by multilingual speakers are not deficient. Despite their deviations from native speaker norms, multilinguals are able to achieve co-constructed intelligibility and meaning. Furthermore, they have argued for a form of competence, influenced by models of multicompetence (Cook, 1999), that is qualitatively different from those of native speaker orientations. In all these ways, ELF has moved the field closer to a consideration of English as a translingual practice.

**English as translingual**

My orientation to English as a contact language is influenced by the notion of translingual practice. In this model, I treat practices as primary, and grammatical norms as emergent. I hold that intelligibility and communicative success are not predicated on sharedness (deriving from grammar or community identity). I see the possibility of diversity and the retention of people’s local identities in contact zone encounters, and don’t assume that communication in these sites is neutral. Though I consider contact zone interactions as constrained by power differences, I see these inequalities as negotiable. For these reasons, I consider it important to focus more on strategies that enable such negotiation of power and difference for meaning and communication. This orientation helps me theorize how English is used across all three circles in contact situations, unlike the WE model that identifies varieties within specific communities.

I have previously adopted the label Lingua franca English or LFE (first used by Firth, 1996) to capture my focus on pragmatics rather than grammatical norms and distinguish it from the ELF approach (Canagarajah, 2007). While ELF gives the impression that there is another variety called English as a lingua franca, perhaps parallel to Englishes as community varieties in WE, my label gives emphasis to the contact relationship and treats English as a social process or mode of practice. Pennycook has added another argument to back up this different terminology, elevating my label to represent an alternate model. He states, “This distinction between English as a lingua franca and Lingua franca English is an important one, since the former tends towards an understanding of a pre-given language that is then used by different speakers, while the latter suggests that LFE emerges from the contexts of use” (Pennycook, 2010, p. 85). Though there is a risk that this label also objectifies this form of English and makes it a variety (and any labeling runs this risk anyway), Pennycook’s distinction is useful in this chapter to distinguish a translingual orientation to English from the previous models of contact English.

What form does English take in situations of contact? English may find accommodation
in the repertoire of a translingual, combining with one or more local languages. The person may not have any “advanced” proficiency in NES forms of English, and yet mix English words and grammatical structures into syntax from other languages. The English tokens may consist of borrowings, reduced forms (as in pidgins), and creative new constructions that might show the influence of other languages. The type of mixing will differ from speaker to speaker according to their level of proficiency in English and according to their language backgrounds. So, speakers of language A and language B may speak to each other in a form of English mixed with their own first languages, and marked by the influence of these languages. Without looking for a single uniform code, speakers will be able to negotiate their different Englishes for intelligibility and effective communication. In this sense, LFE is not an identifiable code or a systematized variety of English. It is a highly fluid and variable form of language practice. Meaning is an inter-subjective accomplishment. As interlocutors adopt negotiation strategies to align diverse semiotic resources, they will construct a hybrid form that meshes different languages for situated meaning.

This way of looking at the use of English is different from the models reviewed earlier. WE deals with highly systematized and stable varieties of English in post-colonial communities. Though borrowings from local languages may be included in WE, there must be a long tradition of using these borrowings to the point where they become stabilized as part of the local English variety. However, in LFE, English and local languages may be combined in idiosyncratic ways as it befits the speaker, context, and purpose. In this sense, while WE describes language varieties, LFE does not. LFE is a form of communicative practice, not a stable variety. Thus, while WE focuses on the variation at the level of form (i.e., glossodiversity), LFE focuses on semiodiversity (i.e., diversity at the level of meaning) with the implications for emergent forms. LFE treats the pluralization of meaning and meaning-making practices as primary, considering the diversification of form as a secondary outcome. There are many advantages to this approach. From a semiotic perspective, even the use of the same form or vocabulary item in a different context may take new indexicality. We are able to attend to these proliferations of meaning through a practice-based perspective. Also, such cases of meaning changes and negotiations are not limited to multilingual forms of English alone. Native speakers are also negotiating English in contact situations, with similar expansions and changes in the indexicalities of their English. WE, EIL, and ELF models leave out a consideration of such processes among Inner Circle speakers. More importantly, the translingual LFE approach addresses the processes underlying all such cases of language change and negotiation, whereas the other models focus on the products and forms that emerge out of these processes. While the products of these interactions are diverse and variable (and I will argue below that there is a place for a consideration of varieties and dialects), the underlying processes are of more
explanatory value.

Annamalai describing the hybrid contact practices in India (without using the LFE label), makes some useful comparisons with pidgins and creoles to bring the significance of LFE to the fore. In some respects, LFE is similar to pidgins, without the pejorative implications attached to the latter. In referring to forms of contact English, Annamalai says, “It is similar to incipient pidgin in its indeterminacy. The words taken from the English language differ from speaker to speaker and even in the same speaker from time to time. Even the same sentence repeated after a few seconds may not have the same words from English” (Annamalai, 2001, p. 173). And yet, LFE should be separated from other contact varieties. While a pidgin is considered a functional language with a reduced grammar and semantic range, LFE is not so. It can have the full range of expression for all possible contexts. Though creole is considered more developed than pidgin, it is also different from LFE. LFE doesn’t have an identity as a separate language, as creole does. LFE is a form of practice, not a language with a stabilized system or structure. Also, while creole has native speakers of its own, LFE doesn’t.

Nor is LFE an interlanguage. LFE speakers are not moving toward someone else’s target; they are constructing their own norms. It is therefore meaningless to measure the distance of LFE from the language of NES. Besides, we have to question the assumption in the interlanguage concept that there are gradations, linear progression, and an end point to be achieved in language learning. In LFE, each contact situation is a unique context, with a different mix of speakers and languages, raising its own challenges for negotiation. It may not be the case that one communicative act contributes to the other and so on, developing a cumulative line of progression toward an end point. Since the contexts are so variable and unpredictable, it is not possible to say that a target can be reached for perfect or competent translingual proficiency. Though translinguals do advance in their proficiency through practice-based learning, this development does not have to be marked by miscommunication or deficient usage, and should not be treated as such.

The translingual orientation gives complexity to processes like pidgins, creoles, and interlanguage. A form-based and monolingualist position has treated these forms of contact communication as deficient and incomplete. A practice-based point of view will reveal that these forms of communication are complex and functional. Similarly, a form-based and non-integrationist view of language has defined processes such as codeswitching and borrowing in dichotomous ways, despite their acknowledgement of hybridity. LFE shows how the meshing of codes can be more fluid and creative in these constructs. However, the LFE approach courts the danger of flattening all the sociolinguistic and multilingual distinctions. I must affirm that there are temporary and
situated sedimentations of form. Translingual practices do give birth to varieties, registers, dialects, and discourses over time. However, a translingual approach would prompt us to treat these forms and norms as always in a state of becoming, open to reconstitution through ongoing socially situated practices. Also, these forms and norms shouldn’t be treated as originary, giving birth to other forms and practices. Practices should be treated as primary. Granted these caveats, in contexts where there are relatively sedimented varieties with community ideologies backing those language labels, constructs such as codeswitching and borrowing may be relevant. We might be able to distinguish the sedimented language complex into which a marked item is switched or borrowed. Pidgins, creoles, and dialects may show different levels of sedimentation. Language ideologies enter into the picture to give these sedimented codes labels of deficiency (from the perspective of dominant groups) or ownership (from the perspective of marginalized groups). In other words, various situational norms and labels evolve from translingual English practices.

An illustration

I illustrate the explanatory value of the LFE approach by considering the following telephone conversation between Ahmad, an Egyptian cheese importer, and Hansen, a Danish cheese exporter (from a transcript presented by Firth and Wagner, 2007 to develop a different argument). I provide a reinterpretation of this interaction to consider how these speakers negotiate English in a transnational conversation typical of contact zones. In many ways, this is a modest example of contact English. Since this is a telephone conversation, contextual resources for interpretation are reduced. Therefore, this analysis is less multimodal. Also, the speakers display considerable proficiency in English. Their sentences are fairly well formed and grammar doesn’t cause major intelligibility problems. They don’t mix their own languages explicitly into this conversation, though indirect influences might be there.

Let us focus on the meaning of the word “blowing”:

1   Ahmad: we don’t want the order after the cheese is uh: h blowing
2   Hansen: see, yes
3   Ahmad: so I don’t know what I can we can do uh with the order now. () What do you think we should do with this is all blowing Mister Hansen (0.7)
4   Hansen: I am not uh (0.7) blowing uh what uh, what is this uh too big or what?
5   Ahmad: no the cheese is bad Mister Hansen (0.4) it is like () fermenting in the customs cool rooms
Hansen: ah it's gone off
Ahmad: yes, it's gone off

There is no evidence that "blowing" is from Egyptian English. The fact that Ahmad is hesitating before the utterance of the word on line 1 suggests that he made some effort in choosing it for this interaction. My students have suggested that the choice is based on a visual metaphor (i.e., the appearance of over-fermented cheese). Thus it could be a personal coinage and metaphorical in nature. Another suggestion has been that it might belong to a professional discourse in the cheese trade. An Anglo-Australian speaker has told me that he has heard the phrase "blown cheese" but not the progressive form of it (Rod Ellis, personal communication).

However, since Hansen doesn't recognize it, we cannot say that the word is shared even in the cheese trade register. What is important from a translingual perspective is not sharedness or prior knowledge, but the way both interlocutors manage to co-construct meaning for an atypical item. They have to resort to diverse negotiation strategies for meaning-making. Meaning emerges from the interaction, rather than being assumed or given.

Before we analyze the strategies the speakers use to provide this word with a shared indexicality, we must appreciate the complications it creates for other models of contact English. To consider WE first, although Ahmad comes from a former British colony, it is not clear that an understanding of Egyptian English will help to resolve the communication problem here. There is no evidence that "blowing" is used with a local indexicality. The enigmatic word is a situational choice that lies outside stable and systematic use. In fact, Ahmad might be monitoring his use to avoid local resources he says that he talks to a non-local "Blowing" is also not evidently part of the lingua franca core or WSSE. Thus, the word is not part of a universally shared norm as ELF or EIL models would postulate. Though this is a type of lingua franca interaction, between subjects from an Expanding Circle and an Outer Circle community, the speakers don't share the meaning of this word.

Some may explain that the word is a case of interlanguage and doesn't fall under the purview of existing models which theorize the stabilized usage of proficient speakers. They might thus argue that the word is idiosyncratic or erroneous in terms of their own models. However, the point to note is that the word is still functional. Both interlocutors end up giving this word its own indexicality and achieving their communicative objectives. Rather than being unusual in lingua franca communication, it is very typical of what takes place. Interlocutors negotiate their meanings situationally in relation to their needs. Translinguals do come up with forms and words that defy systematicity or stability all the time. They co-construct meanings and achieve inter-subjective understanding through negotiation strategies. The fact that norms and
forms are unpredictable and heterogeneous I treat as typical of contact zone interactions. Rather than ruling out items that stand outside the shared norms as erroneous or idiosyncratic (in fidelity to systems), it is more important to consider how people do end up giving them meaning and achieve communicative success. Everyday communicative achievements in the contact zone shouldn’t be puzzling if we focus on negotiation strategies and not forms, as the participants themselves seem to be doing here. Furthermore, this is a case of semidiversity that is not captured by models orientating to glossodiversity. A word that is already available in the English language (i.e., “blowing”) is being used in a new context, receiving new indexicality.

Some scholars may attribute the initial confusion to the local identities and values the interlocutors bring to the interaction. The very indirect way in which Ahmad frames his complaint (in #1) could be based on the face-saving strategies of non-Western communities. Rather than saying outright that he wishes to cancel the order, Ahmad frames his utterance in terms of a preference. The phrase “we don’t want” may indicate a collective preference rather than a legalistic canceling of the order. His follow-up comment (#3) is even more indirect as Ahmad first frames the displeasure as a form of personal dilemma or confusion, and later as a consultation on what to do. The failure in Hansen’s uptake is probably due to this indirect framing of utterances. It is on line 5 that Ahmad says very directly that the cheese has gone bad. There are also power differences that might complicate comprehension. It is possible that the indirect framing of utterances is due to Ahmad’s deferential attitude toward Hansen. We also see that while Ahmad uses the less direct “we” and addresses his interlocutor as “Mister Hansen,” the latter sounds more direct and authoritative. He uses “I” freely, proffers his own gloss for Ahmad’s unintelligible word (in #4), and doesn’t address Ahmad by any title or name. Though these traces of power and culture have a bearing on unintelligibility, I will show below that they are open to renegotiation. There are other factors in the context that motivate both interlocutors to negotiate these factors situationally, beyond the stereotypical differences.

Let us then ask how a word that cannot be legitimized according to WE, EIL, or ELF models turns out to be meaningful. Note first that both interlocutors are very supportive and collaborative in resolving the unintelligible word. On line 2, Hansen initially signals uptake (i.e., “see, yes”), though it is clear later that he didn’t understand the critical word “blowing.” This could be an accommodation strategy on his part (contrary to the presumed directness of Westerners) to be supportive in this conversation. This is a strategy translinguals adopt to go along with the flow of the conversation rather than disrupt it. It is motivated by the collaborative disposition researchers find to be common among translinguals. Firth (1996) calls this the “let-it-pass” principle. It is not adopted merely to be nice to the interlocutor. As the
conversation progresses, the listener will get more clues to resolve the meaning of the unintelligible item (especially since the word will recur if it is critical for the communicative objectives). If Hansen had been judgemental or impatient, he could have conveyed negative attitudes that could have affected the negotiation.

On line 3, we see that Ahmad is clearly monitoring uptake as he repeats his query in a slightly more direct manner. Hansen's response on line 2 was not the right uptake, as he didn't respond to the illocutionary force of Ahmad's utterance. He didn't address the problem of spoilt cheese. Ahmad is again sensitive to the pause on line 3, after his first rephrasing of the problem. He is collaborative and supportive in providing another rephrasing, ending with a question that clearly requires an answer and not another vague uptake. All this shows that Ahmad is sensitive to contextualization cues such as silences and pauses, and uses them strategically for communication.

The longer pause after line 3 suggests that Hansen is now thinking more carefully as he has at least understood the need to make a decision about the order. What is interesting is that he is again supportive and collaborative, and offers a gloss to the word (“big” in #4) as he makes a request for clarification. Clarification strategies such as this are very common in contact zone interactions to achieve meaning (Kaur, 2009). Ahmad corrects him in #5 with a rephrasing with the word "bad." The short pause suggests that the gloss is probably too broad. It fails to gain uptake. So Ahmad offers another gloss with “fermenting” on the same line. Glosses by interlocutors are also well-known lingua franca strategies for meaning negotiation (Kirkpatrick, 2010, p. 141). One might say that even "fermenting" is not very helpful, as it is probably "over-fermenting" that Ahmad meant. At this point, Hansen offers another gloss for “blowing” (i.e., “gone off” in #6) and that gains uptake from Ahmad, as they now resolve the meaning of that word.

That “gone off” is a British expression and approximates British English might complicate the interpretation. However, the nature of the interaction makes clear that both interlocutors are not striving to adopt an NES norm, but only to make sense to each other in their own terms. Furthermore, “gone off” is only a gloss for “blowing” and not the co-constructed new word. The researchers (Firth and Wagner, 2007) mention that in a subsequent conversation these two subjects use “blowing” and not “gone off” as their shared indexical. This confirms the “make it normal” strategy identified by Firth (1996). That is, an unconventional word “blowing” gets normalized as a shared word, rather than being replaced by a British norm (even if we grant that both are aware of the pedigree of “gone off”). We may even say that the gloss doesn't fully capture the meaning of "blowing" as it is used by both participants. It is the whole trajectory of their negotiation, including alignment with multimodal resources in the context, that provides them an emic understanding of the meaning of the word.
We must realize that meaning negotiation is helped by resources beyond language or words. We have to be wary of giving too much importance to words alone for their meaning-making capacity. The models we have considered above (WE, EIL, and ELF) are constructed in the Structuralist tradition, treating language as a self-contained system. However, people are able to make meaning by violating the system (or prescriptively defined grammatical structures), because meaning emerges in alignment with other ecological resources. Note the role of features such as the topic of the conversation, the geographical context, and the immediate situation relating to the cheese import which probably help the interlocutors clarify the word. Note also other features such as the hesitation phenomena and silences on the telephone conversation for the way they communicate levels of uptake and need for clarification. If the fairly delocalized conversation on the telephone had not reduced ecological resources in the transcript, we would have seen how situational features of the ecology in face-to-face conversation provide even greater resources for intelligibility—as I will demonstrate in the chapters to follow. Matsumoto (2012) demonstrates how LFE interlocutors creatively use gestures to complement the negotiation of non-intelligible items, and sometimes to substitute for needed words.

My mention of collaborative negotiations shouldn't give the implication that the contact zone is egalitarian. As I mentioned earlier, there are power differences in this interaction. What is interesting is that they are renegotiated as the conversation proceeds. There are factors in the conversation that help both parties negotiate their statuses and identity positions differently. Though Ahmad is somewhat deferential at times, he is probably also aware that as the buyer he has the power to turn back the shipment, affecting Hansen's revenue. Even better, both people have different interests in this conversation, and they should take care not to harm their mutual interests through the conversation. It is probably this awareness that motivates Hansen to adopt more supportive and collaborative strategies himself, despite Ahmad's deference. Note also that Ahmad becomes increasingly more direct as the conversation proceeds. He can directly say that "the cheese is bad" on line 5. We mustn't take the presumed face-saving and indirect strategies of non-Western cultures too far. We must situate them in the context of the conversation to see how they are used strategically at different points. Similarly, a one-sided exercise of power by either party may not have enabled them to achieve this kind of communicative success so effectively. Power is mutually negotiated to facilitate successful communication and satisfactory outcomes for both parties.

While the example shows that norms neither govern nor guarantee meaning-making, we cannot deny that certain patterned features of English help both interlocutors succeed in this conversation. Consider the fairly similar syntax structure both use, considerably similar to NES norms. Also, though "blowing" seems idiosyncratic, there are
other words that they share. The issue, however, is that no airtight system exists to guarantee meaning. The “system” is porous to resources from other languages, ecological factors, diverse semiotic resources, and the personalized uses influenced by identity and cultural reasons. Furthermore, the system is always relocalized (Pennycook, 2010) with the language resources gaining new meaning and values all the time in each occasion of use. Words and grammatical forms are always gaining new indexicality in new contexts. The “system” is thus always in a state of becoming. Moreover, the example shows that although there are items of sedimented patterns guiding this conversation (such as the syntax and other shared words), one new and unshared word is sometimes enough to upset the functionality of the “system.” Though the other shared items help in achieving communicative success, the new word has to be negotiated in context for the whole interaction to succeed. Note also that the negotiation of the idiosyncratic word doesn’t lead to accommodating the predefined norms, as some versions of CA and SLA would analyze (for a critique, see Firth and Wagner, 1997), but to the co-construction of a new indexical. These are the reasons why a focus on norms and sharedness doesn’t go far enough. We have to focus on the semiodiversity occasioned by the surprising new uses of words and co-constructed indexicalities. From this perspective, the pluralization and diversification of English cannot be controlled. “English” is never at a point of stability or stasis. The stable and shared grammatical system is a convenient postulation to help analysis. A more realistic approach is to focus on the practices of meaning-making that people use to achieve intelligibility in the unpredictable communicative conditions and changing norms of the contact zone.

Conclusion

A translingual perspective thus treats diversity as the norm in the study of English. It challenges the assumption of other models of global Englishes that sharedness and uniformity of norms at different levels of generality are required for communicative success. In contact zones, sharedness cannot be guaranteed. To explain how unshared words or grammatical structures gain situated meaning, the model of translingual English attends to the local contexts and practices of negotiation with the fullest ecological resources. My model focuses on practices rather than form to explain communicative success. While this chapter has made a case for adopting this orientation and demonstrated the possibilities in explaining contact zone communication, we have to now proceed to describing the strategies that facilitate meaning negotiation. This area of work is still relatively undeveloped, and the following chapters will take this inquiry further.
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Chapter 2: Intersectionality in language and identity research

David Block and Victor Corona

Introduction

... it is impossible to develop a full and deep understanding of the discrimination and marginalisation that a 30-year-old female immigrant from Ecuador might suffer in Barcelona if one does not take into account a series of overlapping and interlinked social dimensions. These dimensions include (1) the ways that this woman is positioned in class terms in Catalan society (as a lower-class person doing low-level service jobs like cleaning); (2) her institutional and social status as an immigrant, that is someone who is progressively more unwelcome as the economic crisis deepens; (3) the fact that she is a person of colour, a visible minority with an Andean appearance, whose physical features are not valued in mainstream Catalan society; (4) her status as someone who is culturally different, someone with a world view and behaviours which are not considered ‘Catalan’ or even ‘Spanish’; and (5) her immersion in gender regimes in her home life (with her Ecuadorian husband) and in mainstream Catalan society, which are differentiable but which in both cases work against her attempts at self-fulfilment.

(Block 2014: 69)

The opening quotation by David Block, one of the co-authors of this chapter, sets out the dilemma faced by applied linguists who wish to explore in detail individual and collective identities in their research. In short, how can scholars in applied linguistics take on so many factors at the same time? The short answer to this question is that researchers cannot do everything in their research. However, applied linguists can show sensitivity, awareness and, ultimately, attentiveness to the necessarily intersectional nature of identity. In this chapter, we hope to take the reader a few steps in this direction. We begin with a discussion of the origins of intersectionality, what it means and critiques that have developed around it. This review will, by necessity, be partial, and it will, without a doubt, leave out ongoing and important areas of debate; however, our intention is modest, namely to outline what we think are the fundamentals of intersectionality as applied to language and identity research. This done, we consider how in language and identity research intersectionality has been practised in something of a default manner; seldom if ever discussed as a methodological option or in theoretical terms by researchers. We then move to an examination of data collected by Victor Corona, the other co-author of this chapter, over the past several years as part of his ongoing study of young Latinos in Barcelona. Our aim is to develop an
intersectional analysis and understanding of the lives of Corona’s informants, which might serve as a framework for other language and identity researchers in applied linguistics to follow. We then close the chapter with some observations.

**Current issues**

**What is intersectionality?**

The increased interest in intersectionality in the social sciences and humanities in recent years (e.g. Grzanka 2014; Jackson 2014; Hill-Collins and Bilge 2015) has arisen amid several trends. First, there is a general understanding among researchers that, while research often focuses primarily on one dimension of identity, it is impossible to do this without including other dimensions. Thus, research on racial identity will necessarily include references to and an engagement with gender, nationality and other identity dimensions. Second, where researchers do deal with several identity dimensions simultaneously and do so in an overt manner, this needs to be done in conjunction with an exploration of how the different dimensions included in their analyses actually interconnect. So, in the previous example, it is not enough to say that race and gender are important heuristics for understanding the life of experiences of an individual; there needs to be some discussion of how they are interdependent and how they interrelate in emergent social activity. Third, and finally, there has been a paucity of research which addresses intradimensional differences and variations to a sufficient degree, that is, explorations of how labels such as 'Latino' may hide as much as they reveal if there is no acknowledgement or exploration of the differences among people classified according to these labels.

Ultimately, intersectionality is seen by researchers in the humanities and social sciences as a way to deal with issues like these, all of which point to the complexity of identity in the increasingly varied and variable circumstances of the times in which we live (call it ‘late modernity’, ‘the new millennium’ or even ‘the global age’). At the same time, and again following the theme of complexity across contexts, it is worthwhile to bear in mind that ‘intersectionality does not refer to a unitary framework but a range of positions, and that essentially it is a heuristic device for understanding boundaries and hierarchies of social life’ (Anthias 2013: 4). In this sense, it is wise to avoid universal, overgeneralised statements about what it is.

Although intersectionality has arguably always been around in the humanities and social sciences (who has ever successfully isolated an identity inscription such as ethnicity in research?), any discussion of it taking place today must take on board its origins in Black Feminism (Bilge 2013),³ the common reference being two key publications by Kimberlee Crenshaw (1989, 1991) some 25 years ago. A law scholar,
feminist and anti-racist activist, Crenshaw sought a way to understand how race and gender and, to a lesser extent, class interact in the construction of inequalities in society. She noted that mainstream thinking and theorising in both feminism and anti-racism emerged in isolation from each other, based as they were in very different foundations. In addition, she noted that simply grafting race onto a feminist framework, or feminism onto a race-based framework, would not get activists very far, as experiences emanating from one’s gendered positionings were very different from those emanating from one’s racialised positionings. She concluded by emphasising the importance of an intersectional approach to identity, stating that ‘[b]ecause the intersectional experience is greater than the sum of racism and sexism, any analysis that does not take intersectionality into account cannot sufficiently address the particular manner in which Black women are subordinated’ (Crenshaw 1989: 140).

At about the same time, Crenshaw’s call for a greater emphasis on intersectionality was echoed by Patricia Hill-Collins (1993), who argued for the need to move away from either/or, dichotomous thinking, whereby people are conceptualised in terms of their opposites, such as Black vs White, to ‘both/and’ thinking, whereby a multitude of positions, both passing and more permanent, can be included in the conversation. Hill-Collins also critiqued the tendency of some researchers to rank oppressions, posing questions such as the following: How do you feel most oppressed, as a woman or as a Black person? In bringing intersectionality to the fore in Black feminist scholarship, Crenshaw and Hill-Collins were following still earlier calls for similar thinking about identity, with three foundational sources standing out: Franz Fanon (1967 [1952]), bell hooks (1981) and the Combahee River Collective (1977), an African American feminist and lesbian association formed in 1974. Drawing on the experience of having grown up in the French colony of Martinique and several years of life in France, both during and after World War II (in which he fought), Fanon (1967 [1952]) wrote Black skin, White masks as a psychological treatise on the lasting negative alienating effects that colonialism had on those who experienced and endured it. In this work, he explored many issues related to race, but most important in the context of this discussion is his examination of the interrelationships between race and gender (and sexuality) in terms of ‘the woman of color and the white man’ (Fanon 1967: 41–62) and ‘the man of color and the white woman’ (ibid.: 63–82).

Some years later, and writing about North American feminism, hooks (1981) argued against the essentialisation of identity categories and how Blackness was often masculinised in discussions of race, while feminism was often framed following the interests of middle-class White women. Her book, Ain’t I a woman: Black women and feminism, is based on the ex-slave Sigourney Truth’s speech at a suffragettes’ meeting in Akron, Ohio, in 1851. Truth famously interrupted the meeting, dominated by well-educated White women, with a compelling personal statement that ended
with the famous question ‘Ain’t I a woman?’ This question was posed after she
made clear the differences between her experiences as a Black woman and the
experiences of her fellow (White) suffragettes. Truth had worked like a man in the
fields, gathering and ploughing, and she never had men to protect her from the
elements or the vicissitudes of life. Meanwhile, she viewed her White
counterparts as the beneficiaries of gendered regimes that, while denying them the
vote, nonetheless served to protect them. Along with other early Black female
activists, such as Harriet Tubman, Frances E.W. Harper, Ida B. Wells Barnett and Mary
Church Terrell, Truth served as an inspiration for the Combahee River Collective, who in
April 1977 issued their statement of principles. In this statement, members declared
that they were ‘actively committed to struggling against racial, sexual, heterosexual, and
class oppression’ and that their aims were to ‘develop […] integrated analysis and
practice based upon the fact that the major systems of oppression are interlocking’
(Combahee River Collective 1977: no page).

From this early work on intersectionality to the present, the theorisation of
intersectionality has advanced considerably, such that most researchers today would
accept that identity is multilayered and complex; that different dimensions of identity
cannot be dealt with in isolation from one another; that intracategorical differences are
often the most interesting aspect of identity research; and that to ignore
intersectionality, adopting a default divide-and-analyse position, is to produce research
that can only ever provide an incomplete portrayal of research informants. This
consensus notwithstanding, there are, as Jennifer Nash (2008) notes, a few issues
pending in discussions of intersectionality. For example, Nash queries the extent to
which intersectionality is a useful component of a general theory of identity, asking if it
‘actually captures the ways in which subjects experience subjectivity or strategically
deploy identity’ (Nash 2008: 11). In other words, do individuals live their lives
intersectionally in that they are always conscious of how constraints on their activity
are multilayered and never just about one single dimension? Or, do individuals
self-consciously invoke different dimensions of their identity, selectively and
strategically, as they go about their day-to-day activity? In the midst of these and other
questions, Nash suggests that answering them ‘requires intersectionality to craft a
theory of agency and to grapple with the amount of leeway variously situated subjects
have to deploy particular components of their identities in certain contexts’ (Nash
2008: 11). It also requires a narrative-based approach to research, as there is a need to
listen to the stories of individuals and collectives.

Another issue raised by Nash concerns how intersectional research is carried out. Here
she cites Leslie McCall (2005), who has explored this very issue in depth. For McCall,
over the years there have been three complexities that have (or have not) been dealt
with by researchers working intersectionally, which she outlines as follows:
1  'Anticategorical complexity’. This means a rejection of boundaried identity categories such as race and gender, because (a) they are deemed to be overly simplistic and totalising to capture the complex lives of individuals today and (b) they strengthen the very power regimes that scholars have sought to destabilise and overturn.

2  'Intercategorical complexity’. Inequality is observed to exist between social groups, even if these are relatively difficult to define. Thus, existing analytical categories can be useful in the documentation of inequality along multiple and conflicting dimensions.

3  'Intracategorical complexity’. This angle on intersectionality is based on a suspicion of categories, as in the case of anticategorical complexity, although it is more about handling categories with care and above all about breaking them down, challenging the nature of their composition and how they are used in empirical research.

McCall frames these three types of complexity as options, as points of departure for researchers. She eschews anticategorical complexity as self-defeating, but while she is interested in intercategorical conflicts, she sees intracategorical complexity as where the most useful work remains to be done. More concretely, McCall proposes a move beyond intercategorical inequality and conflict to the examination of intracategorical inequality and conflict. It seems that until the diversity inside categories is understood, it is only with great difficulty and imprecision that they can be invoked in research examining intercategorical differences. Thus a category like Latino, apart from needing contextual clarification (are we talking about the United States or a European context?), needs to be unpacked and understood as a multilevelled marker for lived experiences before it can then be intersected with masculinities and femininities (gender), race or nationality or any other dimension of identity.

An additional issue arising with regard to intersectionality is if it is always based on a conceptual core or central dimension of identity, one that reflects the most important and significant interests of the researcher. It is fairly clear in Crenshaw’s work, for example, that race is in some sense the baseline of her movements outward to examine intersections with other dimensions of identity. Meanwhile, other scholars interested in race and gender have taken different tacks. For example, hooks is far more ambiguous about the centrality of race and gender in her work (e.g. hooks 1981), sometimes seeming to devote more attention to race and other times favouring gender. In addition, in her 2000 book Where we stand, she situates social class as a baseline dimension of identity around which race and gender rotate continuously. Meanwhile, Mignon Moore’s (2011) research examining how Black lesbians form families includes a close synthesis of race and sexuality, moving gender to a more peripheral position. We could go on citing examples, but the point is that, while intersectionality will, ideally, involve
analysis across several dimensions of identity, there will usually be one particular
dimension that is the baseline of the research. However, it should be noted that this
kind of anchoring need not fall into the ontological isolation described by Hill-Collins,
whereby ‘each group identifies the type of oppression with which it feels most
comfortable as being fundamental and classifies all other types as being of lesser
importance’ (Hill-Collins 1993: 25); rather, the idea is to engage (pro)actively with how
dimensions beyond the base dimension articulate with that base dimension as well as
each other.

**Intersectionality in applied linguistics**

In contrast to what we find in race and gender studies, in applied linguistics there is
not much in the way of a developed line of discussion or debate focusing explicitly on
intersectionality. This assessment applies to publications on research methodology in
applied linguistics as well as the huge number of publications on language and
identity which have come out in the last decade in applied linguistics journals (e.g.
*Journal of Language, Identity, and Education*), as monographs (e.g. Joseph 2004; Benwell
and Stokoe 2006; Omoniyi and White 2006; Block 2007; Riley 2007) and as edited
collections (Pavlenko and Blackledge 2004; De Fina et al. 2006; Caldas-Coulthard
and Iedema 2008; Lin 2008; Llamas and Watt 2010; Higgins 2012). An exception of sorts is
a book chapter by Ingrid Piller and Kimie Takahashi (2010), in which the authors make
explicit that intersectionality is a principle running through their research on gender,
language and transnationalism: ‘our concern is with the ways in which general
identities are produced and maintained in transnational contexts and the ways in
which they are intersected by linguistic ideologies and practices’ (Piller and Takahashi
2010: 540). Of course, this is a different sort of intersection from the more common
two-or-more- dimensions approach outlined above, but it is intersectionality
nonetheless. In their paper, the authors manage to show how ‘gendered people and
gendered discourse … do not circulate in isolation from each other, nor in isolation
from language ideologies and other aspects of identity’ (ibid.: 549). However, what is
missing throughout their discussion is a more-than- cursory presentation of what
intersectionality is about and the various issues arising around it, as discussed above. In
fairness to the authors, one does not normally expect explicit treatment of an approach
to research in a publication that is meant to discuss content and results, and their
importance.

In the absence of explicit treatments of intersectionality, one is left to observe how it
actually emerges in deed if not in name; language and identity researchers, following
trends in identity research in general, have long accepted as axiomatic the impossibility
of isolating identity dimensions and then focusing on them individually. There is
always seepage across these dimensions and in the context of migration experiences, just to cite one example; there is a confluence of ethnicity, race, gender, nationality and other dimensions of identity. Trying to isolate one of these dimensions would be fruitless. Of course, this very point is made clearly in Bonny Norton’s (2013 [2000]) classic book *Identity and language learning*, in which she very effectively shows how gender and ethnicity in particular (but also, at times, nationality and social class) flow together in her analysis of the lives of five immigrant women in Canada.

Another good example of intersectionality in action in language and identity research is Carmen Fought’s (2006) work on race, ethnicity and language, as she shows that one cannot really understand a dimension like race without having some notion of how it intersects with other dimensions of identity such as ethnolinguistic affiliation and social class. Fought follows up William Labov’s (1972) classic research on African American Vernacular English (AAVE), which itself documented intersections between race, ethnicity, ethnolinguistic identity and class. She defines AAVE as ‘a variety [of distinct non-standard English] spoken by many African-Americans in the USA which shares a set of grammatical and other linguistic features [e.g. phonological features] that distinguish it from various other American dialects’ (Fought 2006: 46). Writing about contemporary American society, Fought examines how AAVE-linked racial and ethnolinguistic identities intersect with social class.

As Fought notes, early research on AAVE was based primarily on data collected from working-class informants and therefore there was a certain marginalisation of middle-class African Americans from studies. The intracategorical issue that arises here is that obviously African Americans occupy a range of class positions and that these class positions will have an impact on linguistic practices, in particular whether or not AAVE is used, how it is used and in what contexts it is used. Fought surveys research examining the linguistic practices of middle-class African Americans, contrasting their experiences with those of working-class African Americans. She argues that the latter often grow up in segregated neighbourhoods in which a very high proportion of their interactions are with working-class and poor African Americans like themselves. Meanwhile, middle-class African Americans are far more likely to grow up in desegregated neighbourhoods and to have interactions with people from a range of racial and ethnic backgrounds over the course of their lives. In addition, they are more likely to experience intensive pressure to assimilate to mainstream American middle-class culture, which tends to be identified as ‘White culture’. Part and parcel of such assimilation processes is exposure to socialisation into standard varieties of English from an early age (ibid.: 62).

It is in assimilating to mainstream middle-class values and adopting middle-class American English as the dominant way of communicating that intercategorical tensions
arise. In short, racial and ethnic affiliations, or the desire to maintain a recognisable and legitimised African-American identity, come into conflict with social class positions in society (Morgan 2002). This occurs, above all, because, for many African Americans, AAVE is, historically, a key marker of African American identity: as Geneva Smitherman (1977: 3) puts it, it is ‘a language mixture, adapted to the conditions of slavery and discrimination, a combination of language and style interwoven with and inextricable from Afro-American culture’. However, where choices can be made as to what variety of English to employ, matters generally do not play out according to an either/or AAVE/middle-class American-English scenario; rather, there is a scale along which African Americans communicate, and middle-class African Americans insert themselves into this scale every time they speak. One interesting phenomenon that arises from this complex ethnolinguistic milieu is the fusion of middle-class grammar (in terms of morphology and syntax) with some phonological features of AAVE: just enough to identify one as African American but not enough to put off mainstream middle-class Americans (Morgan 2002).

Space does not allow further discussion of Fought’s work on ethnolinguistic identity: its inter-categorical intersections with other dimensions of identity and how it helps her to problematise race and ethnicity, in particular the intracategorical complexity of ‘African American’. As stated above, Fought does not frame her work as intersectional, so we are once again in the realm of intersectionality in deed but not name. In the next section, we will continue along the same lines as Fought, examining intersections involving race, ethnicity, ethnolinguistic identity and class. We do so with a view to exemplifying how more explicit interactional analysis might be carried out in future research. As we have done elsewhere (Block and Corona 2014), we draw on Victor Corona’s research on Latino youth in Barcelona.

**Future directions**

In the context of Barcelona (and by extension, Catalonia and Spain), the term *Latino* encapsulates the ways in which immigrants from Ecuador, Colombia, Bolivia, the Dominican Republic and other Latin American countries affiliate to and participate in a variety of activities (including dance, cinema and food consumption), employing semiotic resources (including language, body movement, hair styles and clothing) which index *lo Latino* (Latino-ness) as a distinctive subculture, differentiable from autochthonous Catalan and Spanish culture. Victor Corona’s research on *lo Latino* in Barcelona, which began a decade ago, grew out of his interest in studying what elements were involved in the construction of this identity in the context of massive Latin American immigration to Barcelona from the early to mid-1990s onwards. In early 2005, he started an ethnographic study involving participant observation in a
working-class neighbourhood in Barcelona with a high proportion of newly arrived immigrants, specifically focusing on public spaces such as parks, bars and, above all, the schools where his adolescent informants were students. The data discussed in this section come from a large corpus consisting of interviews (both group and individual) and spontaneously recorded conversations, collected between early 2005 and mid-2013. We focus on three examples from Corona’s corpus which we believe show how identity dimensions—race, ethnicity, language and class—come together in the day-to-day lives of these young Latinos.

As we mentioned above, Corona’s research was carried out in working-class neighbourhoods in the northern part of Barcelona. Historically, the neighbourhoods have always been predominantly low-income and working-class areas. They received a good proportion of the massive migration from other parts of Spain to Barcelona in the 1950s and 1960s, and they have received a good number of the immigrants who have come to Barcelona in recent years, with a high proportion coming from Latin American countries (Ayuso and Piñol 2010). The majority of the informants in Corona’s research come from low-income families in which the parents have few or no formal qualifications and, as a result, have ended up in employment such as cleaning, construction and various manual jobs like house moving and warehouse work. In her comprehensive survey of immigration to Barcelona between 1995 and 2010, Marina Subirats notes how, for the majority of recent immigrants, ‘working conditions are much more precarious than those of the autochthonous population ... as a consequence of being situated in the low qualification sector’ (Subirats 2012: 378; translation by David Block). And in this context, a Latino identity is very much associated with precarious work conditions and low-qualification jobs. In the interview data presented in Extract 1, Lucía, a girl from Ecuador, tells the story of her mother’s plight, working as a maid in the homes of middle-class Catalan families.4

**Extract 1 Corpus 2005–2006**

**Participant: Lucía**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original in Spanish</th>
<th>English translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>mi madre también me ha contado/que cuando ella recién llegó/también tuvo que fregar pisos/en casa de españoles/pero en casa de españoles/mientras los españoles no terminaban/(xxxx)/o sea sus jeles/no terminaban de comer/ella no podía comer/no podía comer porque decían que las chachas/las chachas/comían después de que los jeles/entonces a mi mamá me decía también a mí/que: e/que ella vino aquí/aí/va/la humillaron bastante/pero ahora ya no/me dice ahora/yo humillo a los españoles/como necesitan de mi/</td>
<td>my mother also told me/that when she first arrived/she also had to scrub floors/in a Spanish home/but in the Spanish home/ until the Spanish had finished/(xxxx)/like her bosses/ until they finished eating/she couldn’t eat/she couldn’t eat because they said maids/the maids/ate after their bosses/so my mum also said to me/that:at/that she came here/and/and they humiliated her a lot/but not any more/she tells me now/I humiliate the Spanish/since they need me/</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sennett and Cobb (1972) famously wrote about the personal anguish, disappointment and shame felt by people who have not achieved as much as they might have in life in terms of material wealth, education, housing and other aspects of life that index social class, using the term 'hidden injuries of class' to capture such feelings. In Extract 1, we are allowed a glimpse at what we might call the 'unhidden injuries of class'; that is, the very overt wrongs wrought on the less powerful by the more powerful. In addition, Lucía goes on to talk about how in Ecuador her mother had worked in higher prestige jobs, certainly not as a maid, and she further reports that as soon as she was able to do so, she left the service of the Spanish family to work as a butcher in a supermarket.

One factor hindering Lucía's mother in terms of her employment conditions was her physical appearance. For the most part, Latinos in Barcelona constitute a 'visible' minority, given that many are not European in appearance (being dark-skinned and having Andean and African features), and this leads to a racialisation of their status as immigrants and ultimately how they are slotted into the existing (though ever-evolving) class system in Barcelona, Catalonia and Spain as a whole. In Extract 2, four of Corona's informants, all male Latinos, explain what their status as a visible minority actually means in practice:

**Extract 2 Corpus 2013**

Participants: Rony (RON) and Miguel (MIG), Ecuadorian
Sergio (SER), Colombian
Naldo (NAL), Bolivian

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TN</th>
<th>SP</th>
<th>Original in Spanish</th>
<th>English translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>RON</td>
<td>la mayoría son racistas/aunque no lo digan/o sea/tú vas por la calle=</td>
<td>most of them are racists/even if they don't say so/I mean/you're walking down the street=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>SER</td>
<td>=si=</td>
<td>=yes=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td>RON</td>
<td>vamos nosotros dos/o que vayamos los cuatro/nos va a ver una señora/y si nos ve/se asusta/</td>
<td>and the two of us are walking/or maybe all four of us/a lady is going to see us/ and if she see us/she's going to freak out/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td>SER</td>
<td>se te queda mirando/se te ve por otra calle/o se ((xxx))/</td>
<td>she just stands there looking at you/and she crosses the street/or she ((xxx))/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05</td>
<td>MIG</td>
<td>cuéntale cuando insultaste a la vieja/ cuéntale/</td>
<td>tell him about when you insulted that old lady/tell him/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06</td>
<td>NAL</td>
<td>íbamos caminando/y había una señora caminando/y yo/me cruzé a otro lado para ver otra cosa/y este -refiriéndose a Miguel se cruzó al lado/y la vieja se asustó/pensé que le íbamos a hacer algo/se ((xxx))/felo/</td>
<td>we were walking/and there was this lady walking/and I/crossed the street to see something/and this one -referring to Miguel crossed across with me/and the old lady freaked out/she thought we were going to do something to her/ she ((xxx))/ugly/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07</td>
<td>RON</td>
<td>ven a un latino/o a un grupo=</td>
<td>they see a latino/or a group=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08</td>
<td>NAL</td>
<td>=ven a un grupo de dos latinos/o más de dos latinos/y ya/</td>
<td>=they see a group of latinos/or more than two latinos/and that's it/</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This exchange came in response to a question posed by Corona about the four boys' sense of citizenship and belonging in contemporary Catalonia. The story told here collectively is one of racial profiling as a natural part of their day-to-day lives, whereby for many older members of the local population (and perhaps for older women in particular), the mere physical presence of these young men in public spaces is framed as a threat. In this sense, being Latino is a racial positioning. However, it is also about a long list of associations marking one as different from a mainstream Catalan culture, such as the boys' tendency to be dressed in a hip-hop style (more on this below) or the fact that they are adolescent males who tend to move around the city in groups of four.

Another way that lo Latino gets realised is through language. Extract 3 illustrates how the pronunciations of certain phonemes serve as ‘acts of identity’ (LePage and Tabouret-Keller 1985) in the same way that certain linguistic features mark one as an African American in the United States (see discussion above). And the production of these features does not go unnoticed by those who self-position as Latino.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TN</th>
<th>SP</th>
<th>Original in Spanish</th>
<th>English translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>VC</td>
<td>tú que sientes/por ejemplo cuando ves un ecuatoriano por ejemplo pronunciando la +θ+?/</td>
<td>what do you feel/for instance when you see an Ecuadorian/for instance pronouncing the +θ+?/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>AG</td>
<td>cómo?/</td>
<td>what?/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td>VC</td>
<td>por ejemplo que diga +θine+ “cine”/ +θordon+ “corazón”/</td>
<td>for instance saying +θine+ “cinema”/ +θordon+ “heart”/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td>AG</td>
<td>aaaa “risas de todos”/</td>
<td>aaaa “everyone laughs”/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05</td>
<td>JV</td>
<td>se me ha españolizado/dicen/</td>
<td>he's become Spanish-ised/they say/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06</td>
<td>AG</td>
<td>nosotros hablamos así/pero de broma/ me entiendes?/por molestar a la gente española/sabes?/pero sí que hay gente de allá/que ya está comenzando a hablar así</td>
<td>we speak like that/but as a joke/you know?/to annoy Spanish people/you know?/but actually there are people from over there/that are starting to speak like that</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We see here the significance of using the voiceless dental non-sibilant fricative (the \( \theta \theta \)-8 - typical of Spanish in much of the Iberian Peninsula) as an identity marker to be avoided if one is to be considered Latino. In effect, being Latino means talking Latino, and those who do not conform are said to have Spanish-ised, that is, sold out to local norms and culture. However, using particular vocabulary, and pronouncing it in a particular way, is not the only means by which Corona’s informants position themselves as Latinos. There is the broader multimodality of communication (Jewitt 2009) to
consider, whereby we take into account how communication and acts of (re)presentation are not just about language but also a whole array of modes, including dress (clothes worn), ornamentation (e.g. piercings, bracelets), body moulding (haircuts, tattoos), gestures, posture and gaze. In Extract 4, Corona is talking to five female informants and one male informant about Latinos and dress in the school context. The female informants are from a range of backgrounds: Catalan, Moroccan, Peruvian and Ecuadorian. The sole male informant, Denilson, is the son of immigrants from the Dominican Republic.

Apart from being part of the Latino group in the school, Denilson was also closely connected to the world of rap and reggaeton, which acted as a shaper of his wardrobe choices. The girls evaluate his dress style favourably; they see him as cool and fashionable, and even in possession of a certain charm or ‘glamour’, as Leire puts it. As Andrea informs us, Denilson and other Latinos look cool wearing their clothes because they are dark-skinned (Denilson, it should be noted, is Black). What is interesting here is how Marta, Leire and Andrea relate clothing to race and ethnicity, with Marta saying that Spanish guys ’look awful’ (les queda fatal) when they try to dress like Latinos. For these girls, not everyone can be Latino and, indeed, Spanish guys cannot even pretend to be Latino because they do not have the necessary skin colour and what Bourdieu termed body hexis. In this context, Denilson is authentically Latino.

Summary

In this chapter we have discussed what intersectionality is about before making the point that while there would appear to be a default intersectionality at work in most language and identity research in applied linguistics, this is not made explicit. The lack of explicitness leads to the absence of any detailed and in-depth consideration of the multiple difficulties arising in the establishment of intercategorical interrelations and intracategorical divergences. We have endeavoured here to inject an explicit intersectional agenda into our discussion of young Latinos in Barcelona, all too aware that we would not be able to do justice to this population in the space allowed here. Nevertheless, we believe that by presenting and discussing the four extracts above, we have made several points about intersectionality worth carrying forward into future language and identity research.

Different individuals intervene in the four extracts, but what emerges is a set of recounted experiences that arguably are shared among those who are positioned by others and who self-position as Latinos in Barcelona. And what we see is the construction of a Latino identity as part of the larger intersection of interrelated identity dimensions embedded in McCall's (2005) 'intercategorical complexity'. In this sense we are in the realm of the intersectionality of race, ethnicity, class, gender and
### Extract 4 Corpus 2008–2009

Participants: Víctor, Corona (VC)  
Marta (MR) and Leire (LR), Catalan  
Fatia (FT), Moroccan  
Ana (AN), Peruvian  
Andrea (AD), Ecuadorian  
Denilson (DL), Dominican

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TN</th>
<th>SP</th>
<th>Original in Spanish</th>
<th>English translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>VC</td>
<td>cómo se viste él/cómo se viste</td>
<td>how does he dress/how does he dress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>LR</td>
<td>=pues se viste bien</td>
<td>=he dresses nicely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td>DL</td>
<td>yo primero agarro</td>
<td>first I take</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td>LR</td>
<td>no no</td>
<td>no no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05</td>
<td>AD</td>
<td>si no estuviéramos</td>
<td>if we weren’t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06</td>
<td>VC</td>
<td>chicos/hay clase/chicos/chicas (.S)</td>
<td>guys/there’s a class/guys/guys (.S)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07</td>
<td>AD</td>
<td>EL JUAN ESTÁ MUY BUENO/risas de todas (.S)</td>
<td>JUAN IS REALLY HOT/all the girls laugh (.S)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08</td>
<td>VC</td>
<td>ey/sin gritar (.S) cómo te vistes?/dirigida a Denilson</td>
<td>hey/no shouting (.S) how do you dress?/ directed at Denilson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09</td>
<td>AD</td>
<td>bie:en</td>
<td>nice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>DL</td>
<td>primero:0</td>
<td>first</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>AD</td>
<td>bien (.S)</td>
<td>nice (.S)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>FT</td>
<td>como si fuera</td>
<td>like he was</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>LR</td>
<td>o sea (1.5)</td>
<td>like (1.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>DL</td>
<td>primero agarro la camiseta</td>
<td>first I take the t-shirt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>LR</td>
<td>tiene/o sea:si/aunque vaya/aunque vaya con ropa:así/indicando anchura con las manos/ancha y eso pero/o no sé/tiene glamour</td>
<td>he has/li:ke/even though he goes/even though he goes around with clothes/indicating width with his hands/wide and that/bu:ut/I don’t know/he has glamour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>VC</td>
<td>ey/escuchamos lo que (1.5)</td>
<td>eh/we are listening to what (1.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>MR</td>
<td>y a él le pega esta ropa</td>
<td>and he looks good in these clothes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>AD</td>
<td>le pega/le pega (.S) porque es moreno</td>
<td>he looks good/he looks good (.S) because he is dark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>MR</td>
<td>tiene cuerpo para llevar esto</td>
<td>he has the body to wear this</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>VC</td>
<td>y los latinos se visten de alguna manera</td>
<td>and Latinos dress in a particular way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>LR AN AD FT MR</td>
<td>si si</td>
<td>yes yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>MR</td>
<td>te digo una cosa/te digo una cosa</td>
<td>let me tell you something/let me tell you something</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>FT</td>
<td>no te pongas roja</td>
<td>don’t be embarrassed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>MR</td>
<td>yo lo he visto/hay españoles que/yo conozco uno/que intenta ser la que intenta vestirse como latinos/pero les queda fatal/le queda fatal/no a los españoles no les pega/a lo mejor a algunos/pero a los latinos les queda mejor la ropa asi</td>
<td>I’ve seen it/there are Spanish guys/I know one/who tries to be la/who try to dress like Latinos/but they look awful/they look awful/no/Spanish guys don’t look good/maybe some do/but Latinos look better in those clothes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
multimodal behaviour (which includes linguistic behaviour), even if we must be careful how we use these categories, so as not to fall into a kind of default essentialisation.

Meanwhile, the other side of the intersectional coin is 'intracategorical complexity', which is in evidence only by default. Thus, where racial phenotype is cited as an identity marker, we need only to imagine those Latin Americans who have a European phenotype (in particular, the Argentinian, Uruguayan and Chilean immigrants) to see that not all individuals potentially classified as Latinos are equal in this regard (Corona and Block in preparation). Class (see Block, this volume) also looms large here, both in terms of the informants' parents, who occupy the lower ends of the Barcelona job market, and the informants themselves, who seem to be destined to work in low-skilled jobs in the local employment market. In addition, with reference to class position, there is the dilemma faced by upwardly mobile Latinos who orient to mainstream middle-class values, a process which has an impact on speech patterns and their multimodal behaviour in general. These individuals may be positioned as disloyal to their Latino roots by other Latinos who have not moved in this direction. There are also gendered differences in evidence, particularly in the story told by the four boys in Extract 2 (would the same thing have happened if the woman in the story had come across four Latinas instead of four Latinos?), and in Extract 4, which is about cool masculinity and style. Indeed, there is much space for further exploration of the multiple masculinities and femininities within the category of 'Latino youth'. Of course, in the midst of this intracategorical complexity, there is also the prospect that Latino as a category may be narrowing, reserved only for those who are relatively dark-skinned, act in certain ways, work in certain sectors and so on. All of this means that intracategorical differences always depend on the demarcations and delimitations of the category in question.

Finally, we would like to return to two questions posed above in our discussion of Nash's (2008) critique of intersectionality:

• Do individuals live their lives intersectionally in that they are always conscious of how constraints on their activity are multi-layered and never just about one single dimension?

• Do individuals self-consciously invoke different dimensions of their identity, selectively and strategically, as they go about their day-to-day activity?

In the four extracts cited above, the informants do invoke different dimensions of their lived identities, and this appears to be done in a fairly self-conscious way as a means of conveying to Corona an awareness of the complexity of their lives. Lucía manifests a kind of class awareness when she retells her mother's story of the overt injuries of class in a middle-class Catalan household. In Extract 2, Rony, Miguel, Sergio and Naldo easily
relate their experience of the 'old lady' crossing the street to racism in Catalan society, a
racism which positions them as dangerous because they have dark skin (although mode
of dress surely is an additional factor in such cases). In Extract 3, Ángel and Javier
explain (and therefore show a keen awareness of) the sociolinguistic rules of the game –
how speaking in certain ways situates one either as a Latino or as a sell-out. And
finally, Marta, Leire, Fatia, Ana, Andrea and Denilson show an awareness of and talk
candidly about the ethno-racial politics of style, inflected by a Latino/non-Latino
dynamic, that reigns in secondary schools in Barcelona. In short, these young people do
appear to live their lives intersectionally in that they show a degree of self-awareness
as regards to how constraints on their activity are multilayered and never just about
one single dimension. And they do self-consciously invoke different aspects of their
identity in different contexts.

Of course, the reader may well wonder what is to be gained by making intersectionality
explicit in research. After all, if most researchers are doing it without naming it, what
difference does it make? In response we might point to the fact that from the earliest
exemplifications of the notion, from the words of Sojourner Truth to the work of hooks
(1981), Crenshaw (1989), Anthias (2013) and others, intersectionality has been linked to
political activism, particularly movements demanding the civil rights of women and
people of colour. We believe that a specific focus on intersectionality, in effect, makes
activism more possible; it makes clear that injustice is never about just one dimension
of being, and therefore is not remediable through a focus on that one dimension. In
such a process, injustice is revealed as far more complex than public discourses would
often have us believe. And by grasping this complexity and confronting it as such,
researchers are more likely to be able to propose action on behalf of those who suffer
injustice.

Related topics
Positioning language and identity: poststructuralist perspectives; Language and ethnic
identity; Language, race and identity; Language and gender identities; Class in
language and identity research; A linguistic ethnography of identity: adopting a
heteroglossic frame; Language, gender and identities in political life: a case study from
Malaysia.

Further reading
(This reader charts the origins and history of intersectionality in Black feminist thought via the
presentation of key analytic and applied texts.)
hooks, b. (1981). *Ain’t I a woman: Black women and feminism*. Boston: South End Press. (hooks examines how Black women have been oppressed throughout history by White men and Black men, albeit in different ways, and by middle-class White women as well, and in the process she lays many of the foundations of current thinking about intersectionality.)


**Notes**

1 Victor Corona is grateful to the ASLAN project (ANR-10-LABX-0081) of the Université de Lyon for its financial support for his ongoing research within the programme 'Investissements d'Avenir' (ANR-11-IDEX-0007). The ASLAN project is funded by the French government, via the National Research Agency (ANR).

2 This is a reworked and expanded version of our discussion on intersectionality in Block and Corona (2014).

3 Practice varies as regards the use of capital letters when 'Black' refers to race. Here we have chosen to use capital letters, following the practice of most scholars we have read who write about race. In addition, and for the sake of consistency, we have also used 'White' with a capital W when referring to race. However, we have left intact all quoted material where either term appears in lower case.

4 It is worth noting that throughout Corona's databases informants make reference to 'the Spanish' (los españoles) to refer to anyone they deem to be autochthonous. This denomination does not take into account sociolinguistic differences dividing this population into Catalan-preferent and Spanish-preferent speakers, but it does go to the heart of a very real issue, namely the feeling among many Latinos that live their lives as separate from 'the Spanish'. We use 'Catalan' here because the people referred to would likely refer to themselves as 'Catalan.'

5 Reggaeton is a genre of urban music directly linked to hip-hop and rap, which also draws on Caribbean rhythms such as bomba, plena, salsa, Latin pop and bachata. The specific rhythm that characterises reggaeton is referred to as 'Dem Bow'. Reggaeton is generally associated with rapping and/or singing in Spanish. It originated in Panama in the 1970s as reggae music sung in Spanish. In the 1990s, reggaeton developed and modernised in Puerto Rico and received its current name. It has since become a global phenomenon, and nowadays has a world market which spreads well beyond the geographical boundaries of Latin America.

6 Bourdieu defined *body hexis* as follows: 'Body hexis speaks directly to the motor function, in the form of a pattern of postures that is both individual and systematic, because linked to a whole system of techniques involving then body and tools, and charged with a host of social meanings and values: in all societies, children are particularly attentive to the gestures and postures which, in their eyes, express everything that goes to make an accomplished adult – a way of walking, a tilt of the head, facial expressions, ways of sitting and of using implements, always associated with a tone of voice, a style of speech, and (how could it be otherwise?) a certain subjective experience' (Bourdieu 1977: 87).
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**Appendix**

*Transcription conventions*

/ shows the end of a chunk of talk, normally paced.

? indicates question intonation.

Pauses are timed to the nearest with the number of seconds in brackets: (.5).

Equals sign (=) at the end of one utterance and the start of the next speaker’s utterance indicates that there was no audible gap between speakers.

Phrases or words in angled brackets (< ... >) is an additional comment by the transcriber on what is happening at the time or the way in which something is said.

CAPITAL letters means a raised voice.
Underlining indicates a word or words stressed for emphasis. Colon (:) indicates an elongated vowel (e.g. no:0).

++ with an italicised transcription in between indicates a phonetic representation of something said.

Double brackets around 'x's shows that the speaker's utterance is inaudible or cannot be made out: ((xxx)).
CHAPTER 3

General and Specific EAP
Specificity and EAP

What sets English for academic purposes (EAP) apart from general language study is its focus on specific, purposeful uses of language. Cummins (1982) refers to specific purposes texts as using ‘context-reduced’ language which tends to be abstract, and seems to rely less heavily for its coherence on an immediate context than the language of everyday interaction. EAP students are studying English for a particular practical need which means curriculum designers study target language features in specific academic contexts, and teachers focus on these features in their classrooms. The idea of specificity, then, has come to influence the kinds of data researchers collect, the ways they collect it, and the theories they use to understand it. Equally importantly, a focus on specificity has shaped the field’s heavy dependence on a strong research orientation, and led to the development and sharpening of key concepts such as genre, authenticity, discourse community, communicative purpose, and audience. But while the notion of specificity is at the heart of most definitions of EAP, debates continue over just how specific its purposes should be.

This debate goes back to Hutchinson and Waters’ (1980) article ‘ESP at the Crossroads’, and arises partly as a result of different perceptions of how academic language is used and learnt, and partly because of the constraints of different instructional contexts. Essentially, the issue resolves into a single question: are there skills and features of language that are transferable across different disciplines or should we focus on what is needed by particular learners? Some teachers have sought to tailor instruction to students’ disciplinary subject matter needs, while others have tried to identify common ground among students and teach what Hutchinson and Waters (1980) referred to as a ‘general linguistic competence’. This second view informs EAP textbooks and has found its way into many EAP programmes, particularly in pre-sessional and preparatory courses for international students seeking to get the International English Language Testing System (IELTS) grade they need to study in English. The issue of specificity therefore challenges EAP teachers to take a stance on how they view language and learning, and to examine their courses in the light of this stance.

While initially there was a polarized debate between opposing camps, a better understanding of both the complexities of instructional contexts and the characteristics of academic language has led practitioners to see the two positions as ends of a continuum rather than a dichotomy: a dilemma rather than a conflict. This chapter lays out the arguments for both positions to raise some key issues of EAP practice and theory while sketching a view of specificity as is supplied by the student as
well as the teacher. The chapter concludes with a brief case study of both general and specific courses in Hong Kong.

English for general academic purposes (EGaP)

Following an EGAP approach, teachers attempt to isolate the skills, language forms, and study activities thought to be common to all disciplines. The claim is that once students have learnt these generic features then they can use them in a variety of contexts and for a range of needs. Dudley-Evans and St John (1998: 41), for instance, include among these: listening to lectures, participating in tutorials, reading textbooks and articles, and writing essays, examination answers, and reports. There are several reasons advanced for taking a general approach (Hyland, 2002).

First, some authorities have expressed doubts about the possibility of discipline outsiders identifying, and adequately teaching, specific varieties at all. Thus, Spack (1988) famously argued that language teachers lack the expertise and the confidence to teach subject-specific conventions and so these should be left to subject specialists as they know them best. Instead, EAP teachers ought to focus on general principles of inquiry and rhetoric. Second, there is the idea that EAP is simply too hard for students at lower levels of English proficiency who need to acquire a ‘general English’ suitable for all contexts before they can study the complexities of academic discourse. This sees language learning as an incremental process of acquisition involving a mastery of core forms before others.

Third, a focus on subject-specific skills relegates EAP to a low-status service role of simply supporting academic departments rather than developing its own independent subject knowledge and skills. This leads to what Raimes (1991) called ‘the butler’s stance’ on the part of EAP, which de-professionalizes teachers and marginalizes EAP units. Widdowson (1983) argues that developing skills and familiarity with specific rhetorical schemata actually amounts to a training exercise. He sees this as a more restricted and mundane activity than education, which involves assisting learners to understand and cope with a wider range of needs. Krashen (2011) similarly regards specific EAP as skill-building: simply describing academic language then teaching it directly. Huckin (2003), in fact, suggests that specific EAP can easily lead to a teacher-centred prescriptivism and an overly rigid focus on certain genres, forms, and tasks at the expense of others. This straitjackets creativity and encourages a dull conformity to convention and a static, decontextualized pedagogy, particularly if teachers fail to acknowledge genre variation. Such an approach may produce unimaginative and formulaic essays, and fail to prepare students for the unpredictable new forms of communication that await them in their professional careers.
He argues:

In general, a teacher centered approach, no matter how specific, is unlikely to have the pedagogical effectiveness of a student-centered approach, especially in heterogeneous classes.

(Huckin, 2003: 3)

Raimes (1991), in fact, argues that academic writing at university should be part of a liberal arts curriculum which elevates the status of EAP by supporting a humanities aspect of students’ experiences.

Fourth, and most centrally, is the idea that there are generic forms and skills that are transferable across contexts and purposes. Skills such as skimming and scanning texts for information, paraphrasing and summarizing arguments, taking notes from lectures, and giving oral presentations are often cited as universally useful to all students (e.g. Bruce, 2005; McCarter & Jakes, 2009). More centrally, some commentators argue that EAP should focus on register-level features rather than disciplinary-specific ones. Hutchison and Waters (1987: 165), for example, claim that there are insufficient variations in the grammar, functions, or discourse structures of different disciplines to justify a subject-specific approach. This is based on what Bloor and Bloor (1986) call the common core hypothesis or the idea that many features of English are found in nearly all varieties. This idea underlies most EAP textbooks as a means of making the materials as relevant, and therefore saleable, to as many students as possible.

Certainly there are register-level features which characterize a great deal of academic discourse, particularly writing. Students are often encouraged to employ features such as nominalization, impersonalization, and lexical density, foregrounding disciplinary arguments and subject matter to suppress their personal interests and identities. They are asked to sacrifice concreteness and empathy and to disguise the dynamic processes of change. Instead, academic conventions require them to discuss abstract concepts and relations, and to categorize, quantify, and evaluate according to the perspectives of their discipline (Halliday & Martin, 1993). Some efforts have also been made to identify what a core of academic competencies might consist of. Johns (1997: 58–64), for example, draws on the work of various writing theorists to create a list of features of 'general expository academic prose': This includes explicitness, intertextuality, objectivity, emotional neutrality, hedging, correct social relations, appropriate genre requirements, use of metadiscourse and signalling, and the display of a 'disciplinary vision'.

The case for specificity

In many situations, however, EAP is most successful when it is tailored to meet the
needs of the specific circumstances of students (e.g. Hyland, 2002; Sloane & Porter, 2010).

Many EAP teachers dispute the view that specialist discourse should be left to subject lecturers. It seems evident, for example, that subject teachers generally lack both the expertise and desire to teach literacy skills so that even giving feedback on written work can be cursory or non-existent (Hyland, 2013). Subject specialists often believe that academic discourse conventions are self-evident and are content to simply assign grades to products without concerning themselves with the process of arriving at the product. Nor is it entirely clear what comprises the underlying core or ‘general principles of inquiry and rhetoric’ (Spack, 1988) which teachers are advised to address. Even faculty members often disagree on commonalities; for example, Krause (2014) found in interviews with 50 academics that views about what generic skills should be in the university curriculum differed by discipline.

A second argument for specific EAP asserts that students do not necessarily learn best by studying general features before more specialized ones. Second language acquisition research shows that students do not learn in this step-by-step fashion according to an external sequence imposed by a teacher but acquire features of the language as they need them (Ellis, 1994). Students may need to attend more to sentence-level features at lower proficiencies, and perhaps require remedial attention in some areas, but there is no need to ignore either discourse or discipline at any stage. In fact, we now know a great deal about how disciplines use language, from the frequency and meanings of self-referring pronouns (Hyland, 2012a) to the genres on which students are assessed (Nesi & Gardner, 2012). It would, therefore, seem almost perverse not to employ the considerable knowledge we have of disciplinary variation in the service of teaching.

There are, in fact, serious problems with identifying a ‘common core’ of language items. Focusing on a finite formal system ignores the fact that any form has many possible meanings depending on its context of use. If we incorporate meaning into the common core, however, we are led to the notion of specific varieties of academic discourse, and to the consequence that learning should take place within these varieties. As Bhatia (2002: 27) observes:

students interacting with different disciplines need to develop communication skills that may not be an extension of general literacy to handle academic discourse, but a range of literacies to handle disciplinary variation in academic discourse.

Taking a ‘narrow angle’ approach focusing on the genres, skills, and language features most applicable to students’ specialisms is also likely to be more motivating for them,
making the relevance of study more obvious while activating their often considerable subject-specific knowledge. It also ensures that students are not studying aspects of the language they do not need or that may be used differently in their own specific fields of study. Even the so-called universal 'semi-technical' items in the Academic Word List (AWL), for example, can have very different frequencies and meanings in different disciplines so that teaching items as if they were generally useful and semantically equivalent may seriously mislead students (Hyland & Tse, 2007).

The wide-angle view which underpins EGAP sees academic literacy as a single, overarching practice; this not only disguises variability, but also suggests to both students and faculty that the language needed in academic contexts is merely an extension of everyday English. Students are seen as struggling with the conventions of their disciplines because of their imperfect acquisition of English at school or because they are using these conventions in a second language. In other words, students arrive at university with a deficit of literacy skills which can be topped up through some intensive EAP classes. The language centre is therefore a kind of remedial safe-house staffed by demoralized and inexperienced staff where EAP is relegated to a minor support role.

On the other hand, English for specific academic purposes (ESAP) may be more professionally challenging for teachers who have to familiarise themselves with the rhetorical and linguistic demands of particular contexts. It requires the jack-of-all-trades EAP practitioner to become a specialist in the ways that particular disciplines see the world and communicate how they understand it. At the same time, however, it elevates the importance of literacy specialists and the centres they work in, gaining the respect of faculty who generally appreciate the investment in time and commitment that teachers make in researching the specialist language of their discipline. This additional professionalism obviously costs institutions more in attracting qualified teachers, and ensuring professional development opportunities for them so they are able to research the needs of students and the demands made of them by their studies. The additional cost of this, however, is likely to be offset by more efficient, targeted, and motivating instruction, so that cost-effectiveness should be determined not just on the basis of cost but on the basis of effectiveness.

Foundation and features of specificity

The principle of specificity receives strong theoretical endorsement from social constructionism which stresses that disciplines are largely created and maintained through the distinctive ways in which members jointly construct a view of the world through their discourses (e.g. Bruffee, 1986; Hyland, 2012b). Each discipline draws on
different lexical, grammatical, and rhetorical resources to create specialized knowledge. Wignell, Martin and Eggins (1993), for instance, characterize the sciences as reworking experience technically by establishing a range of specialist terms which are ordered to explain how things happen or exist. This technicality is then used to create further technicality through defining, classifying, and explaining. The humanities, like history and philosophy on the other hand, employ abstraction rather than technicality, moving from instances to generalizations by gradually shifting away from particular contexts to build ever-more abstract interpretations of events. In other words, literacies are not just tools we pick up and put down as we need them, but are central to community epistemologies and personal identities. This means that students have to deploy a repertoire of literacy practices appropriate to different settings, and handle the social meanings and identities that each evokes.

It is, in other words, difficult to separate completely the teaching of specific skills and rhetoric from the teaching of a subject itself because what counts as convincing argument, appropriate tone, persuasive interaction, and so on, is managed for a particular audience. Students do not learn in a cultural vacuum but are judged on their use of discourses that insiders are likely to find effective and persuasive (e.g. Anderson, Evans & Harshorn, 2014). Ballard and Clanchy’s (1991: 17) point from twenty-five years ago is worth repeating:

    Just as modes of analysis vary with disciplines and with the groups that practise them (physicists, psychologists, and literary critics), so too does language. For the student new to a discipline, the task of learning the distinctive mode of analysis... is indivisible from the task of learning the language of the discipline... One area of development cannot proceed without the other.

This view of discipline-specific variation is supported by a large, and very diverse, body of research.

Most obviously, there is a high degree of specificity in the kinds of writing that students are asked to do in different disciplines. The ability to construct disciplinary arguments is at the heart of conceptual understanding of a field, and learners are required to think their way into their disciplines by learning to craft their writing in community-specific ways. Written genres themselves become the tools by which knowledge and learning are articulated for students. Because of this, writing has come to be seen as a social practice rather than a skill (Lillis, 2001), and specific genres are recognized as having a powerful influence on how students understand and engage with their disciplines. Even in cognate fields, such as nursing and midwifery, students are asked to produce very different writing assignments (Gimenez, 2009), and this diversity can present considerable challenges to students. A large-scale corpus study, in fact, has distinguished thirteen ‘genre families’, ranging from case studies through empathy
writing to research reports, which differ in social purpose, generic stages, and the networks they form with other genres (Nesi & Gardner, 2012).

Even genre names can be misleading as the structure of common formats such as the experimental lab report can differ considerably across different engineering disciplines, for example (Braine, 1995). Terms like lectures or essays imply neither homogeneity nor permanence and it is easy to believe there is greater similarity in the communicative practices of different communities than is actually the case. Ethnographic studies of individual students and courses reinforce this picture of marked diversities of tasks and texts in different fields (e.g. Prior, 1998).

Interviews with faculty and students together with analysis of course assignments at Hong Kong University, for example, revealed that students in the Speech and Hearing Sciences write reflective journals, journalism students write narratives, and pharmacy students produce drug profiles (Hyland, 2015). Nesi and Gardner (2012), in fact, identified three main functions of undergraduate assignments: to demonstrate disciplinary knowledge, to produce new knowledge, and to prepare for professional practice following graduation. These broad social purposes are clearly subject-related and are reflected in the expectations and feedback comments of tutors (Hyland, 2013).

Language, or rather specific varieties of language, therefore has a powerful influence on how students understand and engage with their disciplines. Language is tied to disciplines because it is inseparable from how we understand the world. This famous quote from Bartholomae captures this perfectly:

> Every time a student sits down to write for us, he has to invent the university for the occasion – invent the university, that is, or a branch of it, like history, anthropology or economics or English. He has to learn to speak our language, to speak as we do, to try on the peculiar ways of knowing, selecting, evaluating, reporting, concluding, and arguing that define the discourse of our community.
> (Bartholomae, 1986:4)

These ‘ways of knowing’ are not learned by repetition or memorization, but by writing, and learning a subject needs to be closely linked with learning to write in a subject.

This view of multiple literacies in universities is reinforced by text analysis research. While academic genres are often identified by their conventional surface features, they are actually forms of social action designed to accomplish disciplinary recognized purposes with some hope of success. We are more likely to achieve these purposes if we frame our messages in ways which appeal to appropriate culturally and institutionally legitimated relationships. So, in analysing the extent to which student writing across disciplines draws on generic or specialized vocabulary, Durrant (2014) found substantial variation between disciplines, while most disciplines were relatively
internally homogeneous. Hyland’s work on undergraduate writing also found considerable specificity in both the frequency and functions of features. Students’ uses of hedges (Hyland, 2000), self-mention (Hyland, 2012a) and engagement features such as reader pronouns and directives (Hyland, 2006) all differ across disciplines. One major reason for this is that writers draw on what they know as a result of their reading and writing of other texts. This not only offers the individual writer a way of managing the complexities of disciplinary writing, but also contributes to the stabilization of reproduction of disciplines.

In sum, this research shows that scholarly discourse is not uniform and monolithic but an outcome of different practices and strategies, where argument and engagement are crafted within specific disciplines that have different ideas about what is worth communicating and how this should be done. The fact that subject teachers are generally unwilling, for various reasons, to teach these practices encourages EAP teachers to bring their courses as close as they can to their students’ reasons for learning English. This is likely to make teaching more effective as students will be able to make use of it in their subject classes (e.g. James, 2014). Equally importantly, as I noted earlier, students are likely to be more motivated if they can see that their English course is directly related to their main subject course. Studies by Malcolm (2013), Kember, Ho and Hong (2008) and Woodrow (2013) have all found that students were motivated by courses which they saw were relevant to their wider studies. All these reasons point to the desirability of taking a specific approach as the most effective mean of equipping students with the communicative skills they need to participate in their studies.

Commonalities: contexts, continua, and consciousness-raising

While the idea of professional communities, each with its own particular practices, genres, and conventions, leads us towards a specific role for EAP, there are contexts where identifying these kinds of specific needs is problematic. Many students are enrolled in EAP programmes before they have selected a disciplinary major, such as in the numerous pre-sessional courses offered to international students, or in ‘common core’ first year programmes where students take a range of courses before deciding on a major. Students around the world are also attending classes which prepare them for university admissions tests, such as IELTS, Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL), and the Pearson Test of Academic English. These global language exams can only be reliable if they reduce the complexities of academic communication to something that can be administered and consistently measured for large numbers of candidates. This led, in fact, IELTS to abandon subject-specific exam modules in favour of generic tests (Davies, 2008).
It is also the case that in the modern university, students cross boundaries. The proliferation of double majors, joint degrees, and free electives means they inhabit complex academic and social worlds, moving outside their disciplines to discuss problems and write assignments with peers from other departments, and engage with lecturers and advisors in a disparate range of spoken and written genres. Such epistemological, social, and discoursal border-crossings pose enormous challenges for students and teachers alike. Similarly, it is not difficult to imagine how rhetorically complicated life can become for students in interdisciplinary studies such as business studies, for example, where a student may have to produce texts in fields as diverse as accountancy and corporate planning. This means that it is often difficult for teachers to find sufficient commonalities to develop specific courses where students have varying target needs and little experience of academic discourse.

It is, however, difficult for teachers to identify generic features, so while intertextuality, objectivity, and hedging may be common, each is further refined and developed differently within each discipline. Some fields, such as literature or cultural studies for example, may actually subscribe to very few of them. We might, then, prefer to see skills and features as located on a continuum with some more generic and others more discipline-specific, varying by degrees along a scale. Thus, ‘objectivity’ is obviously most apparent in physical sciences such as physics and chemistry where arguments rest on impartial observation, experimental demonstration, and replication, while research in the humanities tends to be more explicitly interpretative and less abstract, with less ‘exact’ data collection procedures. Further towards the ‘generic’ end of the cline we might place referencing skills. All students need to know how to reference the sources they use and, in part, this is a mechanical exercise involving citation conventions, whether Harvard, APA, etc., and partly knowing how to successfully paraphrase ideas. These things might be seen and taught as generic skills which can be transferred across contexts, but not all disciplines use and evaluate references in the same way. There are, for example, considerable differences in the frequency of citation and in the preference for particular reporting verbs (Hyland, 2004).

In other words, contexts influence the extent to which teachers are able to implement specificity, and this should encourage flexibility in course design and sensitivity to the circumstances of particular students. The strong evidence of linguistic diversity across disciplines and for the motivational and learning benefits of English for Specific Academic Purposes materials and courses often has to be tempered by contextual exigencies. Ultimately, EAP is a means of empowering students with the knowledge and skills they need to succeed in their studies and professional careers, and we have to recognize that there are various ways of doing this. Specificity must therefore, in part, be supplied by the student and not exclusively by the teacher’s analysis of target texts and behaviours. A key driver for specificity in the classroom is the students who make
up those classes, and for this reason teachers have sought to draw on the knowledge learners bring to the class, particularly their analytic skills.

One common solution to heterogeneous classes is to exploit these analytic skills and encourage students to contrast their disciplinary experiences through the rhetorical analysis of disciplinary texts (cf. Swales & Feak, 2012). Rhetorical consciousness-raising seeks to avoid simplistic and formulaic approaches to texts and the prescriptive teaching of target genres. Essentially, the approach emphasizes an exploratory and research-informed understanding of texts which promotes both learner awareness and learner autonomy. Teachers provide learners with the analytical concepts and tools to analyze, compare, and manipulate representative samples of discourse to experience for themselves the effect that grammatical choices have on creating meanings. Consciousness-raising always involves a focus on texts, usually through mini-analyses of the genres students have to write or of their own writing. One example is to ask students to identify and highlight where the writer of a text has chosen to use or avoid / and then determine possible reasons for this, finally writing a report to present their findings. Tasks such as this take a potentially generic feature of academic language and lead students towards the specificity of disciplinary texts. Text analyses, particularly those involving comparison with the analyses of peers, helps students become aware of rhetorical practices and the multi-literate nature of the academy.

Teachers can thus make a virtue of heterogeneity, while at the same time helping to satisfy students’ demands for personal relevance. Consciousness-raising tasks develop sensitivity to the language used in different academic genres, and insights into the expectations of their target communities. Becoming literate in one’s discipline means developing an awareness of the functions of texts and how these functions are conventionally accomplished. By making contact with those outside their field, students come to see that communication does not entail adherence to a set of universal rules but involves making rational choices based on the ways texts work in specific contexts.

**Specific and general courses: Hong Kong cases**

Both types of course present their own challenges, as we found in undertaking a major reform of the EAP curriculum at Hong Kong University in 2012. The reform accompanied a major restructuring of education in Hong Kong which reduced secondary education by one year and added it to the university curriculum. This move away from a highly specialized British-oriented model to align with four-year undergraduate degrees in mainland China and the US aimed to give students greater exposure to disciplines outside their major and opportunities for exchanges with international students. Charged with developing courses to embed relevant English
literacy skills instruction into the new curriculum, the Centre for Applied English Studies (CAES) chose to provide a general EAP course to all 3,000 first year students, called 'Core University English' (CUE), and more specific 'English in the Discipline' courses in later years. Together these would form the basis of students' English learning experience and the cornerstone of academic English support for all undergraduates at HKU (Hyland, 2015).

CUE was designed to enhance students' proficiency in academic English, and so bridge the gap between the English they had learnt at secondary school and the language expected of them when entering disciplinary studies in their second year. We decided that classes would be composed of students from a range of faculties and that they would largely focus on speaking and writing. The materials (Legg et al., 2014) are organized around five main themes of the Common Core curriculum: health, global issues, ethics, values, and Asia, and seek to move students from recognizing and using basic features of academic discourse, through identifying and evaluating sources, to note taking and paraphrasing, expressing a critical stance, synthesizing ideas, and finally structuring a complete academic text. Throughout the course, students are encouraged to express a viewpoint on topical, often controversial, issues, and to support that viewpoint with sources. In tutorials, they learn how to use language to collaborate in reaching deeper levels of understanding rather than winning debates.

The course constantly guides students in understanding the connections and contrasts between academic speaking and writing, and makes considerable use of models of different genre stages. Supported by tutorials and 90 hours of compulsory out-of-class learning materials on the electronic platform Moodle, learners are provided with a metalanguage to explicitly discuss strategies and features and to critically evaluate arguments and stances while reflecting on both texts and their own performances. Course materials contain many student texts which are marked up to show how stance, metadiscourse, citations, and quotes are used and how arguments are structured effectively. The fact that student texts are used as models for reading and writing, and that students are required to draw on content material from their first year common core courses in completing tasks, brings student-centred specificity into the course and helps to ensure relevance and involvement in learning.

After a general first year, students select their majors and begin their disciplinary studies which include a more specific English in the Discipline course. These courses were prepared following extensive research into the literacy demands of courses in different faculties, working in close collaboration with individual departments to ensure that the English courses aligned with the work students would do in their content courses. This kind of cooperation, however, was not always smooth, and teachers encountered a range of attitudes from enthusiastic cooperation to cold
indifference. In some cases, faculty members actively tried to position language teachers as servants, expecting them to simply offer the support that they thought best. In writing of an earlier attempt at collaboration at HKU, for example, Barron (2002) argued that the ontological superiority that science teachers give to scientific facts can make them rigid when negotiating learning tasks and assignments. The divergent philosophies of functionalism in EAP and realism in science, in other words, can undermine cooperation and lead to the subordination of EAP to subject content. Needless to say, these attempts to highjack our courses were rigorously resisted.

The most positive working relationships were when our course preparations made least demands on subject teachers, and where there was mutual respect and acceptance of each other's specialist expertise. We tried to ensure that our voice was heard in the planning of literacy education and that our courses were not subordinated to the disciplinary course. In some cases, faculty members see writing as simply something to get right, but overall the experience of curriculum reform has been positive. It has provided opportunities to explain the nature of our work to faculties and to promote the value of our role in the university, giving us a greater presence and a platform to show the centrality of academic literacy to teaching and learning in the university.

This research into faculty practices has produced some interesting courses. English for Clinical Pharmacy, for example, is a second year course designed to develop students' abilities to meet the communicative demands of drug information delivery by focusing on common oral and written genres in drug information. Parts of the course involve teaching specific words and strategies for learning, and applying new terms so that students are able to select vocabulary and rhetorical devices appropriate to drug information genres, and to synthesize and cite information and evidence from multiple sources to provide drug recommendations. Students also learn how to write clinical correspondence such as a drug reclassification letter and a drug incident report. Both are key elements of their medical course.

The learning activities for this purpose are contextualized in a drug information project jointly devised and co-assessed with the Department of Pharmacology and Pharmacy. Drug evaluation is a fundamental part of a clinical pharmacist's career, as many of the documents prepared by clinical pharmacists have to be based on some form of drug evaluation. This project is the main assessment task and requires students, working in pairs, to evaluate and recommend two drugs that can be used to treat the same medical condition. To ensure the comparison is meaningful, the drugs assigned to the students are selected by the Pharmacy department which, after some initial trepidation, came to see the value of discipline-specific work and that we were not encroaching into professional content areas. The Pharmacy department also advised on the kind of writing task which would be appropriate, eventually settling on an article in a hospital
bulletin, a common site for clinical pharmacists to publish their writing, including drug evaluations, addressed to an audience of healthcare professionals who are working in a hospital.

The Drug Evaluation Project therefore provides an early opportunity for learners to develop and practise necessary, and highly discipline-specific, writing skills. It requires them to search for and select relevant drug information from reliable sources, to compare drugs for the purpose of evaluation, and to write a comparative drug evaluation article for publication in an online pharmacy bulletin using appropriate citation and referencing styles. Each student pair writes a first draft of the article and receives feedback before writing a final draft. Teacher feedback on drafts plays an important role in scaffolding cognitive development, alerting students to their strengths and weaknesses, and contributing to their acquisition of disciplinary subject matter and writing conventions. The students certainly find the project challenging. At the beginning of the course, some complained that the second year was too early for them to write in this way as they did not feel capable of judging sources nor had the knowledge to give drug evaluations. Including a lecture by the medical librarian on finding reliable drug sources, together with the support of the Pharmacy department, helped enormously in the successful development of the programme and enabling students to see its possibilities.

A second example of an English in the Discipline course is the second year English for business studies course. It is based around three main writing assessments using genres which student focus groups revealed were particularly problematic. The main one is an academic paper where students must argue why 'corporate social responsibility' is beneficial to a company's performance. Students are also expected to synthesize a case analysis, another assessment procedure distinctive to the business faculty, and to compile a small writing portfolio from samples of writing they have done, either in or out of the English class. This mixed-genre portfolio is accompanied by a letter integrating the entries, reflecting on their features and structures and pointing out the similarities and differences between them. There is, then, a demand that students produce several pieces of extensive writing, both collaboratively and individually, to demonstrate their understanding of features of key business genres, and the ability to comprehend and make inferences about the use of common language in business journals and reports.

Another aspect of the course was the decision to 'flip the classroom' so that input, readings, and course notes are accessed out of class, and class time is spent on discussion, collaborative writing, and peer and self-assessment tasks. This not only represents a transfer of responsibility of learning to students, but allows teachers and students to have more face-to-face time, and students to master material at their own
pace. By freeing up more time for discovery in class, we hope greater opportunities for specificity are available than by teaching the disciplinary conventions in class.

Our involvement in ESAP, therefore, involves a commitment to research-based language instruction. It means determining what the community’s relevant conventions are so they can be made relevant and ‘demystified’ for students.

Conclusions

The take-home message here is that the discourses of the academy do not form an undifferentiated, unitary mass but a variety of subject-specific literacies. Disciplines have different views of knowledge, different research practices, and different ways of seeing the world, and as a result, investigating the practices of those disciplines will take us to greater specificity. We also, however, need to recognize that not all contexts are the same and that circumstances often require teachers to identify more register-level skills. It is always important, moreover, to recognize how students understand specificity. They usually come with some, and often considerable, subject-specific knowledge, and we need to hand over control of subject content to them, providing them with the tools to explore texts in their subject contexts.

For students, the acquisition of disciplinary knowledge involves an encounter with a new and dominant literacy, and because academic ability is frequently evaluated in terms of competence in this literacy, they often find their own literacy practices to be regarded as failed attempts to approximate these conventions. By detaching academic literacy from its social consequences, it is easy to see communication difficulties as learners’ own weaknesses, and for ESP to become an exercise in language repair. The only way to counter this is to bring these practices back to earth by targeting specific contexts and drawing on the experiences of our learners. Specificity, thus, provides learners with a way of understanding the diversity they encounter at university and shows them how they might best achieve their academic goals.

Further reading
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CHAPTER 4

Discourse analysis across events
Chapter 4: Discourse analysis across events

Discourse analysis is a research method that provides systematic evidence about social processes through the detailed examination of speech, writing and other signs. This book describes an approach to discourse analysis drawn primarily from the field of linguistic anthropology (Agha, 2007; Duranti, 1997; Silverstein, 1976, 2003)—a discipline that studies language use in social and cultural contexts—although we also borrow concepts from related fields. Our approach makes two significant contributions. First, we clearly delineate a linguistic anthropological method for doing discourse analysis, offering transparent procedures and illustrations. Second, we extend discourse analysis beyond the speech event, showing how to study the pathways that linguistic forms, utterances, cultural models, individuals and groups travel across events.

Recent theoretical and empirical work has made clear that many important social processes can only be understood if we move beyond single speech events to analyze pathways across linked events (Agha, 2007; Agha and Wortham, 2005; Wortham, 2012). Learning, for example, involves systematic changes in behavior from one event to the next. A learner has experiences in one or more events and then behaves differently in subsequent events. In socialization, to take another example, a novice experiences events characteristic of a group and then participates more competently in subsequent events. No matter how sophisticated our analyses of discrete events, we cannot offer empirically adequate analyses of processes like learning and socialization unless we study pathways across linked events, because such processes inherently take place across events. In order for discourse analysis to be a useful method for studying processes like learning and socialization, it must uncover how people, signs, knowledge, dispositions and tools travel from one event to another and facilitate behavior in subsequent events. This book presents the first systematic methodological approach to doing discourse analysis of linked events.

An example

Consider the following example, taken from a ninth grade combined English and history classroom in an urban American school. The two teachers are discussing Aristotle’s Politics with 18 students—six boys and 12 girls, mostly African American. See Wortham (2006) for more information on this classroom. The class is exploring Aristotle’s account of human nature, specifically the question of what distinguishes humans from animals. In the passage they read, Aristotle says: “he who is unable to live in society, or who has no need because he is sufficient for himself, must be beast or god” (Aristotle, Politics, 1253a, line 29). This implies that an individual who lives outside society is more like an animal than a human. Teachers and students discuss what
criterion Aristotle would have used to distinguish humans from "beasts."

Right before segment 1, one teacher has tentatively proposed a criterion: humans have goals and animals do not. A student, Tyisha, objects. (Transcription conventions are in Appendix A and B; "TYI" is Tyisha; "T/B" is Mrs. Bailey, one of the two teachers running this classroom discussion.)

**Segment 1: Tyisha's cat as a beast**

| 525   | **TYI:** Mrs. Bailey? I- I have to **disagree**
|       | (class laughter) |
| 526   | **T/B:** can I- can I finish this before you disagree, okay, the idea that he's putting out here is that they- they have goals, and that they can in discussion decide the best way to accomplish their goal. now, Tyisha what's your 
| 530   | disagreement? |
| 531   | **TYI:** becau(hh)- because if a- like- if my- okay, if my cat want to- um you know to get to the top of something, you know, he might sit there and be ((3 unintelligible syllables)) and he'll sit there and try everyday. and then finally he will do it, that was the goal to try and get up there. he had a goal. |
| 535   | **T/B:** okay (1.0) he's got a [goal] but 
| **ST:** | [was his goal really necessary? (laughter from class)] |
| 537   | **T/B:** let's- let's- let's take what- (3.0) let's take what your cat's doing that every day he sees that- counter that he wants to get on, and every day when he passes that counter he tries to get up there. that's a goal. okay[=
| 540   | **ST:** 
| **T/B:** =how is that different than your goal, the goal that you might have had last night when you had this reading, or- 
| | (some chattering) |
| **TYI:** | "I don't know" |

In the first line (525), Tyisha states explicitly what type of action she is performing: disagreement. Such an explicit statement can be useful, as it offers discourse analysts guidance in interpreting the event. Discourse analysis would be easy if analysts could rely on people's explicit descriptions of what they are doing. This cannot suffice as a methodological approach, however, for two reasons. First, speakers sometimes lie, speak ironically or make mistakes. Maybe this event is a disagreement, but perhaps not. Second, speakers cannot be depended upon to provide explicit interpretations of their discourse. Most of the time, both participants and analysts must interpret implicit messages and infer what type of action is occurring.

Our approach to discourse analysis depends centrally on a distinction between what Jakobson (1957/1971) called a **narrated event** and an "event of speaking" or **narrating event** (we place important technical terms in bold when introducing and defining them). The narrated event is what is being talked about, while the narrating event is the activity of talking about it. Narrated content includes more than just narratives.
Jakobson uses “narrated event” to refer to any denoted content, and we use “narrating event” to refer to any discursive interaction among participants, whether or not the speakers tell stories. From lines 527–529, for example, the teacher describes Aristotle’s theory. This narrated event has consistently been the topic of conversation for several minutes. From lines 525–527 and 529–530 the speech event itself is the narrated event, as the teacher and Tyisha mention her impending “disagreement.” Even in cases where the speech event is not explicitly described, any discursive interaction always involves an event of speaking, the interaction between speaker and audience within which narrated events are described. In this passage the narrating event involves teachers and students having a classroom conversation about Aristotle.

Teachers and students could be doing various other things in this narrating event as well. They could be teasing each other, excluding and mistreating some participants, flirting, taking political stands, or various other possible social actions. In our approach to discourse analysis, the central goal is to uncover systematic evidence of the types of social action that are occurring in the event of speaking. An initial step is mapping out the relationship between narrated and narrating events, because content communicated in the narrated events provides crucial resources for accomplishing action in the narrating event.

In the passage above, speakers create two additional narrated events in addition to Aristotle’s theory and the “disagreement” in the classroom interaction itself. At line 531 Tyisha gives an example. There are now three narrated events: (1) the teacher’s claims about Aristotle’s theory of humans and animals; (2) Tyisha’s explicit characterization of the next phase of their conversation as a “disagreement”; and (3) Tyisha’s cat as an example of a “beast” which appears, contrary to the teacher’s claim, to have goals. Then at line 541 the teacher introduces Tyisha herself as a contrasting example, a human who—she will go on to argue—has different kinds of goals than a beast. We could treat this as a fourth narrated event, but we will instead treat it as the introduction of a second character (Tyisha) into the third narrating event, the example about Tyisha’s cat.

Figure 1.1 represents the narrated and narrating events. We will use figures in this format throughout the book to present narrated and narrating events visually. The external rectangle represents the narrating event, the interaction between teachers and students in the classroom. We represent the main characters as ovals, and we separate teachers from students because of their different institutional statuses—differential roles that can be seen in the teachers’ right to direct conversation and evaluate students, for example. At this point in the conversation we represent Tyisha as part of the class, in the same group as the other students, because she is participating in the conversation as many of her peers do. The embedded box on the right represents the narrated event about Aristotle’s theory of humans and beasts. Aristotle distinguishes
between the two and the class discusses what separates one from the other, exploring whether humans have goals and beasts do not, for example. The embedded box on the left represents the example of Tyisha and her cat. Tyisha offers this example in order to argue that animals have goals just like humans, and Mrs. Bailey elaborates it by discussing whether Tyisha herself has goals similar to her cat’s. The example borrows the distinction between humans and beasts from Aristotle, and it presents Tyisha and her cat as exemplars of these two categories. We do not represent the third narrated event, the explicit characterization of their interaction as a disagreement, partly to save space and partly because this topic does not recur until later.

In order to identify the social action occurring in the narrating event, discourse analysts must analyze narrated events, because the characterization of narrated characters and events is one of the most important resources that speakers use to accomplish social acts in discursive interaction. In this example, the distinction between humans and beasts—established in their discussion of Aristotle—and the characterizations of Tyisha and her cat—established through the example—become crucial tools for teachers and students as they position Tyisha herself in the classroom conversation.

The first step in discourse analysis, then, involves mapping out the narrated and narrating events, as illustrated in Figure 1.1. Early in an analysis we often do not know what types of social action are occurring in the narrating event, so we just make a provisional sketch of positioning in the narrating event and revise it later in the analysis. The next step is to figure out how signs that speakers use to describe the narrated event also communicate information about social action occurring in the
narrating event. We recommend that discourse analysts first attend to certain types of signs that often carry information about the narrating event. Deictics, for example, inevitably link narrated and narrating events (Silverstein, 1976). We can define them as linguistic signs whose referential value (what they communicate about the narrated event) depends on information about the (narrating) speech event itself. In line 532, for example, Tyisha refers to her cat as “he.” Participants and analysts only know the referent of “he” because they heard her use the term “my cat” in prior discourse, at line 531. If we entered the conversation at line 532, the referent of “he” would not be clear. At line 541, the teacher uses “you” to refer to Tyisha. We only know the meaning of this term if we have information about the speech event itself, specifically about the identity of the addressee. The systematic use of “he” and “you” in this and subsequent passages distinguishes two focal characters in the events described, and this ends up having implications for the narrating event.

Deictics often provide important information about the social action accomplished through discourse, because they presuppose things about the narrating event at the same time as they describe the narrated event. Distinguishing between “we” and “they,” for example, does more than refer to two groups. It also presupposes a boundary between one group that includes the speaker and another group that excludes him or her. This boundary sometimes becomes salient in social action, as when a speaker systematically places some people beyond the boundary, in an out-group. In the classroom example of Tyisha and her cat, teachers and students use “you,” “he” and

Segment 2: Similarities between Tyisha and her cat

550  ST:  humans can do more things than cats can do, like they can build

      TTY:  no that’s not- just a goal, my goal is to win in Nintendo and
           ((laughter by a few girls in the class))

      ST:  that’s your goal?

      TTY:  it’s a goal, so

555  T/B:  okay maybe winning at Nintendo is like your cat’s goal of getting on top of the-

      TTY:  right

      T/B:  the- the counter, but aren’t- don’t we have more =

      ST:  [better

560  T/B:  long ranged goals than your cat getting on top of the counter, or you winning Nintendo?

      TTY:  but I’m just saying they’re goals, you said animals can’t have goals or
           something, so I just told ya I disagree.

      T/B:  okay, but can we- can we qualify that then.

565  TTY:  yeah.

      T/B:  can we qualify that and say that man (20) doesn’t just have immediate
           goals, but also has long range goals.
other signs to distinguish between and characterize Tyisha and her cat. As the conversation continues, this distinction between Tyisha the human and her cat the beast becomes central to the social action.

In the narrated events from lines 550–558, teachers and students continue to discuss the example of Tyisha and her cat. From lines 558–567, they return to their discussion of Aristotle’s and their own theories about the distinction between humans and beasts. Note the use of reported speech in lines 562–563. We define the term as direct and indirect reports of what someone said. Reported speech connects narrated and narrating events, reproducing and characterizing something from the narrated event to accomplish action in the narrating event. Tyisha uses indirect discourse to describe what the teacher said (“you said animals can’t have goals”) and herself (“I just told ya I disagree”), as she reviews what their debate is about. The teacher had claimed that animals do not have goals, but Tyisha offered a convincing counterargument with the example of her cat—who clearly seems to have goals when he jumps on the counter. At lines 555–558, the teacher accepts her argument, although at lines 558–561 the teacher goes on to propose a different kind of distinction between human and animal goals.

Here Tyisha uses reported speech to summarize the earlier phase of the argument, in which she successfully disagreed with the teacher’s claim. Thus she explicitly marks her successful use of a counterargument. Reported speech links characters in the narrated event and participants in the narrating event, as participants put words into characters’ mouths and in so doing inevitably characterize and evaluate them. Such identification of characters is one important device through which participants act. Tyisha, for example, summarizes her earlier speech in a way that characterizes her past self—the person who disagreed with the teacher a couple of minutes earlier—as confident and matter-of-fact in her demeanor (“I just told ya I disagree”). This positioning helps make Tyisha herself, the student participating in the narrating classroom interaction, seem an intelligent, balanced, successful contributor to substantive classroom conversation. As we describe more fully in Chapter 2, discourse analysts should examine deictics and instances of reported speech early in their analysis because these types of linguistic signs often do important work in evaluating characters and positioning participants.

In this passage Tyisha characterizes her narrated self in other ways as well. By exploring these characterizations, we can analyze more fully how the narrated events become resources for teachers and students as they perform social action in the narrating event. For example, when Tyisha says that her goal is to win Nintendo video games, she might be characterizing her narrated self as pursuing rudimentary, unintellectual goals. We describe this as voicing, the characterization of a narrated person as occupying a recognizable social position (Bakhtin, 1935/1981; Wortham,
2001). In this case Tyisha might be voicing her narrated self as intellectually unengaged, as an unmotivated teenager wasting time on video games. Note that we have used evaluative language in making this characterization. It would be possible to evaluate video game playing more positively. Among a group of video game enthusiasts, for example, Tyisha’s description of her narrated self could be grounds for praise or envy. But in the passage above other participants evaluate it negatively. At line 553 a student says “that’s your goal?” in a disbelieving tone. At lines 555–558 the teacher compares this goal to an animal’s goal. And at line 559 another student presupposes that human goals are “better,” with animal-like goals including Nintendo thus being worse.

Tyisha herself probably intended her Nintendo-playing self as an example of lower, animal-like goals, because she is arguing that humans and animals have similar goals. The teacher had claimed that humans have goals while animals do not, and Tyisha made a plausible counterargument. Now the teacher has acknowledged that animals do have goals (at line 539), but she continues to pursue the idea that humans are different than animals by introducing the idea that humans and animals have different kinds of goals (at line 558). By characterizing herself as having lower, animal-like goals—like playing video games—Tyisha presents her (human) self as having goals similar to her cat’s. She is trying to win the argument by denying the teacher’s claim that human goals make us different from animals.

Tyisha apparently does not anticipate the teachers’ response, however. At line 558, the teacher used an inclusive “we” to refer to humans—she herself, Tyisha and the other students are humans, and the teacher claims that all humans have goals that are different from animals’. As the conversation continues in the following segment, however, the teachers and other students exclude Tyisha from their group. As noted above, deictics like “we” often make important contributions to social action in the narrating event. In the next segment teachers and students make clear that Tyisha is no longer included with the other humans in the category of beings that have higher-level goals. By voicing or characterizing herself as having lower-level goals, Tyisha has made herself vulnerable to this exclusion. “T/S” in this segment refers to Mr. Smith, the second teacher running this class discussion along with Mrs. Bailey.

Tyisha keeps trying to win the argument, refusing the distinction between her own (human) goals and her cat’s goals at lines 584–585 and 589. Up until this point, the teachers have acknowledged her reasonable claim that animals and humans share some similar goals, but they have argued that people also have uniquely human types of goals. At line 590, however, they shift the interactional positioning in the narrating event. They mark this with distinctive intonation at line 590 and line 592, indicating that something important has been said or implied. At lines 593–597 one teacher
Segment 3: Tyisha the beast

T/S: what goal did you have in mind this morning, even when you went to sleep.
T/I: (laughing) I didn’t have one.
580 T/S: sure you did, didn’t you? did you have the goal you had to wake up at a certain time, get dressed in a way by a certain time, get to a place
T/I: yeah that’s true.
T/S: so you had goals even before you started
T/I: [but not in the summertime. I
just got up, see, just like.
T/S: ah, and in summertime when you got up because you had to come to school what was your goal or was it to sleep until three in the afternoon? or to get up and play with your friends?
T/I: the same goal my cat had, to go to sleep, and get up and eat.
590 T/B: ahh, isn’t that interesting?
T/S: (rise-fall intonation contour; “mocking” effect))
T/B: same goals as her (1.0)] =
ST: [cat had
595 T/B: =cat had. wow.
ST: so you are like an animal.
T/B: so you are like an animal.
T/I: I’m not saying, I just don’t have somewheres to be at.
T/B: okay, but that’s not. don’t confuse the issue. one point at a time.
600 Tyisha, you throw out seventeen things and then nobody can even begin to address any of these things.
MST: tss ((hissing laughter))

states this new information explicitly: Tyisha and her cat have similar goals, and thus perhaps Tyisha is different from the rest of us humans. Tyisha has been arguing for the similarity between human and animal goals all along. But now, instead of trying to establish that all humans have some goals different from animals’, the teachers and students argue at lines 596–597 that Tyisha in particular—unlike other humans—has goals like an animal. They accomplish this, in part, through the two instances of “you” in lines 596–597. “You are like an animal” sets Tyisha apart from humans by positioning her with other animals instead. Thus they imply that she is different from the other students in the classroom, and perhaps not fully human. At line 598 Tyisha sees the danger and tries to backtrack, but she fails.

Note how the description of a narrated event—the example of Tyisha and her cat, together with the voicing or social identification of characters in that event—has facilitated social action in the narrating event. The teachers and other students eventually position Tyisha in the narrating event as different from the rest of them, as more like an animal because of the instrumental, lower-level, short-term goals that she allegedly pursues. Figure 1.2 represents the relationship between the narrated and narrating events at this point in the discursive interaction. In the narrated example of Tyisha and her cat, the characterization has shifted such that Tyisha is now positioned along with her cat as having beast-like goals. Aristotle’s distinction between humans
and beasts helps organize both narrated and narrating events, and in both realms Tyisha has switched from being positioned as human to being positioned as a beast. The dashed lines represent the parallelism established between narrated and narrating events. The teachers and other students distinguish Tyisha from themselves and position her as less than fully human, in the narrating event, by using a model of society and evaluative characterizations drawn from the narrated events. They are not talking simply about Tyisha the hypothetical video game enthusiast, nor are they merely discussing the narrated event involving Tyisha and her cat. They are also using these narrated events to position Tyisha herself in the narrating event. Just as a beast cannot cooperate sufficiently with others to live in human society, Tyisha cannot follow the rules of classroom engagement and participate productively in group discussion.

The last lines of segment 3 provide another illustration of how reported speech contributes to narrated events in ways that can accomplish social action in the narrating event. At line 600 the teacher says to Tyisha: "you throw out seventeen things and then nobody can even begin to address any of these things." The verb "throw out" here describes a type of speech event, portraying Tyisha as making lots of points, in scattershot fashion, without offering others an opportunity to engage them productively. Reporting others' speech—directly, indirectly or generically—is one crucial way speakers establish narrated events that have implications for social action. At lines 599–601, the teacher characterizes Tyisha as a disruptive student who refuses to engage productively in classroom conversation, explicitly describing her undesirable behavior. In subsequent chapters we will see how reported speech can also more subtly
contribute to social action in the narrating event by positioning narrated characters and actual participants.

The example of Tyisha and her cat begins to illustrate how discourse analysts systematically explore patterns of sign use. In our approach, discourse analysts first trace how speakers use linguistic and paralinguistic signs as they create narrated events, then make inferences about how these patterns of sign usage contribute to social action in the narrating event. In the example about Tyisha, we have illustrated the first two steps in how such analysis proceeds: first mapping out the narrated events, and then looking for types of signs that often communicate information about how narrated events and characters have implications for the narrating event. We have illustrated how deictics, reported speech and voicing can provide important signals about the social action occurring.

Before offering a more detailed account of how discourse analysis proceeds, however, we must distinguish between discourse analysis of discrete speech events and discourse analysis across pathways of events. Traditionally discourse analysis has been done on single events or on recurring types of events. Our linguistic anthropological approach to discourse analysis was largely developed for analyzing discrete events, and most of the methodological tools we present come from this earlier work. In this book we extend the approach to analyze pathways of connected events over time, because many crucial human processes take place across chains of linked events. The next section describes traditional work on discrete speech events. Then we sketch how a linguistic anthropological approach can be extended to do discourse analysis beyond the speech event.

**Speech events and their contexts**

The analysis of discrete speech events over the past several decades has been enormously fruitful (e.g., Goffman, 1981; Gumperz, 1982; Hymes, 1964; Sacks, Schegloff & Jefferson, 1974; Silverstein, 1992), and our approach uses many tools that have been developed to analyze individual events. Founding figures of discourse analysis such as Goffman (1981), Hymes (1974), Jakobson (1960) and others have described the central components of any given speech event. Every speech event includes participants—a speaker, an addressee and often an audience or overhears. It includes a message, communicated over some channel that connects speaker and addressee, “encoding” the message in some denotational code. The speech and nonverbal signs that constitute the event have an organization—at least a beginning, middle and end, and often more complex kinds of poetic patterning. The communication takes place in some context, both a physical setting and a social world with norms about social identities and social
events. The event has social consequences and accomplishes social action.

Different approaches to discourse analysis offer different accounts of how these elements interrelate. Our approach is not the only useful one. Different research questions will require different approaches. On our account, a discourse analyst must uncover the social functions of a speech event, and this centrally includes the social identities or positions that participants assign themselves and others in narrated and narrating events. For example, exclusion is a type of social action, and teachers and students end up excluding Tyisha in part by characterizing her as a “beast” in the narrated event. Participants accomplish social action in the narrating event by organizing their messages, using signs systematically to position themselves and other participants. For example, the narrated events—the discussion of Aristotle’s definition of human nature and the example of Tyisha and her cat—established the distinction between humans and beasts, and speakers systematically applied this distinction to Tyisha herself so as to exclude her from the classroom conversation.

Put briefly, then, on our account discourse analysis uncovers the social actions performed in discursive interaction, by showing how narrated characters are voiced and actual participants are positioned, as this positioning is accomplished through the systematic organization of signs that communicate explicit and implicit messages, and as this organization is accomplished by making aspects of context relevant. Chapter 2 presents a more detailed procedure for doing discourse analysis. In the rest of this chapter we provide conceptual background for our approach, defining central terms in the italicized sentence and describing key aspects of discursive interaction both within and across speech events. First we want to clarify that, by presenting social action in the narrating event as the target of our approach to discourse analysis, we emphatically do not mean to imply that participants necessarily intend the social action they perform. Sometimes participants accomplish action that they do not intend, and sometimes they are unaware of social actions that they demonstrably orient to but do not consciously understand. In many cases, discourse analysis reveals mechanisms of social action that participants use but do not consciously recognize. The parallel between Aristotle’s description of humans and beasts and the teachers’ distinction between Tyisha and other students with “higher” goals was a central part of the discursive mechanism through which Tyisha was excluded from classroom conversation, for example, but in interviews Wortham (2006) found that the teachers and students were not consciously aware of this mechanism. They were aware of the broader social function, realizing that Tyisha had been excluded, but they were not aware of the mechanisms through which this action had been accomplished.

Silverstein (1992, 1993) shows that the central problem in discourse analysis is determining relevant context. Deictics, reported speech and evaluative indexical signs,
among other cues, signal relevant context. When Tyisha describes herself as playing
Nintendo video games at line 551, for example, she could be identifying herself as
intellectually unsophisticated. But this utterance could signal something else if
different aspects of the context were salient. If everyone knew that Tyisha was a
diligent student who always read more than the teachers required and conducted
scientific experiments in her spare time, her comment about Nintendo would more
likely be a joke or a counterfactual. If everyone knew that the boys in the classroom
were obsessed with video games and played them constantly instead of doing
schoolwork, while Tyisha and the other girls were all diligent students, then Tyisha's
comment could be read as an insult to the boys with no implications for herself. In
order to interpret the implications this utterance has for the positioning of participants
and social action occurring in the narrating event, we must know what aspects of
context are relevant.

Relevant context gets established as speakers organize their messages systematically
so as to foreground certain aspects, and as other speakers subsequently presuppose the
same aspects of context. Participants do this largely through the systematic
deployment and uptake of **indexical signs** that presuppose or create aspects of context.
An indexical sign signals its object by pointing to it (Peirce, 1932; Silverstein, 1976). For
example, “throw out” in line 600 can describe undisciplined, careless speech—the kind
of speech that disruptive, unpromising students might engage in. Participants and
analysts know that this expression has these implications because it points to or
presupposes many other contexts in which they have heard the term used to describe
disruptive, unintelligent or careless people. To take another example, “dude”
presupposes a certain kind of (young male) speaker, the type of person who would
normally use the word. Deictics are also indexical, pointing to their referents in the
context—with “you” pointing to the addressee, a verb in the past tense pointing to a
time prior to the event of speaking, etc.

As a speech event unfolds, indexical signs normally accumulate and point to similar
contexts, presupposing certain aspects of context as more and more likely to be
relevant. After Tyisha talks about playing Nintendo, the teachers return to the
distinction between humans and animals without presupposing that Tyisha herself is
beast-like. At line 558 the teacher’s “we” seems to include Tyisha as a human like others
in the class, and at line 580 Mr. Smith describes some of Tyisha’s activities as involving
human-like goals. But at line 584 Tyisha points out that during the summer she has no
complex goals and just lies around like her cat, and at line 589 she concludes by saying
that she has “the same goal my cat had, to go to sleep, and get up and eat.” These
utterances at lines 551, 584 and 589 all point to similar context as relevant—to a
culturally familiar model of intellectually unengaged people who lie around and do
mindless activities like playing video games.
Silverstein (1992, 1993) calls this accumulation of signs that point to similar aspects of context **contextualization**, the process through which the context relevant to interpreting a speech event is established. Over the course of a discursive interaction a series of indexical signs comes to presuppose some aspects of the context as relevant. One sign alone cannot establish relevant context. If teachers and students had followed Tyisha's comment about Nintendo with discussion of how she is in fact a diligent student, and if she had not subsequently characterized herself as lazy in the summer, then the comment about Nintendo would not have positioned her as lazy and beast-like. But several utterances did in fact presuppose this, and thus that model of a beast-like, lazy person became relevant context for interpreting both the characterization of Tyisha in the narrated event and her position in the narrating event.

Even after these utterances, of course, Tyisha might not ultimately have been positioned as beast-like. Teachers and students could have switched to emphasizing Tyisha's character as a good student, or they could have talked about how inappropriate it would be to compare humans to animals. Any social action accomplished through discursive interaction can be refigured or undone, if subsequent discourse provides robust enough signals to that effect. In the next class, or even years later at a class reunion, these teachers and students could have recalled this conversation and tried to establish that they were just teasing and knew all along that Tyisha was a promising student. In practice, however, relevant context usually solidifies such that participants and analysts can treat a given action as accomplished and routinely presupposable.

In Silverstein's (1992, 1993) terms, this is to say that speech events become **entextualized**. They become stable and identifiable as some kind of social action, after a series of indexical signs has established relevant context and speakers routinely infer that a given social action has occurred. In Tyisha's case entextualization is established in lines 590–601, as teachers and students explicitly state that Tyisha is like an animal and the teacher disciplines Tyisha for her manner of class participation. At this point the social action being accomplished in the narrating event—the exclusion and disciplining of Tyisha—becomes firmly established, and Tyisha is robustly positioned as disruptive and failing to collaborate in class discussion, as like a "beast" who cannot participate productively in collective human activities. This social action is established as a pattern of indexical signs comes to presuppose relevant context.

Any entextualization is a contingent interactional accomplishment. The positions of participants and the nature of the social action can be changed later in the discursive interaction, or in future events. This means that the boundaries of a speech event are sometimes fluid and contested. After line 600, teachers and students go on to discuss another topic and Tyisha stays silent. But they could have taken up the issue of Tyisha's identity, tacitly or explicitly, and then the segment of discursive interaction after line
600 would have been part of the segment we have been analyzing. One central task for discourse analysis is segmentation of discursive interaction, the determination of where speech events begin and end (Jefferson, 1978). There are no unambiguous rules for determining the boundaries of a speech event, because these boundaries depend on the relevant context and social actions that are accomplished. In practice, participants normally establish robust entextualization in recognizable ways, making it clear that some sort of speech event or discursive activity has run its course and is now completed.

The goal of discourse analysis, in our approach, is to uncover the type of social action participants perform. Discourse analysts start by identifying signs that do the work of contextualization, signs that make aspects of context relevant. In the classroom conversation above, for example, Tyisha's utterances at lines 551, 584 and 589 collectively make the model of a lazy, intellectually uninvolved teenager relevant. Discourse analysts then look for signs organized systematically into what we will call a configuration of signs or a poetic structure (Jakobson, 1960; Silverstein, 1992, 1993), signs that collectively establish relevant context. In Tyisha's case, the distinction between humans and beasts is established in the narrated event as teachers and students use Aristotle's account to explore the narrated example of Tyisha and her cat, and then the label "beast" is drawn from these narrated events and used to position Tyisha herself in the narrating event. Many signs presuppose the human/beast distinction and then apply this distinction to Tyisha herself, and the configuration of these signs, accumulating over the course of the interaction, comes collectively to presuppose the voicing of Tyisha as a beast and her exclusion from classroom conversation.

The column on the left in Table 1.1 represents the five main pieces in our approach to discourse analysis of discrete events. As the circular arrows indicate, these pieces are not strictly sequential. There are three phases in any analysis. First, as represented on the first line, we map out the narrated and narrating events, anticipating that aspects of the narrated events (like the distinction between humans and beasts) will be relevant to accomplishing social action in the narrating event. Second, as represented on the middle three lines, we engage in the dialectic of contextualization and entextualization, identifying relevant signs and interpreting the voicing, evaluation and interactional positioning that they signal. Third, as represented on the last line, we infer the type of social action occurring among participants in the narrating event.

It is crucial to see that the three components of the second phase—the middle three lines—represent an iterative, dialectical process, as represented by the circular arrows. Discourse analysts start this phase by identifying indexical signs that point to relevant aspects of the context (for example, "Nintendo" might signal a type of young person
who is seen as wasting time in intellectually dulling activities). Then, as represented on the fourth line, analysts construe those signs and the relevant context, inferring what type of interactional positioning and social action is likely occurring (for example, inferring that Tyisha is different from the other students because she pursues lower-level, more animal-like goals). The two components of contextualization and entextualization depend upon each other, such that one process is not prior to the other. Through contextualization relevant context emerges and supports one account of the voicing, evaluation and interactional positioning that is occurring. But at the same time, an account of the emerging voicing, evaluation and interactional positioning constrains inferences about what context might be relevant. Any segment always contains more potentially salient indexical signs than will in fact play an important role in the analysis. Only by making provisional inferences about the entextualization occurring can both participants and analysts narrow down the potentially relevant indexical signs and potentially relevant context.

This cycle of interpretation, from relevant signs to inferred construals of those signs and back—represented by the circular arrows in the table—is provisionally stopped when a configuration of mutually presupposing signs solidifies (Silverstein, 1992, 1993). This is represented on the third line, with the arrows above and below indicating that a solidified configuration of signs constrains both the indexical signs and relevant
context that become salient and the plausible con-struals of those indexicals. In the example of Tyisha, we have pointed out indexical signs in lines 551, 584 and 589 that together presuppose the model or stereotype of a lazy, intellectually unengaged young person. Cultural models or stereotypes like this become potentially relevant context that participants and analysts use to interpret signs and make inferences about voicing, positioning and social action. When combined with the utterances at lines 593–597, the signs in Tyisha’s utterances contribute to a configuration that provisionally stops the dialectic of contextualization and entextualization. Collectively, these signs strongly presuppose that the stereotype of a lazy, intellectually unengaged young person is being applied to Tyisha and that she is being contrasted with other students in the classroom. Once this has been established, participants and analysts can go on to the third phase of discourse analysis and infer the social action occurring, in this case the exclusion of Tyisha, as represented on the fifth line of the table. We will use tables with this format to represent the central aspects of our approach to discourse analysis throughout the book, applying it to the sample analyses provided in Chapters 2–5. At this point the meaning of some key terms may not be fully clear, but Chapter 2 will provide more extensive definitions and examples.

Discourse analysts aim to uncover participants’ own tacit or explicit accounts of what has happened in an interaction. Analysts argue that an interpretation is plausible by pointing to participants’ actions, which make certain signs and con-texts salient and indicate that participants themselves are orienting to those signs and to the accounts of social action that can be inferred from them. In other words, discourse analysts must identify patterns in discursive interaction, showing what participants themselves respond to as they contextualize and entextualize their utterances. Discourse analysis is thus empirical, because an interpretation can only be supported by pointing to signs that participants themselves use. This does not mean that participants are necessarily aware of their actions or the mechanisms they use to accomplish them, but it does mean that participants must at least tacitly orient to the signs that accomplish these actions.

It should be clear from our account so far that any adequate discourse analysis must include context beyond the speech event itself. Part of discourse analysis focuses on co-text, that component of context composed by the other signs in the speech event. In order to interpret the importance of Tyisha’s comment about Nintendo, we took into account comments elsewhere in the text—about what became understood as her lower-level, animal-like goals during summer vacation at lines 584–589, for example. But co-text never suffices, because relevant context always extends beyond the speech event. In this case, the model or stereotype of lazy, intellectually unengaged youth is crucial to interpreting the exclusion of Tyisha. Participants and analysts must be familiar enough with the social context to recognize this stereotype and signs that
index it. Potentially relevant context is indefinitely large—extending from signs in the same utterance to locally established stereotypes to widely circulating, institutionalized models. So any discourse analysis focuses on contexts beyond the speech event, presupposing models of identity and social life that are necessary to interpret the significance of indexical signs and determine the type of social action occurring. In this book we go beyond this claim to make a stronger argument about context beyond the speech event. We argue that pathways across linked events are central to many social processes and represent an important new focus for discourse analysis.

**Speech chains and enregisterment**

Sometimes discourse analysts have to know what happened in some other event to interpret a discursive interaction, and adequate discourse analyses always presuppose something about models that have been created and learned in other events. Wortham and Rhodes (in press) make this argument more extensively, describing for narrative discourse in particular two different types of context beyond the speech event: context beyond the event that is inevitably presupposed even when the analysis focuses on a discrete individual event, and context that involves pathways of linked events. In the example of Tyisha and her cat, so far, we have shown how a discourse analyst must presuppose models or stereotypes that have been created in other events and learned through prior experience, in order to interpret the social action that teachers and students accomplish in this discrete event. We will see later in the chapter that this example also participates in a pathway of linked events that socially identify Tyisha across several months.

When we ask certain kinds of research questions, discourse analysis can require a unit of analysis that extends beyond the individual speech event to several events linked in a pathway. Many central human processes take place across and not within events. Socialization requires an individual to develop repertoires of cultural models, skills and habits across events and apply those repertoires more appropriately across time. Fashions and trends involve the dissemination of objects or behaviors, along with their associated evaluations, across events to broader audiences. Learning involves increasingly competent participation in social activities across events, with exposure and practice in one event facilitating participation in subsequent events. Few human processes take place exclusively within single events—although some interesting research questions do focus on pivotal patterns that emerge within one event—and most social scientific research explicitly or tacitly studies processes that involve linked events of one kind or another (Agha, 2007).

Our emphasis on pathways of linked events does not compete with the claim that all
discourse analysis inevitably draws on contexts beyond the speech event. It is true both that any discrete event of speaking can only be understood by presupposing information, models and evaluations from beyond that event and that many functions of discourse are best understood in terms of cross-event pathways. Our focus on linked pathways of events does not imply that event-focused analyses have no value. For some research questions, a focus on discrete events—together with their presuppositions about information, models and evaluations from beyond the speech event—is adequate and productive. Further-more, many insights developed through analyses of discrete speech events are essential to our own and others’ work analyzing pathways across events. With our account of cross-event discourse analysis, we draw attention to another productive unit of analysis for understanding discourse and the social processes that it facilitates. We are foregrounding a new object of investigation that builds on and can complement the important work on discrete events.

Our focus on cross-event pathways raises an important question for discourse analysis. If the research method excels at revealing the structure and function of discrete events, how can it provide systematic evidence relevant to processes like learning and socialization that occur only across events? One response would be to study pivotal events, cases where a process that occurs across a series of events is strongly influenced by one event that becomes an inflection point. Another response would be to study typical events, where the same type of event recurs and has similar functions across time and space. Both of these strategies make sense, in cases where pivotal events do in fact occur or where one event is typical of others in relevant ways. But most human processes do not involve just these two types of cases. Occasionally an individual’s socialization depends centrally on one or two pivotal events, for example, and we can provide an adequate account by doing discourse analysis on these. But most of the time socialization involves more complicated pathways across various events, with smaller changes and cross-contextual links accumulating. Sometimes a social type is stable and repeated in some place and time, such that discourse analysis of one typical event can illuminate important patterns. But even in such cases social typifications emerge historically and change as they are disseminated, such that analysis of discrete or typical events will miss important changes and influences.

The alternative response is to do discourse analysis across pathways of events, studying the linkages that allow individuals, signs, stereotypes and objects to travel across events and participate in a social process like socialization or learning. Instead of assuming that an event is pivotal or typical, discourse analysts must develop methods for systematically tracing linkages across events and showing how relevant social processes are accomplished across pathways. This book shows how to do such analyses, extending techniques developed for analyzing discrete events to the analysis of pathways across linked events. Significant empirical analyses have been done that
illuminate cross-event processes (Agha, 2007; Agha and Wortham, 2005; Silverstein and Urban, 1996; Wortham and Rhodes, 2013). This book codifies the discourse analytic procedures used in this body of work and presents a systematic linguistic anthropological approach to discourse analysis across speech events. Before giving a more detailed introduction to our methodological approach, in Chapter 2, we must first develop a conceptualization of how pathways of linked events emerge and function.

Linguistic anthropologists have studied the recontextualization of speech events for several decades (Bauman and Briggs, 1990; Silverstein and Urban, 1996). Bauman and Briggs describe work on narratives and other discursive genres, tracing how a telling in one context can be recreated in a new context, with participants retaining some features while recontextualizing others to fit the new event. Silverstein and Urban present research on the movement of texts from one event to another and the work of recontextualizing texts in new events. Mehan (1996), for example, describes how a student becomes “learning disabled” as ways of speaking about him move from less formal discussions among educators and parents into more formal documents and diagnostic settings, then into official institutionalized accounts. No one event is pivotal, and the characterizations change in some respects from event to event, but across the pathway of events the student’s identity emerges and becomes durable.

Agha (2007) provides a powerful general theory of cross-event pathways. He starts with register, a model of discursive behavior that links signs—ways of speaking or behaving—with evaluative typifications about people. Only certain kinds of speakers typically say “dude,” for example, and anyone who utters this form seems either like a younger male associated with certain subcultures or like someone quoting or making fun of such a person. Registers are collections of such links, with a set of signs that presuppose some recognizable social type of speaker, hearer and/or event. Agha argues that any association between a sign and a typification (or stereotype) has a domain, the group of speakers who will recognize this linkage. He then explains how these three elements of a register (sign, typification and domain) change over time as speakers use and re-use signs across events. The domain expands or contracts, and the signs that index a typification, plus the nature of the stereotype itself, change as the register is used across events.

Folk sociology posits large-scale, enduring groups and stereotypes as fundamental units of analysis. Agha shows how social groups, and the semiotic forms that seem naturally to index them, are created and presupposed through semiotic processes and inevitably change over time. In doing so he points out another kind of indeterminacy that discourse analysis must confront. In the first half of this chapter we showed how signs do not univocally signal their social functions within a speech event, but that participants and analysts must instead infer from relevant context what a given sign
means about the social action occurring in the event of speaking. Sometimes that meaning changes as subsequent context leads participants to reinterpret focal signs (Garfinkel, 1967). Similarly, Agha argues that large-scale stereotypes do not persist such that we can take for granted the groups and stereotypes that they presuppose. Analysts must study the emergence and maintenance of registers (and the social groups that they index and evaluate) over historical time.

Instead of assuming that a speaker who uses "dude" comes from a defined group, for example, we must investigate how the term has been and is being used, across contexts, investigating empirically how the sign, the stereotype and the domain emerge, solidify and change. Kiesling (2004) does this analysis, tracing the various meanings of "dude" across a range of social contexts over the past few decades. In Tyisha's case, we cannot assume that she is simply identified as a member of some stable social type. She started the academic year being identified by teachers and other students as a good student who made productive contributions to classroom discussion. Many other girls in the class were identified similarly, throughout the year. But as shown in Wortham (2006), by December Tyisha was being identified as more of a problem. For several months she was positioned as someone who refuses to cooperate with others in productive class-room discussion and she was often excluded, as in the discussion of Tyisha and her cat above. Toward the end of the year, however, she was again identified as making more positive contributions to class discussions. From Agha's perspective, we must study the changing stereotypes that were used to identify Tyisha, and the signs that indexed these, across the months-long pathway from good student to disruptive outcast and back.

Agha presents two central concepts for describing the emergence and trans-formation of registers: speech chains and enregisterment. Empirically, associations between signs and the social typifications they index emerge across chains of linked events. In the simplest case, someone hears a certain association ("dude" being used by a certain type of young male) and then in a subsequent event uses that term to index a similar social type (while telling a story about such people, for example, perhaps using reported speech to voice a narrated character). A register emerges across such linked events, as sign–stereotype links are established and re-used by members of a growing social domain. In this book we use the term pathway to describe a linked series of events that compose what Agha calls a speech chain. "Trajectory" is another possible term (used in Wortham, 2006, for example), but it presupposes a path predetermined from the start, whereas linked speech events in practice change and branch unexpectedly—more like pathways than trajectories or chains.

"Enregisterment" is the term Agha uses to describe how recurring signs become linked to social typifications across speech events over time. Enregisterment describes
how an identity for an individual or a stereotype about a group can become widely recognized. Cultural patterns like registers do not stay stable for a bounded group, as presupposed in many simple theories of society and culture. Instead, links between signs and stereotypes emerge and shift. Participants in interaction must coordinate their heterogeneous repertoires in practice, not draw on a stable set of shared categories (Bourdieu, 1972/1977; Rymes, 2014). A register emerges and changes as speakers repeat the use of certain signs across events, indexing presupposed stereotypes. Often a register has evaluative content, construing speakers positively or negatively. Sometimes registers are institutionalized, when schools, governments or other institutions codify guidelines for usage or disseminate sign–stereotype linkages. These evaluations and institutionalizations can provide stability to a register, but signs, typifications and domains continue to change, and individuals who come to the register at different points in the pathway often use it in heterogeneous ways. Analysis of any register thus requires attention to historically emerging changes.

Enregisterment happened across the pathway of events in which Tyisha was socially identified in Mrs. Bailey’s class. In several events from December through February, teachers and students made analogies between events in the curriculum that described iconoclasts, individualists or outcasts and Tyisha herself. A typification or model emerged, both in descriptions of the curriculum and in presupposed accounts of Tyisha’s social identity, in which an individual insists on his or her own positions or desires and refuses to cooperate in the ways required to form a cohesive nonauthoritarian society. Various signs—like the term “beast” as used by Aristotle, referring to a person who refuses to live in human society—came to index this model, across a pathway of events. The domain of this model included the teachers and students in the class, who over time came to associate these signs and the model. Below we will analyze other events from this pathway, illustrating how events became linked and socially identified Tyisha over time.

Following Agha (2007), we argue that cross-event chains or pathways constitute a different unit of analysis, larger than individual speech events but smaller and more dynamic than macro-level sociological essentializations. In order to analyze pathways of linked events, a discourse analyst must study the individual events that make up the pathway. But discourse analyses of processes like learning, socialization and social identification must also study how cross-event linkages emerge and solidify. In this book we provide a systematic method for doing such analyses.

We argue that cross-event discourse analysis borrows crucial principles from within-event discourse analysis, but that it also has some distinctive characteristics. As Silverstein (2005) argues, the principles for interdiscursive enregisterment are in many ways similar to those for intradiscursive entextualization. Many of the same principles
we use to explain the solidification of social action within an event can be extended to explain the emergence of registers across events. Configurations of mutually presupposing signs emerge within a discrete event, as the characterizations of Tyisha as a "beast" did in the discussion of Tyisha and her cat. Similarly, sign–typification linkages across events come to presuppose each other and establish a more robust pathway that has a clear shape and direction. That is, across a set of linked events participants signal particular typifications and position others in ways that become familiar and robustly established. As participants across events presuppose the sign–typification linkage, it becomes more durably presupposed. Tyisha, for example, did not become an outcast in the classroom only during the discussion of humans, beasts and her cat. Her status as an outcast, as a student who disrupts collective activity and should be excluded from the community, emerged across many events over several months as indexical signs came durably to presuppose this model of her identity. The emergence of sign–typification links across events can be analyzed using the same tools introduced above and elaborated in Chapter 2, identifying configurations of indexical signs across events that presuppose each other and establish more robust pathways that accomplish cross-event processes like socialization and learning.

As we have described above, the social action accomplished in an event emerges as relevant context is established, as configurations of signs become organized such that they position narrated and actual participants as accomplishing social actions. When we do discourse analysis on pathways of linked events, something similar but more complicated happens. Table 1.2 compares discourse analysis within and across events. Discourse analysis across events includes the same general components as discourse analysis within events, but several additional components are required to analyze a pathway of linked events.

Discourse analysis across speech events is similar to discourse analysis of discrete events, focusing on how narrated events and indexical signs create relevant con-text as signs are configured poetically, thereby establishing participants' positions and social actions. But discourse analysis across events has three additional features. First, when discourse analysis extends across events, we must select the events to focus on, identifying which events are linked in a pathway. Linked events become relevant context for each other, often through devices like reported speech, recurring narrated events or other sorts of parallelism. These linked events form a special kind of context, cross-event context, that is important to establishing social action both within and across events. Second, indexical signs across linked events provide a more extensive set that can be configured into mutually presupposing structures and thus establish relevant context. In order to explain how social action and social processes are accomplished across pathways of events, analysts must describe a cross-event
configuration of indexical signs. Third, pathways across linked events can accomplish more complex social processes and more durable results than are typically achieved in single events. Analysts must describe how actions and processes are accomplished as a pathway of linked events takes on a definite shape. Discourse analysis across events shows how participants use signs to accomplish a more rigid pathway—establishing robust positioning, social action and social processes—as configurations of signs across events link together and come to presuppose relevant context.

Table 1.3 represents discourse analysis beyond the speech event, using a slightly modified version of the five-line table introduced above. We will use this format throughout the book when presenting cross-event analyses. In the first stage, represented on the first line, the analyst infers which events are potentially linked in a pathway. There is a set of (smaller) circular arrows in the margins, connect- ing the first line to the second, because the process of determining relevant linked events requires inference, and this inference depends on which indexical signs and aspects of context become relevant. Many events might potentially be part of a pathway, and the analyst must examine signs in these events in order to decide which ones are in fact linked. After identifying linked events, the analyst describes the narrated events for each. In the next stage, represented on the second and fourth lines, the discourse analyst engages in the iterative process of identifying relevant indexicals that occur across linked events, then inferring from the relevant context signaled by these indexicals the types of voices, evaluations and positioning that might be occurring across events. Construals of voices, evaluations and positioning make certain indexicals salient, but then newly considered indexicals make new construals plausible, in a back-and-forth interpretive process. This dialectic ends provisionally when a configuration of mutually presupposing indexical signs from across events solidifies and establishes some interpretation as most plausible. This cross-event configuration of signs is represented on the third line of the table. In the last stage, represented on the last line, analysts infer the social actions and processes accomplished across the pathway.

We will briefly illustrate discourse analysis beyond the speech event by examining classroom discussions that involved Tyisha both before and after the discussion of her cat on January 24. In this section we will discuss three other speech events. Any event participates in multiple pathways, and an analyst must select a pathway of linked events relevant to the research question being addressed. For example, an analyst might be interested in the development of a teacher’s pedagogical skills over time. Such an analyst could productively trace a pathway across events that included Mrs. Bailey or Mr. Smith using a particular pedagogical tool in more skillful ways. The study presented in Wortham (2006) asks research questions about social identification in Tyisha’s classroom, and it follows the emerging identities of Tyisha and some other students across the academic year. Because the research question focuses on Tyisha’s
Table 1.2 Components of discourse analysis within and across speech events

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Narrated events serve as resources</th>
<th>Within Events: Contextualization and Entextualization</th>
<th>Across Events: Recontextualization and Enregistrement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MAP NARRATED EVENTS</td>
<td>Discursive interactions describe narrated events, which communicate context (this communication itself being a type of action) and provide resources for other social action in the narrating event. Mapping narrated events identifies potential resources that may be important to the discourse analysis.</td>
<td>SELECT LINKED EVENTS AND MAP NARRATED EVENTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indexical signs presuppose and create relevant context</td>
<td>SELECT INDEXICALS AND IDENTIFY RELEVANT CONTEXT</td>
<td>Narrated events have been established in prior discursive interactions, and these are often presupposed such that they become resources in subsequent events. Analysis must identify linked events that might make up a pathway and map the narrated events within each of these.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poetic configuration of signs establishes relevant context and supports an account of social action</td>
<td>CONFIGURE INDEXICALS</td>
<td>SELECT INDEXICALS AND IDENTIFY RELEVANT CROSS-EVENT AND OTHER CONTEXT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not all potentially salient indexical signs point to aspects of context that become relevant, and not all possible interpretations of social action become plausible. Signs are configured such that they presuppose clusters of other signs, making some indexicals more salient. Ultimately, a poetically organized configuration of mutually presupposing indexical signs ends the back-and-forth construal of relevant context and possible interpretations, such that one account of social action becomes the most plausible.</td>
<td>Indexical signs point to past and future events along the pathway, tying events together. Other events along the pathway are established as a central part of relevant context, through indexical links like reported speech, shared narrated events and recurring evaluations. Focal indexical signs from across linked events point to cross-event context (context from other events linked in a pathway) and to other aspects of context that become relevant to understanding social actions and processes accomplished across the pathway.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DELINEATE CROSS-EVENT CONFIGURATIONS OF INDEXICALS</td>
<td>A set of signs and relevant context is established as indexicals across events are poetically configured, as signs from several events come to presuppose each other. As this cross-event configuration of signs solidifies, it provisionally ends the back-and-forth construal of relevant context and establishes the social actions and processes that are being accomplished across events, thus establishing a more rigid pathway.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant context</td>
<td>CONSTRUE INDEXICALS</td>
<td>CONSTRUE INDEXICALS AND TRACE THE SHAPE OF PATHWAYS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>grounds inferences about voices, evaluations, positions and actions</td>
<td>Narrated events and indexical signs make certain aspects of the context relevant to interpreting the discursive interaction. Through entextualization, participants construe these signs and contexts, providing possible interpretations of the voicing, evaluation, positioning and social action occurring in the narrated and narrating events. Rows 2, 3 and 4 in this Table are iterative, with the selection of relevant context and the construal of that context shaping each other, until a configuration of signs solidifies and makes one interpretation of the positioning and social action most plausible.</td>
<td>As linked events collectively come to presuppose overlapping relevant context (e.g., relevant stereotypes that recur in the larger society), a pathway becomes more rigid and particular interpretations of social action become more highly presupposable. Instead of entextualization, we have the broader process of enregisterment, with a pathway of events collectively accomplishing social actions and processes. This is a dialectic process, with newly relevant context in a current event providing opportunities for reinterpreting the pathway, while a firm account of the pathway constrains the context that might be relevant. When cross-event configurations of signs become stable, they make one construal of the actions and broader social processes most plausible.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants' positions in and across narrating events can be inferred from relevant context, and social action is accomplished as participants come to presuppose one version of what happened</th>
<th>IDENTIFY POSITIONING AND SOCIAL ACTION IN NARRATING EVENTS</th>
<th>IDENTIFY EMERGING CROSS-EVENT ACTIONS AND PROCESSES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relevant context allows participants and analysts to infer the interactional and evaluative positions being occupied by narrated characters and participants in the narrating event. These positions, together with other relevant context, allow inferences about the types of social action occurring in the narrating event. Inferences are always provisional, but in practice stable interpretations of an event usually come to be presupposed.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Participants and analysts attend to relevant context across events and make inferences about positioning and social action both within and across events. Pathways across events can accomplish more complex, durable social actions and processes, like socialization, learning and social identification. Over time pathways across events become rigid and presuppose certain outcomes, but these can change with future recontextualizations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
identity, we used two criteria for selecting events to include in our pathway for the current analysis: events in which Tyisha’s social identity is explicitly characterized by teachers and other students; and events in which Tyisha becomes a character in an example—as she did in the discussion of Tyisha and her cat—in ways that have implications for her social identity. Wortham (2006) provides a more extensive analysis that justifies the selection of events and describes other relevant events in the pathway.

On January 18, several days before the conversation analyzed above, the class was also discussing Aristotle’s Politics. They had not yet reached the section on “beasts,” but were instead discussing Aristotle’s account of courage. Before the segment excerpted below, the teachers had asked whether a person can “obey courageously.” Students readily understood that one can resist authority in ways that require courage, but they were not sure whether one could obey authority in a courageous way. At this point Tyisha introduced herself as an example.

In lines 280–284, Tyisha creates a new narrated event. Before this, the primary narrated event in this discursive interaction focused on Aristotle’s view of courage, together with
Segment 4: Tyisha the courageous liar

280  TYY:  okay, I[widow] had a friend and she was like, sneaking out with a boy, and she lied and said that she was going with her friends. and she told me, if my mother call, to tell her she was at the zoo with her friend Stacey. now that took her courage to tel[l] me.

285  FST:  (hh[h])
     TYY:  [and it took c(hh)our(h)ge for me to tell her mother that.
     FST:  s[mhm]
     T/B:  did it take courage for her to tell her mother that?
     290  FST:  [no [l]
     T/B:  why would that
     TYY:  [yeah it took courage to tell my Mother

295  FST:  (3 unintelligible syllables))
     MRC:  I don’t think it took courage.

teachers’ and students’ views on this topic. Tyisha gives an example about her friend and the lie that Tyisha told to keep her friend’s mother from discovering her friend’s activity. As in the example of Tyisha and her cat, this example of Tyisha the courageous liar might characterize Tyisha as morally questionable. Tyisha describes her narrated self as courageously doing something that comes to be understood as immoral. This example does not illustrate the idea of courageous obedience that the teachers were exploring, but the class proceeds to discuss whether it can be courageous to perform an immoral act.

When analyzing events in a pathway, a discourse analyst must also analyze individual events. We will not do a full analysis of the January 18 classroom conversation here. See Wortham (2006) for more detail on this and the other events described below. Figure 1.3 maps the narrated and narrating events after Tyisha introduces her example. The curricular topic involves Aristotle’s definition of courage and the question of whether different kinds of acts can be courageous, as represented in the narrated event on the right. The solid lines indicate the curricular question of whether the various actions—like resisting authority or acting immorally—can in fact be courageous. The example presents Tyisha’s act of lying to her friend’s mother and asks whether this was courageous. No complex action is occurring in the narrating event yet, besides an academic discussion among teachers and students. The laughter embedded in Tyisha and another student’s speech at lines 280–286 might indicate that she is making a joke, and so the narrating event might involve humor, but this is not yet clear.
As the discussion continues, one of the teachers argues that it would have been courageous to tell her friend’s mother the truth, instead of lying.

Substantively, the disagreement about “courage” is relatively simple. The teacher and several other students argue that an immoral act like lying cannot be courageous because, as they articulate later, courage is a virtue and cannot be manifested in an immoral act. Tyisha (joined by Jasmine at lines 317–320) argues that lying to her friend’s mother took courage, although she acknowledges that telling the truth would also have been courageous. Tyisha’s argument seems plausible, but the other implications of her example take over the discussion and push substantive issues to the background.

The narrated events involving Aristotle’s account of courage and Tyisha’s lie provide resources that teachers and students use to position each other in the narrating event. For instance, they draw on Aristotle’s evaluative distinction between courageous and not courageous. Tyisha tries to position herself as courageous and thus good or admirable. But she does so using an example of herself doing something immoral. Her laughter at lines 280–286 and 322–326 might indicate that she is enjoying the tension between claiming virtue while describing an immoral act, and perhaps also enjoying the opportunity to describe immoral acts as part of a substantive classroom discussion. At the same time, the teachers and some students use the content of the example to position Tyisha as different from the other students, as immoral and something of an outcast.
Segment 5: Lying in a mother’s face

T/S: then, which is courage?
T/B: Shhh
310 FST: [so you gonna sit there and lie to her face
T/S: [lying] to lie; or to tell the
truth be[cause] you=
FST: ["to tell the truth"]
T/S: =knew that she was wrong.
315 CAN: [cause it’s wrong]e
FST: [tell the truth. tell the truth
TYI: both of them=
JAS: both of them take courage [to me
TYI: [=both of them take
320 courage, you all wrong
T/S: [explain how both.
TYI: because (hnhh)[h]
FST: [because
T/S: let her
325 TYI: if I lyin’- If I’m sittin’ here lying in another person
mother face, that took courage[he]e. [and if I’m=
T/S: [why?
TYI: [telling her because you don’t-
FST: lies.
330 T/S: have you never lied to your mother?
FST: [hnhh]e
TYI: no- not- not to no one else’s momma, no.
T/S: have you ever lied to a teacher who is a mother?
FST: uh(hhh)
335 TYI: that’s different.
FST: aw man.
STS: ((2 seconds of laughter))
TYI: that’s very different um- I mean that’s different. I’m
always over there visiting this friend and her mother, might
340 have had trust- trust in me and I come over and tell her this
big, bold faced lie.

Tyisha’s example includes various indexical signs that signal relevant context and allow
inferences about voicing, evaluation and positioning, like the evaluative
characterizations of her narrated self as doing something wrong. Consider the verbs of
speaking used to describe Tyisha’s statement to her friend’s mother. As mentioned
above, reported speech and the verbs of speaking used to characterize speech are
powerful resources for socially identifying others. When introducing the narrated
example Tyisha initially used “tell” to describe the act of speaking to her friend’s
mother, at line 283. The teacher reframed this as a “lie” at line 301, in a segment not
reproduced here (cf. Wortham, 2006, for the transcript), and he contrasted lying with “telling the truth” at lines 311–312. Another student made this more highly presupposing, saying “so you gonna sit there and lie to her face” at line 310. Tyisha herself embraced this characterization of her act at lines 325–326: “I'm sitting here lying in another person mother face.” At the end she produces another colorful formulation: “Her mother might have had trust in me and I come over and tell her this big bold-faced lie” (lines 339–341). These more and more highly presupposing terms for describing Tyisha’s lie communicate an increasingly robust characterization of her narrated self. The terms describing her utterance more and more highly presuppose flagrantly immoral behavior. The indexical presuppositions of these verbs of speaking form a configuration, such that this characterization of Tyisha as immoral becomes more firmly established, at least in the narrated event.

At line 333 one of the teachers makes clear that this characterization has implications for Tyisha’s own position in the narrating event. He asks: “have you ever lied to a teacher who is a mother?” Everyone in the class knows that the other teacher, Mrs. Bailey, has a teenage daughter. Everyone knows that many mothers of teenage daughters worry about their daughters lying and sneaking off with boys. The first teacher’s question at line 333 does not contribute to the substance of his argument, because for the purposes of defining courage it is irrelevant whether a person lies to a teacher or to someone else. But his question establishes a parallelism between the narrated character Tyisha lied to in the example and Mrs. Bailey herself, and thus it
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*Figure 1.4 The outcome of the example*
makes Tyisha's immoral narrated behavior relevant to her position in the narrating event. It opposes her to the second teacher, on an issue of substantial emotional import, because Mrs. Bailey may worry about being lied to by people like Tyisha.

Figure 1.4 represents this parallelism between narrated and narrating events. The discussion about Tyisha in the narrated event has raised the issue not only of whether she was courageous but also of whether she was ethical. By the time they get to the "big bold-faced lie" at line 341, Tyisha is clearly voiced as unethical in the narrated event. By talking about "a teacher who is a mother," Mr. Smith has established the parallelism indicated with the dashed lines: the relationship between the narrated characters Tyisha and her friend's mother may be similar to the relationship between the narrating Tyisha and Mrs. Bailey—at least insofar as Mrs. Bailey might identify with the friend's mother and condemn Tyisha. Mr. Smith has put into play the question of whether Tyisha herself might engage in unethical behavior that would affect people like Mrs. Bailey.

So far we have focused on the indexicals/relevant context/contextualization and voices/evaluations/positioning/contextualization that occurred within the speech event on January 18. This is not a complete analysis of the event, as we give only enough detail to make our forthcoming points about discourse analysis across events. Table 1.4 represents our brief analysis. At the end of the conversation, as we will see in the next segment below, Tyisha is positioned as disrupting classroom conversation and as an outcast from the classroom community. This social action is similar to the exclusion described above from the January 24 discussion of Tyisha and her cat.

**Table 1.4 Analysis of the discrete event “Tyisha the courageous liar”**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Map Narrated Events</th>
<th>The example of Tyisha the courageous liar provides an opportunity to voice Tyisha, and the concept of courage from Aristotle raises the issue of ethical and unethical behavior</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Select Indexicals/ Relevant Context</td>
<td>Indexicals like the verbs of speaking, from &quot;tell&quot; to &quot;lie&quot; to &quot;bold faced lie&quot; and &quot;lie in her face&quot; presuppose a model of increasingly serious unethical behavior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Configure Indexicals</td>
<td>The accumulating and increasingly highly presupposing verbs of speaking form a configuration that solidifies the relevance of this model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constrain Indexicals</td>
<td>Tyisha embraces and others adopt a characterization of her as flagrantly unethical; Mrs. Bailey's status as a mother positions her as opposed to Tyisha the liar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify Positioning/Action in Narrating Events</td>
<td>Tyisha is separated out from the teachers and other students, as a less moral person, and she is excluded from class because she is positioned as disruptive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This similar social action provides a link between Tyisha's positioning in the courageous liar discussion on January 18 and in the January 24 discussion of "beasts." On both days Tyisha disagrees with the teachers about the academic topic under discussion, giving relatively convincing arguments. On both days Tyisha presents an example that ends up characterizing her narrated self as morally questionable and as different from and lesser than most humans, including the teachers and other students. On both days the teachers and other students try to engage with her argument substantively but end up foregrounding her morally questionable characteristics and positioning her in the event of speaking as an outcast who disrupts the classroom community. On both days the interaction ends with teachers explicitly disciplining her, as we can see in the following excerpt from January 18.

At lines 409–411 the teacher speaks explicitly to Tyisha about her behavior and the rules of engagement in classroom discussion. She makes clear that Tyisha is prone to make up her own definitions and disrupt productive classroom conversation, and she effectively excludes Tyisha from the discussion for the next several minutes. Linda follows up at line 418 by calling Tyisha's argument stupid (echoing comments made at

**Segment 6: Tyisha disrupting the class**

LIN: I don't think that's courage to go and steal a candy bar
[because courage- right=

MST: [it's stupid

395 LIN: =cause courage, the virtue of courage, what we read
of courage was to do something- something good, not to
do something and go and do something evil.

T/YI: [that's not

ture

FST: [yeah that's

right

T/YI: courage is not just doing something good.
(students talking at once)

T/YI: if I go [shoot you in the head

405 T/B: [shhhhh

(students arguing)

T/B: ahh, if we can- if we can talk about courage as being
something good, the virtue of courage, and go back to that
definition, and I know you never bought into it, but the rest
of us seem to be, using this as a definition, so therefore,
we'd ask you to kind of go along with it.

FST: okay.

T/B: the idea of courage, was not just doing things you're
afraid to do, but doing things that- overcoming your fear
for a good reason. Linda?

410 LIN: I was saying what Tyisha said, if you go shoot
somebody in the head, you gonna call that courage? or you
is gonna call that stupid?
lines 394 and 397), but the teacher’s preceding statement has made clear that Tyisha should not defend her alternative position any further.

When the discussion of Tyisha and her cat occurred on January 24, students and teachers could presuppose that Tyisha is morally questionable and prone to disrupt class more easily than if the January 18 discussion had not occurred. At lines 599–601 in the segment presented above from that January 24 conversation, Mrs. Bailey characterizes Tyisha as a disruptive outcast, in a way that echoes lines 409–411 from the January 18 conversation. Mrs. Bailey and others were able to use fewer indexical signs in order to presuppose these characterizations on January 24, because these signs now index not only a general stereotype of immoral and disruptive adolescent behavior but also the specific conversation on January 18 in which a similar stereotype was also presupposed and attached to Tyisha. In other words, the configuration of signs indexing this stereotype includes mutually presupposing signs from both speech events, and each event becomes relevant cross-event context for the other.

Entextualization within the discussion of Tyisha and her cat—the identification of Tyisha as (metaphorically) less human than other students and as disruptive, and the act of disciplining and excluding her from classroom conversation—is facilitated not only by relevant context that includes circulating social stereotypes but also by cross-event context, by indexical links with preceding classroom conversations like the one on January 18. In fact, Wortham (2006) describes other events beyond these two that participate in the pathway that established Tyisha’s social identity over several months. But these two examples illustrate how cross-event configurations of indexical
Signs can contribute to social action in the subsequent event of speaking. Figure 1.5 represents the parallelism between and the characterizations across these two events of speaking. Each of the narrated events in the figure represents voices and evaluations from the January 18 discussion on the left and the January 24 discussion on the right. Both narrating events end up separating Tyisha from the rest of the class, positioning her as less human or morally questionable and as a disruptive outcast to be excluded from classroom conversation.

By examining these two conversations together we can also begin to see enregisterment occurring, the emergence of Tyisha’s social identity across events. In this case an individual is being socially identified in a classroom over an academic year. The social domain is small—two teachers and 18 students recognize the model of identity being established for Tyisha. But even within this small spatiotemporal envelope, social identification can have significant consequences for Tyisha’s personal development and institutional credentials, as well as significant consequences for students’ socialization into norms about “good” students who are “likely to succeed” through “cooperative” behavior. We have seen the smallest possible unit of enregisterment so far—two conversations that presuppose each other and begin to establish a pathway across which Tyisha’s social identity emerges.

We will offer two more brief examples of events along this pathway. The next occurred on February 7, during a discussion of Spartan infanticide. Lycurgus describes how ancient Spartans exposed sickly infants to the elements, reasoning that an infant too weak to survive would end up being a burden on the society and should be allowed to die of exposure. Tyisha was absent on the day this discussion occurred, but the teacher nonetheless mentioned her.

**Segment 7: Positioning an absent Tyisha**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T/B</th>
<th>STS</th>
<th>BRE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“I’m going to play Tyisha, that’s not right.”</td>
<td>“Hahahaha”</td>
<td>“They just put them out an- as a test, if it lives then it’s strong, and if it dies then it dies.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“These people are stupid, that’s not right [laughs]”</td>
<td>[Hnh, hha]</td>
<td>“I’m going to play Tyisha, that’s not right.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>=Her today.</td>
<td></td>
<td>“They just put them out an- as a test, if it lives then it’s strong, and if it dies then it dies.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>([7 seconds comments and laughter])</td>
<td></td>
<td>“They just put them out an- as a test, if it lives then it’s strong, and if it dies then it dies.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“She- you know that’s what she’d say? What is your response to that?”</td>
<td>([Unintelligible response]) “Hahahaha”</td>
<td>“You’d never say that when she’s in the room.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
At line 248 the teacher characterizes Tyisha by creating a hypothetical narrated event in which she reacts to the practice of Spartan infanticide. She uses reported speech that might voice Tyisha as blunt, confrontational and perhaps unsophisticated. These utterances could also characterize her as an outspoken, no nonsense independent thinker willing to take chances, however. The term “stupid” in line 250 might index a lack of sophistication, and this seems to support the first reading. The teacher also presupposes that Tyisha intimidates other students at line 258.

The voice being assigned to Tyisha here is not fully clear from this short segment. But other events in the pathway provide relevant context that reduces the ambiguity. This brief hypothetical narrated event presupposes other events, like those on January 18 and 24, in which Tyisha has behaved in similar ways. It joins a pathway of linked events across which Tyisha’s identity has been established—as a disruptive student who separates herself from others by taking contradictory positions and refusing to collaborate in productive classroom discussions. Figure 1.6 represents the parallelism and the accumulating presuppositions about Tyisha across the events of January 18, January 24 and February 7. These events provide cross-event context for each other, with the characterization of Tyisha as a disruptive outcast in the narrated events, and the positioning of her as an outcast in the narrating events, becoming more firmly established as the events presuppose each other.

By April 12 Tyisha’s position had changed, however. On this day the class discussed John Steinbeck’s story The Pearl. The story describes an indigenous person who finds a valuable pearl and must either accept an unfairly low price from the Europeans who dominate commerce in his town or risk a hazardous journey to the city to get a better price. Teachers and students discuss the question of whether one should accept unjust but familiar circumstances or risk more revolutionary changes. They do this by

![Figure 1.6: The pathway across three events](image)
describing a second narrated event, in addition to the Steinbeck story—Jim Crow America, in which segregation laws disenfranchised African Americans, including family members of most of the students.

*Segment 8: Tyisha is not content*

1180 T/B: okay, I, I, excuse me, I’m a southern state and uh,

1180 T/B: I’ll give you an education, Jasmine. I’ll give you an education in that building over there, with all these kids crammed in, with textbooks that are fifty years old. or (1.0) you can take a chance, and you can stand up to the power structure, and maybe even pull your kids out of school and boycott schools for a while, and maybe not get any education at all for awhile because you want a real education and not this Jim Crow education.

FST: right.

T/B: what do you do?

1190 FST: you stand up for what you believe in.

T/B: you take what you can get? or do you go after what is really what you want?

STS: (3 seconds of chatter)

1195 T/I: because, if he had been poor for this long, and he had a chance to be happy with his life, why don’t give it to someone you know that’s not gonna be satisfied as you?

JAS: but, but in, in the long run, wait a minute, in the long run you might not even get nothing, so you just gonna sit there.

1200 T/I: I’d rather go try, then just sit there and say this is about sitting down. I– I think I could have got more than that. I’m not gonna sit there no longer, I’m gonna go out and search for some money. I’m not gonna be like that.

Wortham (2006) analyzes the complex entextualization and enregisterment occurring in this and linked events. We do not have space for detailed analysis here, but one crucial element is a model drawn from the curriculum and used to position Tyisha in the narrating event. Both the Steinbeck story and Mrs. Bailey's example of Jim Crow America present a member of an exploited group, indigenous people or African Americans, who face a choice about whether to confront those in power.

In her example from Jim Crow America at lines 1179–1187, the teacher asks Jasmine whether she would confront racist educational disparities. Like the example of Tyisha and her cat, and Tyisha the courageous liar, this example places a student into the position of a person or topic from the curriculum. In those earlier cases teachers and students used the model from the curriculum—involving the distinction between humans and animals, or the distinction between moral and immoral acts—to position
Tyisha as different from others in the class. But in this case the model incorporates Tyisha as a member of the classroom community. Figure 1.7 represents the two narrated events at this point in the conversation, with a member of an underprivileged group having to decide whether to challenge the exploitative people in power. Wortham (2006) shows how, as the conversation proceeds, this model of social relations allows Tyisha herself to become a member of the students' social group, challenging people in power like the teachers.

By introducing the example of Jim Crow America—something that both teachers and students condemn on this and other days, and a topic that potentially marks Tyisha’s similarity with many other students because they are seen as members of the same racial group—the teacher provides an opening for Tyisha to become less of an outcast. Tyisha’s comments at lines 1194 and 1200 make clear that she would stick up for herself and work against those in power by, for instance, trying to sell the pearl for more money than the Europeans were offering. In this event and others from late February through May, Tyisha was identified by teachers and students more positively than before. She continued to defend unpopular positions and argue against teachers and other students. But they started to evaluate this behavior differently. Instead of treating it as a disruptive refusal to collaborate, they characterized it as a principled insistence on questioning authority. Before the passage above, Tyisha had argued that the indigenous protagonist should not accept exploitation by the Europeans and should instead demand fair treatment even if this required a risky journey. On other occasions in the spring she made similar arguments—for example, arguing that
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students should not uncritically accept historians’ accounts of the past but should consult other sources. As described in Wortham (2006), these parallel narrated events helped establish a pathway across which an organized set of signs came to establish a different type of characteristic position for Tyisha.

From December through February several linked events established Tyisha as a disruptive outcast, including the examples on January 18 and 24. But then the pathway changed direction. From late February through May she turned into a principled dissenter. Wortham (2006) shows how one resource was particularly important to this transformation. The narrated events described in curricular materials shifted across these two parts of the academic year. In the first period the curriculum described relations between the individual and society, focusing in many cases on outcasts who were excessively individualistic. This model was transferred onto the classroom itself, with Tyisha often positioned in the role of an individualistic “beast” who refuses to collaborate, as we have seen in the two examples given above. In the second period, however, the curriculum addressed questions of authority and exploitation, foregrounding power relations and exploring resistance to authority. This model provided a different position for an outspoken participant like Tyisha, and she became a legitimate dissenter. Tyisha’s identity as a disruptive outcast was established across a pathway of events, but then the pathway became less rigid and changed direction as other resources were introduced. After a period of some indeterminacy in which both characterizations were used to identify Tyisha, her pathway became more rigid again with her positioned as a principled dissenter. The voices or positions described as narrated events in the curriculum provided important resources for this change in Tyisha’s identity.

Tyisha’s pathway across events became rigid for a couple of months, then fluid for a short time, then rigid in a different direction for another couple of months. Table 1.5 represents this cross-event analysis. It took detailed empirical investigation to determine when and how the change in Tyisha’s social identification occurred. The shape of pathways that emerges through enregisterment occurs at different spatial and temporal scales, and these pathways sometimes take unexpected turns. As Lemke (2000), Blommaert (2007) and Wortham (2006, 2012) argue, we must not let theoretical or political commitments predetermine the scales at which we expect social regularities to occur. It may be common for students from certain social groups to get increasingly identified as disruptive across their school careers, for example, but this does not occur in every case. The objects of discourse analysis are dynamic and heterogeneous in scale, and our approach must attend to this fact.

**Discourse analysis across events**
In order to do discourse analysis across speech events, we must first analyze discrete events—analyzing how *narrated events* and *indexical signs* establish *relevant context* and provide resources for *voicing* narrated characters and *positioning* participants in the narrating event. We must trace the dialectic of *contextualization* and *entextualization*, the back-and-forth process through which relevant context establishes likely interpretations of the voicing, evaluation, positioning and *social action* occurring, while emerging interpretations of social action constrain the context construed as relevant. We must show how mutually reinforcing accounts of relevant context and social action solidify as organized *configurations* of signs are established, provisionally ending the dialectic of contextualization and entextualization.

Then we must extend some of these principles of discourse analysis within speech events to examine patterns across linked events. Discourse analysis across speech events requires analysis of individual events in a pathway, but it also requires three additional steps. We must *identify linked events* that make up a pathway, studying how events become relevant to each other as they become linked through reported speech, parallelism across narrated events or other devices. We must *delineate cross-event configurations*, studying how indexical signs across events come to presuppose each other and create relevant context that establishes more rigid pathways. And we must *trace the shape of pathways*, showing how they become rigid and establish more complex and durable processes like socialization and learning.
This book provides systematic guidance on how to combine within-event and cross-event analyses to do discourse analysis across speech events. Chapter 2 expands the accounts given in this chapter, providing a systematic overview of tools and techniques required to analyze discourse beyond the speech event. We present tools for doing discourse analysis within and across speech events through the five tasks of selecting linked events/mapping narrated events, selecting indexicals/relevant cross-event context, construing indexicals/tracing pathways, configuring indexicals, and inferring social action/broader social processes. Each component is illustrated through sample analyses.

Discourse analysis beyond the speech event has been done with several kinds of data. Although the approach presented in Chapters 1 and 2 applies to all discourse, somewhat different approaches are appropriate in different cases. Chapters 3–5 apply these tools and techniques to analyze three types of data: “ethnographic,” “archival” and “new media.” Ethnographic studies analyze living people and actions in context, typically at shorter timescales and within more limited spatial scales. Archival studies analyze historical processes, typically at longer timescales and broader spatial scales. Studies of new media analyze actions in mediated worlds, typically at shorter timescales but broader spatial scales. New media studies also often focus on highly interconnected messages that depend on each other for completion, whereas the documents, interviews and observations in ethnographic and archival studies are often less immediately interconnected. These are ideal types, and many research projects will involve more than one of these data sources.

Chapter 3 illustrates discourse analysis beyond the speech event using ethnographic data—face-to-face participant observation with living people in context. We use examples from ethnographic discourse analyses that the two of us have recently done. Data from Wortham (2006) were introduced above, and the more extensive analyses in Chapter 3 trace a pathway of speech events across which one of Tyisha’s classmates was socially identified. Reyes (2013) also examines classroom data over the course of a year. She shows how participants reject or support the use of student nicknames depending on the pathway along which a particular event of speaking is located. Chapter 4 shows how discourse analysis beyond the speech event can be done on archival data, in which researchers analyze discursive artifacts that illuminate broader sociohistorical processes. The chapter applies our approach to archival discourse analyses by Miyako Inoue (2006) on Japanese women’s language and Robert Moore (2007, 2011) on Irish English accent. We focus on how the tools of voicing and reported speech facilitate cross-event archival analyses. Chapter 5 shows how discourse analysis beyond the speech event can be applied to new media data, in which researchers trace digital forms of communication that began emerging in the late twentieth century. We use recent work by Elaine Chun (2013) and Betsy Rymes (2014) to trace cross-event
recontextualizations of media forms along pathways in digital space. Chun analyzes how a Chinese American, who deploys signs that are potential indexes of “blackness,” gets identified across trajectories of YouTube commentaries. Rymes traces the recontextualization of music video genre elements in several videos that range from sincere to ironic performance.

Recent work in anthropology, linguistics and related disciplines has made clear that we must move beyond the speech event and examine pathways of linked events in order to understand how language helps constitute the social world. We now have a sophisticated theoretical account of this new approach to language and social life, and we have a growing body of quality empirical work that illustrates the productivity of the approach. But researchers interested in discourse need methodological guidance about how to study cross-event pathways empirically. This book provides such guidance. Chapter 6 closes the book by summarizing our approach and exploring the implications of cross-event analyses for common theoretical assumptions about the spatial and temporal scales of discursive action.