11. **Globalization Theory and Migration**

**Stef Slembroutch**

### 11.1 Introduction

This chapter engages with theories of globalization and migration through the lens of sociolinguistic inquiry. Globalization processes tend to be commonly talked about, sometimes celebrated and often contested, in terms of accelerated geographical reorderings in the fields of economic production, in money flows and technological spread. This chapter, however, asserts the centrality of language and symbolic practices and it does so by attending to one salient aspect of contemporary globalization processes, namely migration, while discussing implications for sociolinguistics. Two further introductory points deserve mention and help set the scope of discussion. Contemporary forms of migration are nowadays understood as a dimension of globalization processes, but it is worth reminding ourselves that the study of migration is in fact a much older theme, both in social and economic studies and in sociolinguistic enquiry. In more than one respect, the theme of migration predates the present burgeoning of empirical and theoretical interest in boundary-crossing processes, which are looked at through the lens of globalization phenomena (e.g. Thomas and Znaniecki, 1918, a pioneering work in the biographic approach to the sociology of migration). My second point therefore entails an historical horizon: to connect the present concern with, for instance, heightened multilingualism, which has resulted from an unrivalled increase in contemporary human movement around the world, with earlier historical linguistic and sociolinguistic understandings of migration-connected language developments which concentrated on the genesis of historically-recognized languages, language families and functional varieties, often in a context of imperialist expansion and colonial settlement.

### 11.2 Globalization and the Linguistic Cultural Turn in Late Modernity

To talk and write about 'globalization' as a process of accelerated transformation of local and regional phenomena into 'global' ones raises both the question of its 'naturalized' upper limit (phenomena that would truly cover the globe in its entirety) and its lower threshold (the extent to which phenomena can no longer be exclusively understood in 'local' terms or – perhaps more prominently – escape the category and unit of the 'nation-state', which for quite some time has dominated the way in which sociopolitical and economic spaces have been inventorized, measured and regulated). The latter originated in the long-held assumption that societies would be coterminous with nation-states. Discussions about the upper limit of globalization are mostly invested with an idealized perspective. This is evident from the opposing teleologies of either a completely deregulated world economy or one driven by worldwide solidarity. Therefore, the stricter answer to the question (when it is posed from the 'global' end) is probably that we do not (as yet) inhabit a globalized world and it remains to be seen whether we ever will. As far as the
lower threshold is concerned, one can conversely state the progressive evaporation of a sense of self-sufficient bounded locality (and, with it, the unit of the nation-state) in a range of transnational processes. One must add immediately here that what marks the present era as one of globalization is more a matter of degree, intensity and acceleration in social geographic complexity than that it would be possible to clearly identify an earlier era as pre-globalization (cf. Robertson's 1990 use of the term 'glocalization' to stress the tailoring effects of local conditions which interact with global flows). Globalization has been advocated as progress and advancement; it has also been denounced for its disruptive, de-authenticating and hegemonic effects. Boundary-crossing contact is probably as old as organized humanity itself, but this does not detract from the fact that the positioning of the 'transnational' of course presumes the existence of geopolitical units that can be understood as nation-states, in itself a construction of modernity. Moreover, understandings of contemporary geographical orderings in terms of a dynamics of neatly-nested spatial units prove insufficient, as the nation-state has by now been widely observed as being bypassed from two ends. This is captured in Lash and Urry's (1994: 279) two-sided formulation that 'contemporary nation states are now too small for the big problems of contemporary social life and too big for the small problems'. See also Swyngedouw (1996), and Pernson and Strath (2007), on the hollowing out of the functions of the nation-state by supranational and transnational forms of organization that compete with it, in the case of Swyngedouw (1996) with particular reference to economic collapse and industrial conflict within the European Union (EU). Bypassing the state cannot however be equated with its erasure. Especially when one turns to migration, it must be observed how the state and its typical sectoral divisions into fields (e.g. health, education, law, politics, etc.) continue to function as major channels for official policy, research funding, and publically-regulated responses to migration.

Different but related understandings of globalization phenomena have prioritized: (i) the agentic role of people in transnational 'networks of exchange'; (ii) the spread of goods, services and social categories such as labour, money, etc., via exchange relationships which are often captured conceptually as 'flows' (Appadurai, 1996); as well as (iii) resultant geographical demarcations of scope, distribution, circulation and uptake which are posited through the concept of 'spaces' (Appadurai 1990) - a metaphorical use which originates in the term landscape. Appadurai distinguishes five different types of 'spaces', depending on the content that has a particular distribution (ethnoscapes, finanscapes, technoscapes, mediascapes and ideoscapes; the category of ideoscapes particularly includes the international spread of an European-American master narrative of capitalist democracy around which political cultures are organized). Appadurai also notes multi-centredness and increasing disjunction between the 'scapes' of different spheres. The underlying emphasis is on constructedness, including how a 'space' is always invested with viewpoint, and the bigger challenge here is indeed one of sustained cartographic effort. Thus, as a first example: throughout the 1990s, the US-Swedish-owned television station V14 was cable-transmitted throughout Flanders and broadcast in Dutch only (using subtitles for imported material); its television studios were situated near Brussels; yet, as the television station’s corporate seat was registered in Britain and the station was answerable to British courts of law, it succeeded in circumventing Flemish restrictions on the broadcasting of commercials during children’s programmes that would 'normally' apply to it (compare with Triandafyllidou et al., 2009 on the European media space).

In facing the challenges posed by globalization, historians, geographers and linguists, etc., have mostly (some would argue: inevitably) embraced a cultural turn, as it is difficult to separate our specific understandings of globalization from other significant sociocultural shifts which originate in the latter half of the twentieth century: e.g. post-Fordist information economy (Bryson et al., 2000), risk society (Beck, 1992), reflexive late modern subjectivity (Giddens, 1991), etc., to name just three of these. Thus, accounts of deterritorialized finance and economy remain partial unless one also engages with the ways in which these are premised on particular culturalized communicative practices, as indeed is captured in the title of Lash and Urry (1994), Economies of Signs and Space. Similarly, a discussion of 'risk society' (in short: modern society is driven by its responses to particular types of risk which are intrinsic to modernization itself) will be at the heart of any analysis of durable economic, climatological and ecological development. Compare also with Giddens (2006) who anchors a proposed redefinition of the European ‘social model’ of the welfare state in the recognition of key shifts in sociocultural values.

Not surprisingly then, globalization has also been understood in more processual terms. For instance, ‘space/time-compression’ (Harvey, 1990) is a term used to describe the condition of (near-)simultaneity despite physical distance. It refers to the diminished importance of distance during a given historical moment - both the shortening of time and the shrinking of space...
The analytical imperatives that follow from it include the manifold complexities and incongruities that follow from resultant co-temporalities. A related concept is that of ‘space-time-distanciation’ (Giddens, 1984, 1990), which refers to the interlacing of social relations at a distance with local contextualities. Such relations are increasingly stretched across greater distances. For Giddens, social life is ordered across space and time. The problematic of ‘space-time-distanciation’ denotes a historical trajectory in the evolution of societies and it is central to understanding both globalization and late modernity: the increase in opportunity for human control that comes with space-time-distanciation is matched by a corresponding increase in the relevance of larger-scale challenges (see: Callinicos, 1985; and Lash and Urry, 1994: 230ff. for a critical assessment). As Fairclough (2000: 94ff.) stresses, space-time-distanciation brings out the intimate ties between mediated meaning-making and power.

Finally, globalization has also been understood in terms of determinate relationships of inequality. The categories of ‘core’, ‘periphery’ and ‘semi-periphery’ as developed in world-systems analysis (Wallerstein, 2004) here appear as yardstick concepts of cultural-geographic proximity and distance. Inequality through dependency has been noted in relations of a global scope (e.g. inter- and intracontinental North/South-relations, or within smaller-scale units, e.g. a sharpened contrast between urban and rural spaces). In the latter example, the set of contrasts has entailed (again quoting Lash and Urry, 1994: 28) that the urban spaces, being information-soaked, service-rich and heavily-networked, come closer to inhabiting the highly ‘wired’ villages of non-contiguous communities which by one definition would be called cosmopolitan and globalized. One must also immediately add here the ways in which such relations are being replayed in dislocated contexts which involve diaspora and migration. Think for instance of the state-organized migration of the 1960s which resulted in large sections of a rural Anatolian population in Turkey ending up in the urban periphery of cities such as Essen, Ghent, Rotterdam, etc.; or consider an example at the scale of particular institutions, e.g. how doctors with Third-World degrees find themselves employed in the pharmacy of a Brussels hospital and are occasionally called into the wards to act as interpreters during medical encounters with patients who share their first language (Collins and Slemroux, 2009: 35–6). Coe and Yeung’s (2001: 368) observations in the context of economic globalization can be extended to attendant sociolinguistic processes: globalization ‘is not spatially homogenizing, but instead depends upon, and contributes to uneven geographic development at different scales’. The same is true of increases in space-time distanciation. However, at the same time, the constructedness of these processes, including their potential being encouraged, embraced, appropriated or resisted, does not come with an immutable inevitability, as globalization entails ‘a set of complex and conflicting tendencies, the outcomes of which cannot be predicted a priori’.

Central to sociolinguistic enquiry here are questions of the (often simultaneous but divergent) representations of (trans-)locality, as spatialized and as inserted in time, and as struggled-over realities of person, place, group, object, etc. This has been the subject of much sociological enquiry, e.g. Fenton and Bradley’s (2002) study of the role of economic action in the articulation of co-occurring ethnic identities, while sociolinguistic research has focused on representations of both elite and ordinary actors, representations distributed along mass media and high-tech channels or expressed in the sequestered space of face-to-face encounters (e.g. Bayham and De Fina (2005) on experiential narratives of displacement and relocation; Delany et al. (2008) on the cultural resources, framing devices and repertoires of justification articulated in racial exclusion; Cudlass-Coulthard and Iedema’s (2008) on the effects of failure and uncertainty in people’s constructions of identity when they face change in diverse border-crossing contexts, including migration and asylum). The study of such representations and their circulation dynamics is however best not divorced from an analysis of sociolinguistic resources, understood in the widest sense possible: languages, registers, discourse formats, interactional sets-ups, etc., which, in their own right, are often subject to (trans-)local processes of recontextualization - appropriation, shift and transformation. In this, purchase in mobility and articulation at a higher scale are often at stake (cf. Haarstad and Fløysand, 2007 on ‘scale-jumping’ and empowerment). Here are two fairly rudimentary examples of ‘national’ articulation which attend to their reception at a higher scale and the role which sociolinguistic choices play in these: the ANC’s (African National Congress) choice for an anglophone articulation of the category Black (rather than ‘non-racial’ or ‘non-white’, see Howarth, 2000: 106) was both a unifying factor in South Africa’s struggle against apartheid and a tactical choice which facilitated uptake in news media around the world and in world political forums such as the UN. This can be contrasted in the post-apartheid era with, for instance, the reconciliatory philosophy of Ubuntu (a mobilizing category borrowed from Nguni) which, since 1994, has been frequently invoked as a specifically pan-African and racially-inclusive approach.
to defining one’s humanity through that of others (cf. in Zulu, ‘Umuntu Ngumuntu Ngabantu’ means that ‘a person is a person through other persons’). As Haarstad and Fjøsnes (2007: 289) point out, ‘it is necessary to probe deeper into the power relationships that are produced by the restructuring of relationships in space and time’. Let me now turn to migration.

11.3 MIGRATION, COLONIALISM AND THE FORMATION OF LINGUISTIC RESOURCES

Migration, then, specifically brings out the aspect of human movement. It is an old theme – traditionally discussed in relation to tribally-organized collectivities (e.g. Germanic migration within Europe in the first centuries; large-scale Bantu migration across Southern Africa from the fourteenth century onwards), or in terms of colonial settlement which accompanied trade missions and military campaigns (e.g. Roman settlement across Europe or successive waves of European settlement in North America). The impact of such migrations on the formation of ‘languages’ as durable effects of sustained language contact is one theme within historical linguistics, e.g. sub-stratal effects (Bynnon, 1997: 252ff.) of local Germanic vernaculars on the language use of the Roman colonizers which underpin the transition from Latin to French (see also: Lass, 1997; Campbell, 1998). It has also been a theme within sociolinguistics: pidginization and creolization are typically associated with the colonization of the New World by European-based powers (Thomason and Kaufman, 1998 is a key reference in this area). Specific concepts and terminology thus reflect an interest in specific periods in history, though research, even where change has been presented as ‘contact-induced’ (Kaufman, 2003), has not necessarily been couched in an analysis of lived experiences of migration, while the distinction between ‘creoles’ and ‘languages’ has been challenged both on theoretical and empirical grounds (e.g. Ansaldo and Matthews, 2001).

What marks the current era of globalization as different is, first of all, the unprecedented surge in human movement around the globe (refugees, displaced persons, migrants), mostly in the form of selective or collective responses to economic deprivation, war and conflict, political persecution and genocide. This is the migration of the ‘have-nots’ in search of a better or safer life elsewhere, often, though not exclusively, moving from relative ‘(semi-)periphery’ to the ‘core’. Note that what counts as ‘centre’ and ‘margin’ will be highly circumstantial and invites sophisticated and layered readings of ‘difference’. Secondly, there are the increasing flows around the world of a whole range of ‘haves’ who, in various functional modalities, spend time away from base localities because they can afford to do so, either travelling as tourists or as members of specific professional, occupational and retirement communities. Students can be found in both categories. The theme of migration invites inquiries into the positioning of groups in transformed labour relations (e.g. Lamont, 2000) and a second important area of attention is of course that of minority rights, especially in relation to the institutional domains of the welfare state (e.g. Kymlicka, 1995, 2001). Experiences of migration are often continual or recursive processes (more than just one-way experiences), and may involve continued contact with, even physical movement between, contexts of ancestry and current residence (Basch et al., 1994; Sassen, 1999; e.g. Galasinski and Galasinska, 2007 and Galasinska and Koslowska, 2009) for sociolinguistic enquiries into how immigrants makes sense of evolving ‘parallel’ worlds; e.g. Budich, 2009 for how this may be tied up with the transnational exchange of commodities; e.g. Valentine et al., 2009 for the effects of subsequent moves in a migration trajectory on functional distribution within specific sociolinguistic repertoires.

Typically, effects on the language use of individuals (as part of collectivities) is, in this area of inquiry, talked about in terms of ‘linguistic fate’, one of language maintenance – e.g. through heritage language programmes, language adaptation, shift, death or loss, patterns of code selection, code-switching and style shifting as discernible processes of (emergent) language change in successive generations who are born in/outside the host country (Saville-Troike, 2003: 211ff.; see McConnell, 1997: 355ff) on the structural variables of ‘status’, ‘demography’ and ‘institutional support’ which affect ethnolinguistic vitality). Three comments must be added here immediately:

1. The theme of language maintenance/loss brings together postcolonial contexts (in which the hegemony of the colonizer’s language is asserted) with contexts of migration (in which the migrant community’s language encounters a local language which is established throughout the social spheres). Language dominance is probably a common factor. Note that some national contexts have both, e.g. the USA or New Zealand.

2. Language contact must also be put in the context of ‘return’. ‘Return’ here can mean ‘in person’ – when returning for a shorter or longer period of time (e.g. Zentella, 2003). This may come with a focus on ‘second languages’ (e.g. Taura, 2008 on the retention/loss of English by returnees in a Japanese context). Return is also to be interpreted ‘Strict language loss means the pre-existing of language, and often, of culture’. However, the regulation expectations of language are also affected by the expectations of social relations and the expectations of social roles. In addition, they can be shaped by the expectations of social norms and the expectations of social values.
3 In addition, studies of migration have unprecedentedly resulted in the theorization of the social indexicalities and language ideological aspects of valuations which cluster around various forms of code-switching, mixings, stylizations, crossings, lingua franca uses and ethnicized accents (e.g. Rampton, 1995; Auer, 2007).

However, we still need to ask how the linguistic resources of individuals, resources we can see being used in actual interaction, can be projected to the level of language communities, in view of pronouncements about the long-term directions in which linguistic resources develop (see below for a further discussion). In addition, we must ask what else is needed to come to terms with the complexities of language practice in contexts of contemporary migration. Set against the wider interest in globalization processes outlined in the previous section, the relationship between language and migration has, in some respects, been modelled further by drawing beneficially on the wide range of interests developed in various niches of linguistic and sociolinguistic enquiry and the specific contributions which these niches can make to studies of globalization and migration.

11.4 AN ON-THE-GROUND ANALYSIS OF MIGRANT-RELATED SOCIOLINGUISTIC DIVERSITY

Globalization and contemporary migration have pushed sociolinguistic researchers to question some of the received boundaries of their discipline, as it has become difficult to ‘do’ sociolinguistics without taking on board some of the key themes of, just to name four ‘disciplines’ here: translation studies, language learning and education, analysis of institutional and professional discourses, and literacy studies. The challenge also applies conversely.

Globalization and contemporary forms of migration have resulted in an exponential growth in translation and interpreting (Crónin, 2003) – up to a point where analyses of medical consultations or, more generally, social welfare encounters have to shrug off the boundedness of received monolingual contours. In recent years, one has equally witnessed a number of reorientations in language education and language pedagogical efforts which invoke a sociolinguistic turn sensitive to aspects of bi- and trilingualism, emergent language varieties, and the complex workings of language ideologies and sociolinguistic attitudes. For instance, national education departments have had to rethink their ‘national language curriculum’, so as to include also the learning of official languages as a second language (a novel experience in quite a few Western European states). Research in this area has also noted the specific challenges of curricular design. In some contexts, this has meant facing highly diversified needs for X as a second language resulting from successive waves of immigration: e.g. newcomers who have just arrived with no X at all vs users with pre-school neighbourhood experience in language X as a second language. At the same time, challenges of teacher recruitment have been posed by the organization of language courses in the immigrant languages when they are taught in the diaspora (Creese et al., 2008). These themes are not new in their own right, but they may well be unprecedented in contexts affected by recent waves of migration; the need to address them may also have come with greater urgency and increased complexity (e.g. hyperdiversity because many different language backgrounds are simultaneously at play, or the complexities of a situation in which the language learning needs of recently-arrived immigrants are being addressed through an established second language learner curriculum for indigenous minorities). Similarly, professional and institutional discourse studies were previously very much a linguistic terrain, in which attention to diversity in linguistic resources was mostly restricted to matters of ‘lay speak’ vs ‘expert speak’ with some attention paid to social-class orientations in the coding of experience and degrees of client education. It has now become a terrain which ventures into the specifics of multilingual institutional encounters in which professional–client communication is mediated through informal or professional interpretation, code-switching, or by resorting to a lingua franca with varying levels of functional proficiency brought to the encounter (e.g. Collins and Stembrough, 2006; Gotti and Salager-Meyer, 2006; Moyer (forthcoming) on medical interaction; e.g. Bennmamam, 2000; Haviland, 2003 and Trinch, 2003 on legal contexts). Following these developments, questions of literacy have been posed, too – not only the more traditional questions raised in a context where professionals and institutional agents face clients who thus far have not acquired written language or who experience difficulties in managing it but also literacy in the use of IT-driven
technologies of communication, next to cross-national experiences in institutional literacy, literacy related to expert-systems as presupposed by the late modern ideal of self-governance, and literacy in response to institutional shifts in value which favour client-centredness, choice and the negotiation of institutional courses of action (see chapter by Barton and Lee in this volume). The paradigmatic shift towards 'New Literacy Studies' (e.g. Street, 1993; Collins and Blyth, 2003) not only accords with these programmatic requirements but also is much necessitated by the complexities of the migrant experience. One specific theme that has often been noted in this area concerns the interactional deficits of decontextualized written solutions for the communicative gaps induced by language difference. This that is an area at the interstices of analysing institutional regimes of client-oriented communication and multilingual encounters underlines the importance stated earlier of studying the language impact of migration in relation to contemporary value orientations in institutional cultures.

In a more general vein, Copland states (2003: 466) that 'the qualities of linguistically mediated social experience that define "local"... all potentially carry an imprint from shifting global structures and relationships'. Echoing Comaroff and Comaroff (1992: 32ff), macro processes always 'have their feet on the ground'. There is a need for a sociolinguistic perspective which invites equal attention to representations of difference and the situated actions of individuals, both in the micro-interactional spaces in which difference and diversity are acted out and in the mediated spaces of mass communication. In practice, it is not possible to maintain a strict distinction between the two types of context. The difference is one of scale of inquiry, not one of priority. In fact, studies of mass media representations of globalization and migration are invited to pursue also the question of how situated individuals interactively engage with such representations (adopting an actional perspective, alongside the more commonly adopted perspective of textual constitution which is characteristic of much in media studies). Conversely, studies which prioritize the micro-sequence dynamics of face-to-face interaction are equally invited to address the larger-scale structuration effects brought about by mass media representations, as they permeate local sense-making in face-to-face interaction. Thus, representations in (inter)national media will tend to 'dawn' over the neighbourhood experiences of migration which they cover, while neighbourhood experiences through national exposure impact upon the construction of relevant socioeconomic realities in areas unaffected by migration flows. Expressed boldly: the notion of the global itself is best approached as articulated across interacting levels of social geography reality. Burawoy (2001:148) adds the meta-reflection that the pulses of academic endeavour are equally implicated: inasmuch as for him the global invites ethnographic understanding, ethnography has gone global, too (anthropology in particular had for a long time already depended on a fundamental perception of border-crossing colonial relationships, whereas sociology mostly took for granted the nation-state as its natural unit of analysis).

Recent work in political, cultural and economic geography has thematized the problematic of interacting levels of analysis through the notion of 'scale' itself (see above) — the construction of spatial and temporal units and coordinates in socioeconomic processes and, as sociolinguists will add, their articulation in discourse. Scale is a very old concept in geography: in fact, it is hard to think about geographical units of analysis unless one deploys a concept of 'scale'. More recent work emphasizes how scale is socially produced. In the words of Haarstad and Fløysand (2007: 292):

... the 'scale question' has been addressed in recognition of the increasing interconnectivity of social relations caused by time-space compression, which necessarily problematizes the spatial parameters of those relations and the geographical context in which they occur .... Globalization does not merely detach social relations from space (deterritorializing), but also reinscribes these relations in new ways (reterritorializing).

Attention to 'scale' and processes of 'scaling' ('upscaleing', 'downscaleing', 'rescaling', etc.) allows us to circumvent some of the circularity that comes with received micro-macro-reasoning: communicative events are often best viewed as 'micro', 'meso' and 'macro' at the same time — and much will depend here on whose interpretative viewpoint is given priority in analysis. Thus, the child’s limited Dutch displayed in a language-immersion classroom in Ghent may, at one and the same time, represent (for the teacher) a recently-arrived child who is coming to terms with a challenging new environment and who copes reasonably well given that the parents do not speak the language either, and (for the visiting school inspector) yet another instance of a failing national policy of language integration for immigrants. The construction of contextual categories is subject to the indexicalities which are presupposed, played out or interactionally worked up at the moment of speaking (and, retroactively, when interpreting discourse, as an aspect of recontextualization). Indexicalities can be viewed as ‘ordered’ (Silverstein, 2003). The use of 'scale' and 'scaling' can thus concern with discursive situations and intertexts, new contexts following the relate...
can thus be extended to address a theoretical concern with the effects of de/re-territorialization and dis/re-location on the construal of place, time and situational reference as they are interpretatively and interactionally 'pinned down' or exported to a new context of expression (Baynham, 2009). The following vignette is anecdotal but illustrates well the related point of 'fractal recursivity' (Irvine and Gal, 2000). A former colleague, who grew up in Dublin but has lived in Belgium for over 20 years, during a discussion of the concept of 'scale' intimated how, when frequenting one and the same Irish pub in the centre of town, he embodied different units of reference for his interlocutors. This, he said, bore both on the topics attended to and the evaluative exchanges on these: (i) 'Ireland', when he visited the pub with Flemish friends; (ii) 'Flanders', when meeting with visitors from Dublin or the Irish Republic; and (iii) the 'guys from the other side we never got to talk to', when having a drink with a colleague from the UK who grew up in Ulster. Distinctions are applied recursively to a fraction of a unit, as meaningful distinctions are played out to constitute a smaller group or individual with presupposed ancestry in the larger-scale unit.

Note, in addition, that the interest in scale takes up beyond this. As a further illustration, therefore, here is what Creese et al. (2008: 18) state about heritage language classes in the UK complementary schools they studied (complementary schools are voluntary schools which serve specific linguistic, religious or cultural communities):

Young people in complementary schools negotiated paths for themselves which were in some ways contrary to the ideologies of the teaching materials used in complementary schools. If teachers and administrators held the view that students ought to learn a community language as an endowment of knowledge of a national history, nationalism, and identity, this was not necessarily accepted unproblematically. Rather, the young people’s attitudes to their languages, and their multilingual practices, constituted an urban response to their place in the world, as they negotiated subject positions which took them on a path through language ideological worlds constructed by others.

What is noteworthy about this instance is that the spatialization of the young learners which is presupposed in the learning materials intersects with two timescales: that of heritage and that of urban adolescence. The latter contrast is organized hierarchically in internally-conflicting directions: heritage as valuable tradition which is supported institutionally and urban adolescence as lived time valued by the adolescents. The net result is a social dynamics which is undecided and in flux (Creese et al, 2008: 18):

Young people found ways to parody the texts, their teachers and themselves, often questioning and sometimes ridiculing the folk stories, traditional rituals, ceremonies and festivals. At other times, young people showed a willingness and interest in the ‘heritage’ chosen by their teachers to focus on in class and assemblies and showed much enthusiasm in participating in community events such as Diwali festivities (Gujarati case study) and Children’s Day (Turkish case study).

The further point illustrated is that of certain ‘sites of engagement’ (Scollon, 1997) over others being particularly amenable to articulations of scale and even scale-shifting.

One of the specific challenges posed to scalar analysis resides in the multiple uses of the term ‘scale’. One can detect at least four uses:

1. Scale as a category rooted in experience and participant perception – refers to particular practices attended to by participants as reflecting and bearing upon particular time/space-scales.
2. Scale as a value-oriented gauge in the assessment of structured relationships – scale analysable as determinate relationships of inequality; as Fairclough (2006) stresses, this need not be transparent to those immediately involved.
3. Related to this, ‘scaling’ refers to a dynamic process which connects situated phenomena with trans-situational power, purchase and mobility (or the lack of these).
4. Finally, there is scale in the way it is more traditionally understood by geographers, as by and large a matter of drawing on a set of decontextualized units of analysis and inventory (calendar and clock time and units of space measurement, together with received geopolitical and institutional-organizational units).

One response to the challenges noted is that of multiple, interconnected readings and of adequacy in interpretation. The problem of interpretation is confounded by the inevitable dilemmas posed by Fairclough (2006: 5) when he draws attention to the paradox that, in practice, it is not possible to draw a strict separation between, on the one hand, discourses about globalization (which are often contested) and, on the other hand, globalization as real processes which are not necessarily recognized by participants for what they are. The paradox is that processes can only be talked about by resorting to representations. The resultant programme is threefold: it is one of developing an analytical-interpretative vocabulary which adequately captures process, does justice to experience and
has purchase in the formulation of equitable policy and feasible intervention. In addition, what appears to be needed is not only that we dynamically conceive of a large-scale process in direct relation to detailed analysis of local symbolic processes but also that we capture the scalar complexities and contradictions that accompany the many different aspects of globalization. This way we may also succeed in capturing the unpredictable, push-pull effects of globalization which are easily missed in the sweeping manifestos. This calls for an ethnographic turn, much in the spirit of Burawoy (1991) and Gal and Kligman (2000) for whom ethnography counts as a specific engagement with ‘thick’ empirical detail which is oriented to the advancement of realistic sociologically-informed understandings.

### 11.5 Challenges Posed to Received Sociolinguistic Notions and Theorizing

The challenges posed by a sociolinguistics of globalization and migration invite multiple connections with long-standing sociolinguistic themes such as studying the effects of language contact. While stressing the continuities, there is also a need to think through the discontinuities which have been foregrounded in recent research. The shift from a sociolinguistics of ‘community’ to one of ‘context’ is one of these (Clyne and Kipp, 2006; Collins et al., 2009; Rampton, 2009). Some definitions of speech communities have stressed commonality of language – the monolin
gual paradigm (e.g. Lyons, 1970) – while other definitions go by regularity of interaction (e.g. Gumperz, 1962), in this way allowing bi/multilingual speech communities. The impact of migration reaches further than the latter, as rather fundamental questions are raised about ‘contexts’ of interpretation, especially the temporal/spatial dimensions of language use and meaning-making (the shift towards a paradigm of spatialization and its central category of ‘scale’ discussed above bears testimony to this). Not surprisingly, this comes with conceptual challenges which extend to the category of ‘language’ itself (e.g. Blackledge and Creese, 2008). Migration has posed challenges of hybridity and the occurrence of selectively emergent varieties with limited distribution as socially identifiable registers (e.g. the adolescents of Maghreb descent in Jaspers’ (2005) fieldwork who socially identify and regularly deploy stylizations of ‘newcomer Flemish’ and ‘Turkish Flemish’). Similarly, the theme of world languages, recast more recently into a debate about linguistic imperialism and imposition ‘from above’ (Mazruie, 1975; Phillipson, 1992; Canagarajah, 2002; Holliday, 2005), has been addressed as one of local and global dominance through global circulation (e.g. standard English as a colonial inheritance; standard English and its purchase in a transnational job market). At the same time, various kinds of hybridization have been described as coming ‘from below’ (e.g. Alim et al., 2008 on hip-hop registers; e.g. English learned and developed en route as a medium for articulating refugee experiences). With this, questions of coexistence and competition with local languages have been raised for both postcolonial and diaspora contexts (e.g. Vigoireux and Mufwene, 2008). Note that competitive coexistence is also a major aspect of language policy in supranational spaces such as the EU or globalized markets for mobile phones and software (Krzyżanowski and Wodatk, 2007 on the hegemonic multilingualism of a number of ‘core’ working languages in the EU; e.g. Cronin, 2003 and House, 2008 on the implications of a growing distributional dynamics of ‘covert translation’; the need for fast global dissemination has resulted in simultaneous and automated access to a dominant anglophone source text and its translations for recipients in many different linguistic and cultural contexts.) In addition, questions such as, ‘What is English?’, in fact an old theme in the sociolinguistics literature, have returned, now with more stress on the face-to-face contact between non-native Englishes. For instance, Maryns (2005) gauges the impact of different ‘Englishes’ as a dimension of the interactional and interpretative asymmetries which bear on the contact between bureaucrat and asylum seeker in which, say, a variety of English which builds on Krio from Sierra Leone meets ‘face-to-face’ with the ‘outer circle’ secondary-school English of the Flemish institutional representative. The outcome of the contact is deeply consequential for the applicant. Attempts at formulating workable (de-ethnicized and transllocal) criteria for ‘international English’ or ‘English as a lingua franca’ have given rise to intense debate. (Key tenets of this debate are captured in, for example, Rubdy and Saracconi, 2006.)

Less often dwelt upon are the challenges posed to the concept of ‘genre’. Genres are traditionally thought of as contained by a societally-defined community of practice or a language community. Thus, the next step from locating discursive formats which are relatively more/less mobile across situational contexts (e.g. the indepth interview as a trans-situational discursive format) is to talk about genres which are better understood as ordered in transnational spaces of circulation (through processes of borrowing, appropriation, imposition and translation). Genres
possess or lack transnational mobility. Certain
genres can be thought of as almost ontogenetically
connected to global landscapes (e.g. email),
whereas other genres just appear to travel very fast
(e.g. hip-hop). Questions of relative homogeneity
across transnational landscapes and/or relative
susceptibility to local adaptation and recontextual-
ization are very much at the forefront and under-
mine often-held assumptions that generic variation
is mostly to be situated inside the space of a
particular language or a community. (See research
on the adoption of television formats worldwide:
the use of a single language in the broadcasted
artefact is often a mistaken indicator that the
‘genre’ would belong to the ‘language community’;
e.g. Stembrouck, 1998.)

In addition, it is also worth noting how a prevailing
logic of homogeneous language communities
defined by language, ethnicity and nationality (now
sized down to the scale of cities, regions, neighbour-
hoods) in more than one respect has continued to
inform both institutional-organizational responses
to migration in education, health, etc., and along
with this, many research initiatives. Research tends
to be organized ethnolinguistically, often for heuris-
tic reasons of uniformity of sample and focus. Also,
in this area we face challenges to a paradigm in
which ‘the systematicity of language’ is perhaps
too easily taken for granted (Rampton, 2009).

Other methodological challenges to a sociolin-
guistics of migration and globalization pertain to
the logistical difficulties involved when concen-
trating sociolinguistic and ethnographic effort
across transnationally-constituted constituencies
of text interpretation and sites of engagement.
This has been noted earlier for analyses of media
products which are consumed simultaneously
(Hanks, 1996: 140ff. on television). Globalization
has added the further challenge of transnational
audiences who consume one and the same video
artefact on CNN or Eurosport, a channel which
provides simultaneous commentary in different
languages, with advertisements during the breaks
tailored to different audience segments (cf.
Richardson and Meinhof, 1999). Where is the
text? And, what is the best vantage point for
observing interpretive practice? In a different
variant, a similar set of heuristic and logistical
problems presents itself when one is analysing
institutional contact in a neighbourhood which is
characterized by hyperdiversity, or indeed if one is
to engage with linguistic ethnographies of trans-
national mobility which invite the researcher to
take part in a journey rather than do fieldwork
within a single community space. (See also
Marcus’s 1998 advocacy for multi-locale ethnog-
raphy which seeks to overcome some of the
stuffing effects of a straightforward micro-macro
dichotomy; the advocacy is to be systems-
directed; ethnography can become more ‘flows’-
sensitive by actively participating in the complex
connections between places, rather than being
single-place focused.)

The question of ‘community’ as a unit of analy-
sis also surfaces in the need to revisit language/
class-analysis in contexts of migration —
especially how social class connects to particular
language experiences in institutional contexts (see
chapters by Mallinson and Dods worth in this
volume). Collins and La Santa (2006: 1) observe
how we currently ‘lack models which translate
ethnicity and class, as social categories, into the
processual and interactive concepts likely to
generate insight into learning processes’. The
concept of ‘social class’ has been much tied up
with the sociology of the nation-state. It has
tended to be absent from sociolinguistic efforts to
come to terms with the sociolinguistics of the
transnational, often replaced in this by ‘ethnicity’,
‘culture’ and ‘ethno-national identity’ as categories
which would be more easily amenable to
transnationally-defined populations.

Finally, the theme of the nation-state, although
problematized, is far from absent in globalization
and migration studies. The nation-state continues
to be articulated in literature, film, discourses of
government, popular events, etc. (e.g. Billig,
1995). Especially in the context of migration stud-
ies, there are various indications of a continued
role for the nation-state as a significant regulating
force in how sectors of society (e.g. politics,
health, education, etc.) respond to waves of migra-
tion. This brings us full circle, returning to the
oldest theme in sociolinguistics, that of society
and language use. What might we mean then by
‘society’?
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12.1 INTRODUCTION

Charles Sanders Peirce was a prominent American philosopher. To sociologists, his theory of signs and the concept of iconicity are fundamental to understanding the nature of objects, their relations, and the context within which these relations are perceived. His work on cohesion, pronouns, and context has been influential over decades of sociological analysis. For instance, George Herbert Mead's concept of the relationship between individuals and their social environment is closely related to Peirce's ideas. The relationship between the two is further explored in the work of Schegloff and Goffman, who developed theories of conversational analysis and pragmatics which examine the roles and statuses and