Language and Education

CHAISE LADOUSA
Hamilton College, USA

Most educational practices involve the use of language. Sometimes, although relatively rarely, curricular materials and pedagogical activities explore language as an explicit domain of inquiry. This should not imply, however, that language and education are mutually implicated only when such is made explicit in the curriculum and the classroom. So often in educational systems, the very routines of classroom interaction and registers of language used within – by some, at least – bear the marks of histories of social, economic, and political dominance, suppression, and exclusion. In addition, educational practices, institutions, and bureaucracies have themselves shaped registers of language, particularly standardized varieties, and thus influenced representations of and ideas about who belongs in the classroom (and who does not) and who is valued within a society (and who is not). Anthropologists have found in language and education a relationship particularly important in the study of inequality and its reproduction.

The study of language and education in anthropology began during a period marked by massive shifts in educational policy and practice in the United States. One of the primary reasons that scholarship on language and education has always been so focused on inequality is that it emerged in the wake of the 1954 landmark United States Supreme Court decision in the case of *Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka*. The court's decision effectively overturned the court's ruling in the case of *Plessy v. Ferguson* in 1896 that made the separation of public facilities by race legal. A great deal of work in language and education in anthropology has focused on African American (see African American Languages (AAV, AAEV, Ebonics)) or Native American students in classrooms and has sometimes considered such students' communicative practices outside of class. Such work has often offered comparisons with the communicative practices of Anglo-American students, usually in an effort to demonstrate the relative lack of resonance of African American or Native American students' practices with those of the larger classroom and with the teacher. In later work, the representation of marked groups has grown, and especially important has been work considering Latinx and Southeast Asian students.

Theoretical and methodological frameworks for the study of language and education

Studies of language, on the one hand, and education, on the other hand, have had uneven histories in the discipline of anthropology. Whereas language played a part in constituting the very discipline – in the United States, at least – education came

The International Encyclopedia of Linguistic Anthropology. Edited by James Stanlaw.
© 2021 John Wiley & Sons, Inc. Published 2021 by John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
DOI: 10.1002/9781118786093.iela0194

of age as a realm of significant and concerted anthropological interest much later (see Linguistic Anthropology, History and Development of). For example, *Anthropology and Education Quarterly*, the journal of the Council on the Anthropology of Education, is in its forty-ninth year of publication. Complicating the history of the study of language and education even further is that approaches to the study of language in anthropology have changed. While the study of language characterized the Boasian study of anthropology, more recent anthropological scholarship has come to apprehend discursive activity as fundamental to cultural reproduction. While the more recent approach is older than the journal's founding, the *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology*, in its twenty-seventh volume, reflects the shift.

Well known is Franz Boas's (see Boas, Franz) critique of earlier social evolutionary approaches to change exhibited by humans. Language played an especially important role in that critique. Boas argued that scientific inferences about change could not be based on the notion that language, race, and culture change together, such that developments in one area might be extended across the other two. Boas called for the study of change within each domain separately, and he envisioned a long period of research before an adequate account of the historical development of Native American peoples might emerge. The dismissal of the idea that languages and their structures might be ranked in terms of complexity or sophistication was a founding tenet of American anthropology. The disposition to language would influence work on the intersection of language and education profoundly.

The exploration of language in educational contexts emerged within the methodological paradigms that renewed an interest in language in anthropology. By the end of the 1960s, different approaches shared an emphasis on language apprehended as discourse in place of the earlier emphasis on language apprehended as an entity grounded in grammar to be learned prior to, or during, fieldwork. Borrowing liberally from Roman Jakobson's (see Jakobson, Roman) delineation of communicative functions, Dell Hymes (see Hymes, Dell) argued for a model of communication generally that, ultimately, required detailed reflections on specific moments of activity. For example, Hymes made the distinction between "outcomes" and "goals" of communicative activity. He noted that outcomes do not correspond to goals because goals can be informed by or tied to particular roles emergent from specific genres. Anthropologists, Hymes explained, must investigate the particularities of such features of communicative interaction just as they would any ethnographic phenomenon, with attention to detail and with an analytical apparatus capable of reflecting pragmatic phenomena unfamiliar to the anthropologist. Hymes argued that the inclusion of the Jakobsonian formulation of communicative functions could, via the consideration of specific moments of communicative action, enrich the anthropological methodology of long-term intensive fieldwork. Hymes offered his model of communicative features within a paradigm he referred to variously as sociolinguistics (see Sociolinguistics), the ethnography of communication, and the ethnography of speaking (see Ethnography of Speaking and Communication). Hymes not only contributed to a paradigm that would become especially influential in the study of language and education; he also conducted research and published on the ways in which racially marked students' practices outside of the classroom are not generally recognized within.

John Gumperz (see Gumperz, John J.) initiated another line of enquiry called interactional sociolinguistics. Gumperz was especially interested in situations bringing together people who differed in their understanding of shared activity. Central to Gumperz's approach were what he called "contextualization cues," discursive elements that provide a sense of actors' understandings of pragmatic phenomena. By showing the ways in which the "same" discursive element can cue different pragmatic phenomena, Gumperz was able to provide an explanation for certain moments of communicative misunderstanding. Gumperz's influence would be far reaching in the study of language and education as many of his students, as well as other scholars, would apply the notion of contextualization cues and their misrecognition to the roles of teacher and student as well as to the differences between the participation of members of different groups in the same classroom. Richard Bauman and Joel Sherzer contributed to an emphasis on communicative function in their ethnographic explorations of genre (see Genre). Bauman and Sherzer considered traditional practices and performances to pose questions about authenticity, authority, and the possibilities of transformation in discourse. An interest in genre has become important in the study of what constitutes academic discourse and language used in curricular materials and practices, or language associated with school.

Also influential in the emergent paradigm of the ethnography of communication were contributions made by scholars outside of anthropology. Erving Goffman's (see Goffman, Erving) attention to speaker roles in interaction had a particularly important influence. Goffman noted the inadequacy of considering the involvement of interactants in discourse from the point of view offered by the terms "speaker" and "hearer." Different entities, Goffman showed, can have different relationships to the same utterance. Who composes an utterance is not necessarily the same person whose ideas and opinions the utterance conveys. And both of these roles can differ from the one that corresponds to who actually delivers the utterance. Roles, Goffman explained, are "laminated" in interaction, often in ways people come to associate with institutional contexts. By studying the lamination of speaker roles, scholars of interaction can provide insights about how people differently engage with discourse and how such differences are organized in institutional domains. Goffman's insights would provide inspiration to scholars of language and education studying patterns of interaction inside and outside of the classroom.

Harvey Sacks (see Sacks, Harvey) and his colleagues Emmanuel Schegloff and Gail Jefferson initiated an interest in the analysis of interaction focused on patterns of interaction. They noted regularities in who takes turns at talk when, and explored the ways in which such regularities were nested within larger interactional patterns. Sometimes notions of genre and institutional context are relevant to the patterns such that participants in interaction might be said to inhabit roles. The approach initiated by Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson in the 1960s continues by the name conversation analysis (see Conversation Analysis [CA]). For some scholars, whether one considers phenomena outside of what can be shown to occur in the immediate context of discursive interaction can differentiate conversation analysis from more critical approaches. In any case, conversation analytic methods went on to be employed by scholars investigating

classroom talk, and often complemented other approaches such as interactional sociolinguistics and the work of Erving Goffman.

More recently, linguistic anthropologists have included in their investigations of discursive activity people's reflections on language structure and the use of language by others. People not only produce discourse, they reflect on its structure and production, and such reflections represent an important domain of ethnographic investigation because they reveal the ways in which pragmatic phenomena are circulated, transformed in their interpretation and resonance, and sometimes made invisible. Michael Silverstein's elaboration of Roman Jakobson's engagement with the work of Charles Sanders Peirce (see Peirce, Charles Sanders) has promoted the use of a tripartite arrangement of signs, their relationships to their objects of representation, and that which mediates the relationship between the sign and its object of representation in a subsequent sign (see Semiotics). Linguistic anthropologists – Asif Agha, Susan Gal, Judith Irvine, Paul Kroskrity, and Kathryn Woolard, among many others – have employed Peircian apprehensions of semiotic phenomena to provide explanations for the ways in which interactants engage in particular contexts of interaction in ways shaped by histories of political economic processes and transformations. Emergent from such activity has been the realization that the exploration of semiotic relationships in interaction can aid in calling attention to the significance of constructions of race, class, gender, sexuality, ability, and other, less widely circulating apprehensions of human difference in the reproduction of inequality. Such domains of difference are particularly relevant to language and education, and scholars have used language ideological approaches (see Language Ideology) to show that educational institutions can powerfully shape the ways in which languages are imagined and employed.

Basil Bernstein (see Bernstein, Basil) and Pierre Bourdieu (see Bourdieu, Pierre) are responsible for inspiring work on the relationships between language, education, and social class (see Language and Social Class). In the 1970s, Bernstein used a distinction between the "restricted" and the "elaborated code" to describe two possible approaches to the world through linguistic communication. The restricted code develops when interlocutors largely share knowledge about the world such that their utterances do not need to exhibit the kinds of distinctions and abstractions of the elaborated code. The difference in code overlaps with the difference in social class because members of the working class are largely restricted to the development of the restricted code and members of the middle class have access to the elaborated code. The institutions of education have come to help to determine who has access to which codes because the curriculum has developed with respect to class-differentiated requirements of labor. The analysis of pedagogy in school became the focus of Volume IV of Bernstein's *Class, Codes, and Control* published in 1990. In it, he offers an elaborate conceptual apparatus to link forms of curriculum and teaching to distinctions within the middle class.

Bourdieu's *Language and Symbolic Power*, published in English in 1991, extended the Marxist notion of capital to symbolic and cultural forms. It has been influential in research in a linguistic ideological vein for its attention to the misrecognition that pragmatic phenomena can undergo in moments of interaction. Misrecognition focuses attention on the ways in which some pragmatic feature is interpreted from a point of view that excludes certain interpretations. For example, a teacher might interpret

a student's silence as disinterest or even unwillingness rather than as a sign that the student is unfamiliar with the classroom routine or that aspects of the classroom routine violate what is normal or valuable to the student outside of the classroom. Some linguistic anthropologists have critiqued Bourdieu's metaphors for their privileging of the economic and the rather restricted metapragmatic regimentation that can ensue in analysis. Nevertheless, Bourdieu's work has become much more influential than Bernstein's in the study of language and education in anthropology. This is likely due to the elaborate conceptual architecture of Bernstein's arguments and their rather specific orientation to social class distinctions.

Early work in the anthropology of language and education

An early set of contributions to the ethnographic study of communication in educational settings is the volume published in 1972, *Functions of Language in the Classroom*, edited by Courtney Cazden, Vera John, and Dell Hymes. In his introduction, Dell Hymes makes explicit that the volume is meant to explore the ethnography of communication in the domain of the classroom. The sections of the volume invoke important distinctions within that paradigm while most of the chapters focus on groups marked by ableism and racial inequality, often framed as ripe for cross-cultural misunderstanding. The first section, for example, is entitled "Perspectives from Nonverbal Communication." The chapter by Paul and Happie Byers offers examples of the ways in which nonverbal communicative elements can add to moments of miscommunication in situations of cross-cultural interaction and prejudice. The next chapter by Aaron Cicourel and Robert Boese considers the case of Deaf students to point out that teachers so often do not apprehend the very language they are teaching as a native speaker would. Especially well represented in other chapters are examples focusing on African American or Native American students and the particular dilemmas they face given that teachers are often unfamiliar with their ways of interacting and communicating. Indeed, the cover of the book's first edition depicts three people sitting around a table. A white teacher is addressing one of three black students. One assumes the children are students because they all hold pencils and have books open in front of them. Hymes's introduction explicitly invokes the mood of hope to underscore that the study of classroom discourse in the vein of the ethnography of communication can shift the focus on the cognitive to the cultural and can reveal that prejudice is based on misunderstanding.

Hugh Mehan's 1979 book entitled *Learning Lessons: Social Organization in the Classroom* was an early and particularly influential effort to account for the classroom as a particular interactional space. Mehan offered detailed examples of discursive interaction from the classroom that showed the pervasiveness of the routine of "initiation," "reply," and "evaluation" (IRE). One person (the teacher) chooses the topic and begins the sequence simultaneously. A student, often identified by the teacher, replies to what was initiated. The teacher then evaluates the student's reply. In the case of a positive evaluation, the teacher can shift the topic. In the case of a negative evaluation, the teacher can search for a different reply. Mehan showed that the classroom is inhabited by people

whose turns at talk, focus of attention, and ability to comment on the utterances of others are presupposed by the particularly salient and differentiated roles of teacher and student. What is to be achieved in the classroom is overdetermined by the students' successful evaluation by the teacher. Later ethnographic work on classrooms and communities drew on Mehan's work to demonstrate that the routine Mehan identifies differs from or even violates the logic of communicative practices of communities in which students with stigmatized identities were raised.

In her *Classroom Discourse: The Language of Teaching and Learning*, initially published in 1988, Courtney Cazden provides an overview and extension of the IRE routine, as well as a review of examples taken from a large number of different scholars' studies of the classroom. Cazden, like Mehan, argues that the IRE routine constitutes what one might call a "traditional" approach to teaching and learning. In the second edition of the book, published in 2001, Cazden notes that there are, increasingly, classrooms wherein what some call "adventurous teaching" occurs ([1988] 2001, 5). Part of what makes teaching "adventurous" is the involvement in some manner of the communicative practices of the students outside of the traditional classroom routine. Such practices can be unfamiliar to teachers and can be stereotyped and distorted pragmatically in mass media and law enforcement discourses. Furthermore, the rise of neoliberal approaches to education emphasizing individual responsibility, testing achievement, and reduced funding for curricular programs that address the needs and talents of students least familiar with the traditional classroom routine has made adventurous teaching less possible. Nevertheless, Cazden argues, the existence of adventurous teaching has made a detailed apprehension of discourse in the classroom newly important: "If the potentialities of classroom discourse, in which students talk more and in more varied ways, are significant for all students, then we have to pay careful attention to who speaks and who receives thoughtful responses" ([1988] 2001, 5).

Language, education, socialization, and the reproduction of inequality

Two monographs were published in 1983 that would become especially influential in the study of language and education, Shirley Brice Heath's *Ways with Words: Language, Life, and Work in Communities and Classrooms* and Susan Phillips's *The Invisible Culture: Communication in Classroom and Community on the Warm Springs Indian Reservation*. Both are rich ethnographies that pay careful attention to practices that are the source of stigma for subordinated groups (see Language Prejudice). The description of such practices requires fieldwork in multiple locations because the practices attain different pragmatic resonance at home and at school. When the practices emerge within educational contexts, they serve to mark the students as different and set them up for characterization as uncooperative, uninterested, or misbehaved. Both authors are careful to describe dominant modes of interaction as particular and hardly inevitable. This allows for the authors to argue that the interpretation of subordinated students' behavior in the context of schooling signals the failure on the part of the school and the educational system more generally to apprehend, much less appreciate,

the communicative lifeways of many students. The students whose practices go misrecognized at the school are, of course, those students who have faced the greatest political-economic deprivations.

In *Ways with Words*, Shirley Brice Heath presents a region of the southeastern United States in the 1970s undergoing a shift from a paternalistic relationship between textile mills and labor to one of downsizing in the face of relocation in the search for corporate profits, on the one hand, and a focus on wages, on the other hand. Whereas African Americans were excluded from industrial work during the period of legalized segregation, they have come to have access to jobs. These jobs have become available, however, just when they have begun to be scarcer, and just as many white youth have begun to look elsewhere, outside of the factory and outside of their places of birth and upbringing, for some degree of social class mobility. Additionally, the end of legal segregation has brought white and African American youth together in school. Heath argues that to understand the ways in which schoolchildren interact in the classroom and the ways in which teachers respond to and reflect on those interactions, one must consider the communicative milieu in which the schoolchildren grew up (see Language Socialization). Heath describes three communities differentiated by communicative practices to make two points. Schoolchildren from the three communities are differently successful in school because the school and the ways of communicating within are based on the practices of only one of the communities. And the practices of the three communities have different ramifications as their children progress from grade to grade encountering school practices.

Roadville is a small, white, working-class neighborhood several miles from Maintown, a small city that has served increasingly as a bedroom community of a much larger city nearby. Parents decorate a separate space for the infant and refer to the infant in the third person in linguistic constructions that speculate on the infant's thoughts and feelings. Parents engage with their children via books and other printed materials (see Reading) and initially emphasize letters, numbers, and questions focusing on the recognition and repetition of elements presented within the materials themselves (see Literacy). Increasingly, this approach is mediated by a notion of the truth whereby reflections on printed materials are judged as true or false. This is especially important in engagements with the Bible, an especially pervasive source of textual reflection in many domains of Roadville life.

Trackton is a small, African American, working-class neighborhood near Maintown. In Trackton, infants experience much less purposeful spatial separation from their parents and adults do not make efforts to set off activities oriented to the infant. Parents do not offer printed materials meant specifically for the growing infant, and adults feel that the child will begin to engage with printed material when the child is ready and capable. Growing children imitate segments of the adult discourse they hear around them, and, gradually, they begin to inhabit the focus of group attention. Children are evaluated by their ability to create an imaginative storyline that maintains the attention and interest of others present.

Maintown is a largely white middle-class city. Printed materials are pervasive in children's lives, throughout the stages of their development. Early on parents begin to urge children to extend aspects of the stories they read beyond the contexts of the

stories and find allusions out in the world. Children begin to signal their recognition that a distinction between the factual and the fictive is important in the creation of their stories. They often borrow aspects from the printed material with which they are familiar in creating their stories. Much of their talk with adults is mediated by their encounters with printed materials. Indeed, Heath reports that a child's expression of interest in talking about books will draw adults away from activities at hand.

Heath notes that the school and teachers' engagements with students are based on Maintown ways of raising children. Engagement with literate materials is paramount and students are encouraged – increasingly as grade levels progress – to engage with texts such that their own interpretations and creations are mediated by the difference between the fictive and the real. In lower grades, children raised in Roadville do not suffer as much in the classroom as children raised in Trackton. Roadville students are able to interact in a context where teachers approach texts as narrative plots, the details of which are to be recognized and recalled. Trackton students, on the other hand, are at a significant disadvantage in the early grades. They vie for turns at talk and use what narrative materials are at hand to create storylines that are imaginative and entertaining. Teachers interpret their behavior as disobedient and unfocused. In middle school, children raised in Roadville begin to suffer for their early socializations to contexts involving printed materials. They experience great difficulty in responding to teachers' prompts to engage with printed materials outside of the context presented by the material itself. The students imagine the results of such requests as deviations from what is true, and give evidence that such interaction with texts is not just unfamiliar, but contradicts the way they have been taught to approach printed materials from a very young age.

The Invisible Culture by Susan Philips (1983) presents the results of ethnographic research among Native American and Anglo communities and classrooms in Oregon in the United States. The book makes the point that people in the two groups are predisposed to different ways of interacting in the classrooms. This is because the Native American and Anglo schoolchildren have experienced different socialization practices before arriving at school. Philips studied two classrooms in which the vast majority of students were Native American and two classrooms in which the vast majority of students were Anglo. The Native American classrooms were in a school located on the Warm Springs Reservation and the Anglo classrooms were in a school in a nearby town.

In the book, Philips brings to bear linguistic anthropological insights about participant structures (see Participant, Role and Status of) to understand the differences she observed. A participant structure depends on the ways a participant signals and demonstrates recognition of features of interaction like utterance boundaries, speaking turn assignments, trajectory of addressee – the person or entity to which an utterance is directed – as well as the ways these features relate to one another. By employing the notion of participant structure, Philips develops an analytic stance different from the ones employed by the students and teachers involved in classroom interaction.

In the classrooms, Philips found that Anglo students readily exhibited recognition of the participant structures by which the classroom operates. The teacher largely initiates turns at talk and largely assigns who is to speak next. Teachers do this with body and gaze (see Gaze) direction as well as with the use of names. Native American students

do not exhibit recognition of the participant structures on which the teacher's actions are based. They speak more slowly and do not signal utterance and turn boundaries in the same way as the Anglo teacher and students. Native American students are not used to having turns assigned to them and are not in the habit of being required to produce an utterance limited to the relatively short amount of time expected by the teacher and the Anglo students. Their upbringing has inculcated a participant structure wherein assignments of turns at talk are not explicitly directed at others. Turns at talk tend to be taken rather than designated, and turns tend to give the speaker as much time as is needed. For these reasons, Philips notes that the Native American students exhibit more talk in group work with fellow students than in interaction with the teacher.

The participant structures of the classroom not only differ from those embodied on the reservation outside of class, but activity in the classroom proceeds without regard to the participant structures to which the Native American students are accustomed. Teachers find the Native American students to be shy or to lack confidence or, worse, to be disinterested in classroom participation (see Attention (and Joint Attention)). Philips takes a critical approach to the educational context in which Native American students find themselves when she points out the disjuncture between the goals of the participant-structure-orchestrating classroom interaction and the outcomes of interaction in the classroom. While the teacher's activities are meant to give everyone the chance to speak and to participate in class, the Native American students are, by and large, predisposed to take up such assignments to speak in the manner expected of them outside of class. Indeed, Philips remarks that it is precisely those Native American students who can get used to the participant structure underpinning classroom interaction who can profit from access to education. The idea that the classroom might be restructured to benefit students whose socialization assumes a different participant structure is never raised in the schools and the connections between discipline, interest, and intelligence are never questioned.

Ways with Words and *The Invisible Culture* are two of the most influential ethnographies considering the relationship between socialization practices and classroom environments. Both books have been cited extensively and both have remained in print for over three decades. Scholars have used and extended their insights to challenge deficit-based accounts of learning. In such accounts, the inability of people from stigmatized or racialized groups to succeed in institutional contexts is derived from their socialization practices rather than from the institution's lack of awareness of their socialization practices. Scholars have used the methods and insights of Heath and Philips to argue that schools can often offer seemingly neutral pedagogical methods and mechanisms of evaluation based on the unit of the individual and not the community. In so doing, school practices can redirect the mechanism of school underperformance and failure away from the interface of home and school for those most in need of attention to socialization histories. James Collins and Richard Blot (2003) provide an extended consideration of the merits and influences of *Ways with Words* in their ethnography of language practice in institutional contexts, and argue that an account of the larger political, economic, and policy shifts occurring during the 1970s in the United States

(and elsewhere) would have increased the book's value as a critical perspective on the ways education interfaces with communities in ways especially detrimental to some.

Recent work on discourse in classrooms and communities

In the last two decades, scholars have provided new methodological and theoretical overviews of the importance of discourse analysis in the classroom, and have offered extended analyses of the development of identities in the classroom over time. Scholars have traced the ways identities that circulate widely in society, on the one hand, and identities that emerge within the spatial and temporal confines of the classroom, on the other hand, resonate across specific moments of discursive activity. Betsy Rymes's *Classroom Discourse Analysis: A Tool for Critical Reflection* was originally published in 2009 and a second edition was published in 2016. The book makes explicit that it is important to consider the relationships between discourse that takes place outside of the classroom and discourse that takes place inside of the classroom. A central analytical construction of the book, "communicative repertoire," is oriented to the difference. Rymes notes that a communicative repertoire is particular to a person and is an embodiment of "an accumulation of habits and norms for communication acquired over a lifetime" (Rymes [2009] 2016, 19). Rymes points out that classroom spaces and the activities often taken for granted there intersect different communicative repertoires in different ways. The intersection can be particularly alienating for some people, especially for members of subordinated or stigmatized groups, and exclusion from classroom practices often results. Rymes, thus, has continued earlier interests in the ways in which members of subordinated groups are often judged as silent, disobedient, or unintelligent by certain routines in the classroom. She argues that a student's particular biography in and out of educational institutions should be understood (by anthropologists, teachers, and students alike) as shaped, in part, by the student's communicative repertoire.

Stanton Wortham's *Learning Identity: The Joint Emergence of Social Identification and Academic Learning* was published in 2006, and the monograph offers a particularly detailed and analytically robust set of reflections on particular moments of classroom discourse. Wortham calls for the analysis of the ways that classroom discourse unfolds over the course of an academic year such that patterns in interaction might reveal how arguments and positions come to be established, oriented to, or decried. Wortham calls for the concomitant analysis of how identities are established for specific students over the course of the year, as well as ways in which such identities resonate with topical aspects of curricular materials and the lesson. The book traces the emergence of the identities of particular students attending a ninth-grade class in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, wherein a history teacher co-taught with an English teacher. Wortham shows that the students' identities emerged differently, and in concert with the ways in which teachers and other students established stereotypes of their demeanor in class vis-à-vis analogies to various aspects of the pedagogical materials. Wortham argues that it is

worth taking pains to point out and analyze linkages between moments of social identification in the classroom because such linkages are tied to students' engagement with cognitive aspects of the curriculum – that is, learning.

Postcolonial language and education

The relationships between language and education are especially complex in nations (see Nation and Nationalism) in which colonial forms of government were once dominant. Whether languages are included in the school curriculum often depends on their role in pre-independence education or their role in the establishment of a postcolonial polity. Whether a language is felt to have a legitimate, relatively standardized disposition often depends on its pre-independence history of engineering (see Language Planning). In postcolonial nations, people have come to see the school, among other institutions, as a place where languages can gain legitimacy. Many political movements have imagined a language's inclusion in the school curriculum to be a chance to legitimize a major feature of a group's identity. And complicating the ties of various languages to relatively standardized forms and identity groups is the continued resonance of languages once firmly associated with colonial governments and infrastructures of communication and rule.

Anthropologists, in particular, have gone to great lengths to demonstrate the ways in which modernist constructions of the nation (see Modernity and Tradition) were rather incompatible with the cultural logics by which people in modern nations interacted. Postcolonial polities have undertaken language engineering projects, and such efforts have typically been underpinned by a number of modernist notions. On the one hand, the adjective "modernist" can describe an ideological disposition that envisions the nation as an entity to be constituted by emblems. A particular collection of emblems, thus, signifies belonging to a particular entity. The existence of a national education system became a generic emblem of the acquisition of modernity, while a language, or a standardized variety of a language, became a more particular emblem of national identity. On the other hand, the adjective "modernist" can differentiate practices, ways of thinking, and people from those felt to be backward. Engagement with technologies thought to be relatively advanced often goes hand-in-hand with constructions of the modern.

In postcolonial polities, the emblematic status of languages in the national educational system is often contentious, not just complicated. This is because national governments have attempted to modernize languages by engineering a relatively standardized form and including it in the educational system. At the same time, however, such languages exist in a larger ecology of languages available at school, and often the set of these languages includes the former colonial language. Languages can begin to acquire ideological dispositions that depend on others, and the qualities of the languages developed as national are often identified in opposition to the qualities of the languages of the former colonial government.

Hindi Is Our Ground, English Is Our Sky: Education, Language, and Social Class in Contemporary India by Chaise LaDousa was published in 2014. The book explores the

ways in which teachers, students, and their guardians are implicated in the distinction between Hindi- and English-medium schools across Hindi-speaking northern India. Multiple languages are part of the curriculum of any school in the region, but languages have also come to represent the institutional identities of schools themselves. The language-medium divide has been shaped by the policies of both the colonial government and the postcolonial government of India, as well as indexical connections between the languages given their use in official domains like school. A language's use in schools, for example, makes that language quite different from languages not found in the curriculum, just as the differences between Hindi and English are focused and magnified by their association with institutions as types. People readily draw on a set of stereotypes to draw contrasts between Hindi- and English-medium schools at the same time that they ignore the fact that many Hindi- and English-medium schools serve as exceptions to those stereotypes. The book shows that the language-medium distinction is particularly salient to parents and students from middle-class homes, as the choice between language mediums is a foregone conclusion for the elite (English-medium) or the poor (Hindi-medium).

Indigenous language and education

Indigeneity, the quality of being original or native, is often related to colonial forms of government and exploitation and the continued relevance of such constructions in postcolonial polities. Language is implicated in the production of indigeneity in some of the same ways as it is implicated in postcolonial identities and politics. Language generally serves as the discursive mechanism for people marked by indigeneity to interact with institutions such as schools, and schools have long been places wherein processes of standardization have been presupposed for legitimate inclusion in the curriculum and participation in certain school environments. Often, a particular language has emerged as partly constitutive of Indigenous identity, and scholars have explored the ways in which language regimentation, legitimation, and revitalization efforts can reveal or create social divisions that are complicated by larger dynamics of the production of class, gender, and racial distinctions in social formations. Such concerns have made the school and the larger educational system particularly fascinating domains in which to consider the ways in which language is implicated in the politics of indigeneity.

Bilingual Education and Language Maintenance: A Southern Peruvian Quechua Case by Nancy Hornberger, published in 1988, is an early and significant sociolinguistic exploration of Indigenous language teaching and reproduction. Specifically, Hornberger explores what is necessary methodologically to account for the relationship between schooling efforts and the reproduction of language learning and use. Early chapters are devoted to a description of the ways in which educational policy in Peru has approached Spanish and Quechua in schools, as well as shifts in those policies. Later chapters provide ethnographic considerations of the community and the two schools in which Hornberger worked. The choice of the schools was purposeful in that one provided a bilingual education program and one did not. Hornberger uses ethnographic insights from the two schools to make the point that language maintenance

efforts are necessarily considered from a point of view outside the logic of the efforts themselves. Indeed, the languages, Quechua and Spanish, at issue in the bilingual program are themselves associated with domains of activity in the community. Hornberger notes that the community's very involvement with those domains is shifting such that the languages are changing in their sociolinguistic significance. Language planning efforts must be considered within the wider communicative ecology of the communities in which schools exist, as well as in the wider policy worlds of the states through which school systems are administered. This is especially true of Indigenous languages, languages that have complex and unequal sociolinguistic resonances with the state and its institutional domains as well as complicated sociolinguistic resonances in other domains.

Another classic ethnography of the ways in which indigeneity in schooling in a post-colonial polity is salient in sociolinguistic relationships and reproduction is Aurolyn Luykx's *The Citizen Factory: Schooling and Cultural Production in Bolivia* (1999). Luykx considers the case of a normal school in a rural area of highland Bolivia in the aftermath of reformist shifts in national educational policy toward an appreciation of Indigenous language. Like Hornberger, Luykx provides an account of the ways that a history of national politics has made for changing school policy with respect to language over time. Luykx stresses the reformist shift in Bolivia toward a multicultural inclusion of Indigenous language in schooling contexts. At the same time, in the context of the normal school meant to prepare teachers for work in schools across (primarily rural) areas of the country, Luykx explores routines both outside and inside the classroom that thwart the shift toward an acknowledgment and use in Bolivian school and society of Aymara, the Indigenous language most students grew up speaking. For example, Aymara achieves representation in the school through a specific course. The teacher finds aspects of the (fluent) students' Aymara deficient given the processes of enregisterment the school context seems to demand. A register is a form of language tied to social uses and purposes, a notion especially salient to the disposition of Indigenous languages in school settings. In the case of the normal school, students find their engagements with a language they know well disorienting and even alienating. Needless to say, students' engagements with Aymara in the normal school are hardly conducive to the multicultural goals underpinning reformist efforts emergent in Bolivian educational policy.

Barbra Meek's *We Are Our Language: An Ethnography of Language Revitalization in a Northern Athabaskan Community* draws explicitly on linguistic anthropological work on language ideology to probe questions about what is necessary for language revitalization (see Language Revitalization) efforts to take place. In order to understand revitalization efforts focused on Kaska in the Yukon Territory of Canada, Meek seeks to understand histories and contexts through which language varieties have been ideologized. She finds that revitalization efforts in relatively formal educational settings create sociolinguistic "disjunctures" for youth. She notes, "While some children are acquiring an Indigenous language passively at home (serving a goal of language revitalization), the institutionalization of the language erases the grammatical and communicative diversity of these family interactions (countering language revitalization efforts)" (2012, xxi). Indeed, people meet linguistic and discursive uses of Indigenous language in relatively

formalized educational contexts that increase rather than decrease uneasiness with and insecurity about the language. Meek asserts that it is crucial to understand the specific material, interactional, and ideological dimensions of language revitalization efforts so that moments of sociolinguistic disjuncture might be avoided.

Minority language and education

Minority languages are those spoken by minority populations in a nation (see Minority Languages). Many scholars have noted that a vast majority of the world's languages are, indeed, minority languages. A language's minority status is often entangled in language ideology with the indigeneity of a language's speakers, but this is not always the case. The revitalization efforts surrounding a minority language are the focus of Alexandra Jaffe's *Ideologies in Action: Language Politics on Corsica* (1999). Especially important to Jaffe's efforts to understand activist revitalization efforts regarding Corsican were the language ideological frames through which people understood the significance of the language. One of the most important insights of the book that points to Corsican's status as a minority language is that people often understand Corsican vis-à-vis Italian and French. Furthermore, Jaffe shows that activists attempted to resist French language domination but did not resist reproducing ways in which the relationship between French and Corsican was structured outside of schools.

Language, education, and migration

Scholars of language and education have also devoted special attention to the lives of immigrants and refugees. Many of the themes that make postcoloniality and indigeneity especially significant to the intersection of language and education also apply to immigrants and refugees. Language policies, schooling practices, and ideas about who belongs to the nation and who does not shape the experiences of immigrants and refugees in particular ways and make for particular intersections with other vectors of identity in terms of race, class, gender, sexuality, etc. In addition, immigrants and refugees face particular burdens. Access to formal education for immigrants and refugees, for example, crucially depends on whether one's manner of arrival fits or does not fit bureaucratic forces beyond one's control. One's very ability to interact with bureaucratic institutions and processes of the state often entail familiarity with particular literacy practices as well as with standardized language varieties. Immigrants and refugees may or may not have access to or be authorized to work with agents of the state, and communication with agents of the state can lead to the evolution of complex social relationships. These relationships can intersect, for example, the immigrant's or refugee's relationships with children in complex ways that themselves can change over time.

Although Puerto Ricans living in New York City are US citizens, their use of Spanish – as well their use of English – can be racialized. They thus become marked by failure, need, and exclusion from the nation (Zentella 1997). Ana Celia Zentella's *Growing Up*

Bilingual: Puerto Rican Children in New York points to studies that demonstrate that maintaining the use of Spanish in a classroom of Spanish speakers improves students' English learning abilities. Such studies are especially important in the current era when national educational reforms are increasingly organized by a monolingual ideology that assumes that English should be the national language of instruction and that students who do not have a command of academic English should develop one in a short period of time. Zentella notes that even school programs in New York City that call themselves bilingual often do not have students engage curricular content in Spanish.

Lesley Bartlett and Ofelia Garcia's *Additive Schooling in Subtractive Times: Bilingual Education and Dominican Immigrant Youth in the Heights* focuses on Gregorio Luperón High School in New York City's Washington Heights for its efforts to avoid the "subtractive" approach to students' communicative and linguistic knowledge that mandates a sole focus on academic registers of English (Valenzuela 1999). Washington Heights is a neighborhood long associated with people from the Dominican Republic, and Luperón primarily serves Dominican newcomers and Dominican children born in the United States. By being committed to developing students' English and Spanish in the content of courses, the school offers the possibility of what Garcia has called "translanguaging," "any pedagogy that intentionally uses two languages flexibly in a bilingual arrangement that promotes bilingualism and biliteracy" (Bartlett and Garcia 2011, 17). Luperón High School, the authors point out, enjoys a New York State provision that some of the exams necessary for graduation can be taken in Spanish. The authors also point out that the benefits to students conferred by the school's bilingual practices are nullified in the monolingual language ideology underpinning the language market outside of working-class jobs.

Monica Heller's *Linguistic Minorities and Modernity: A Sociolinguistic Ethnography* focuses on a school in Toronto associated with the French linguistic minority in Canada in order to trace the ways in which the ideological refractions of a linguistic minority have shifted since the early 1990s. Heller notes that while "Champlain is still thought of as an *oasis culturel*, a francophone island in an anglophone sea, its motto, 'Unity in Diversity', has come to refer mainly to a polyglot, multicultural student body, joined together by their mutually affinity with French, their shared belonging to an international *francophonie*" (1999, 63) (see Language, Globalization, and Colonialism). Corresponding to this shift has been the foregrounding of an ideological connection between language and capital, a commodification of language, and a backgrounding of a connection between language and nation through shared substance, blood. Heller provides a detailed examination of some of the ways in which school practices in and out of the classroom have traditionally helped to consolidate the identity of an elite in the school, but also notes a shift in the ways in which, for example, racially marked immigrants have begun to take part in practices central to identification with the school and its authority.

Immigrants and refugees often arrive in a situation in which traditional schooling is no longer available because they are older than what the school system allows for attendance. Immigrants and refugees often face a double burden. They are in need of educational certification for better labor possibilities, but are also often in need of the language, and especially its academic registers, used in the new schooling system.

Adult education opportunities are hardly universal, and when they are available, they present different burdens to different students. Julia Menard-Warwick's *Gendered Identities and Immigrant Language Learning* (2009) investigates a family literacy center in a working-class area of the San Francisco Bay area, paying special attention to the ways in which gender operated within the lives of the Latin American students. Gender shaped the ways in which migrants experienced their lives, the ways in which they reflected on their work in the literacy center, and the ways in which they sought to make use of their work in the center. Most importantly, many of the students reflected on their language needs and learning desires by noting the importance of contexts in their lives in which bilingual usage is the norm. Menard-Warwick uses the finding that ideologies about gender and language powerfully shape the experiences of students to argue that teachers should try to learn about the linguistic habits of their students outside of the classroom and the curriculum.

Language, education, and youth

A growing number of scholars have begun to probe the ways in which youth (see Youth Language) engage in practices that are sometimes salient and sometimes ignored by those with institutionalized authority figures in school. This should not imply that there is any predictable distinction between aspects of youth practice and institutionalized practices at school. Rather, the work of linguistic anthropologists who have explored the practices of youth gives evidence that schools provide a context for youth activity, to be sure, but that whether and how youth practices interface with classroom discourse or prescriptive discourse disseminated inside and outside of the classroom are questions best explored in ethnographic fieldwork.

Complementing her classic ethnographic analysis of class reproduction in an American high school near Detroit, *Jocks and Burnouts: Social Categories and Identity in the High School* (1989) is Penelope Eckert's *Linguistic Variation as Social Practice: The Linguistic Construction of Identity in Belten High*, published in 2000. Particularly germane to the study of language and education is Eckert's demonstration that peer group differences between jocks and burnouts, underpinned by orientation to social class distinctions and an embrace or a rejection of school authority, correspond to vocalic variations involved in the Northern Cities Chain Shift. Furthermore, the social class of parents is not a good predictor of the student's participation in a peer group. Rather, the school seems to provide a space specific to such groupings and one where linguistic variables take on special resonance in group identification, and, ultimately, social class reproduction. The provision of an arena in which unequal group formation flourished seems very far indeed from the mission of the school: to provide every student a chance to succeed through engagement with school materials and practices.

A school Norma Mendoza-Denton calls Sor Juana High School provides some of the ethnographic setting for her exploration of the discursive dynamics involved in the reproduction of the gang distinction in Northern California that is anchored in the difference between El Norte (the North) and El Sur (the South). Semiotic resources such

as color, hairstyle, musical genre, numbers, and phonetic realizations aid in the constitution and recognition of the girls with whom Mendoza-Denton worked as belonging to one or the other group. The two groups are not the only identities at school, but they are the identities that the police and school officials simplify and criminalize with their decontextualized understandings of gangs and their purpose. Rather, the ethnography explores some of the ways in which gang affiliation affords the engagement with certain gendered qualities that the girls find sorely lacking in the identity categories to which they do not belong. Although *Homegirls: Language and Cultural Practice among Latina Youth Gangs* (2008) is not an ethnography of schooling per se, it is valuable to the sociolinguistic study of education for its demonstration that schools and school officials often derive their understandings of particularly marked students from circulating discourse that misrepresents those students, and that such students may seek affiliation with identity categories outside of school in a search for belonging and agency.

So often in the discursive interaction of youth, linguistic elements that circulate as stereotypes (see Stereotype) of other groups are used to mark coolness, intimacy, or a cosmopolitan disposition. *White Kids: Language, Race, and Styles of Youth Identity* by Mary Bucholtz (2011) reports on fieldwork conducted in the mid-1990s at a school the author calls Bay City High School, located in the San Francisco Bay Area. The book probes the ways in which youth of European American descent engage with stylistic elements in the recreation of identities. Often these stylistic elements are derived from or interpreted with respect to stereotypes of African American Vernacular English, especially among identity groups known as "hip hop," "preppy," and "nerd." One of the most valuable insights of the book is articulated in Bucholtz's claim that "[European American students] all profited from their structural position in the racial order, and many of them, despite considerable differences in their identities, were unified by a shared discourse of white racial marginalization, disadvantage, and danger" (2011, 17). *White Kids* provides detailed transcriptions in which Bucholtz explores the relationships between the linguistic reproduction of youth styles and identities, on the one hand, and the involvement and reproduction of racialized distinctions, on the other hand.

Discursive dynamics among stigmatized youth outside of the relatively official contexts of schooling is of special interest because there, stigmatized youth engage with markers of identity in ways unanticipated in official discourses about them. Angela Reyes takes advantage of a chance to consider moments when first-and-a-half- and second-generation Southeast Asian youth in an afterschool video project in Philadelphia record their own activities and reflect on them. The youth complicate any notion of a unified Asian identity and give evidence that they are aware of the ways in which stereotypes about Asian academic success implicate them in especially stigmatizing ways. Reyes also demonstrates the complex ways with which Southeast Asian youth in the video project engage with highly salient and stereotyped linguistic forms, sometimes associated with Southeast Asian immigrants and sometimes associated with African Americans.

Conclusion

Anthropologists have investigated the classroom as a space wherein communicative practices exhibit social and cultural difference. Anthropologists have also considered the ways in which regional, national, and global spheres matter in the relatively large-scale production of unequal access of students to linguistic varieties and registers used in classrooms. Anthropologists have often considered difference through the lens of equality, informed by the ways classrooms and educational systems have figured in civil rights movements and have been the focus of changing legislation. Equality has also served as a lens through which to understand the movement of people within and across national borders. Social class, ethnicity, race, gender, and indigeneity are just some of vectors of identity relevant to the ways that communicative practices exhibit inequalities in the classroom. Anthropologists have sought to understand the ways in which students fare in the highly orchestrated routines and standardized registers that many pedagogical practices presuppose, and have demonstrated that the pragmatic dimensions of communicative practice in the classroom are often quite particular. This often poses a rather serious dilemma for relatively self-conscious or purposeful efforts of cultural and social reproduction such as that found in language revitalization efforts. In sum, schools and educational systems serve to shape discursive resources as well as to limit students' access to them. Schools and educational systems thus play a dual role in discursive production. They are engines of cultural production and social exclusion.

SEE ALSO: Ervin-Tripp, Susan; Fishman, Joshua

REFERENCES AND FURTHER READING

Bartlett, Leslie, and Ofelia Garcia. 2011. *Additive Schooling in Subtractive Times: Bilingual Education and Dominican Immigrant Youth in the Heights*. Nashville: Vanderbilt University Press.

Bernstein, Basil. 1990. *Class, Codes, and Control,* Volume IV*: The Structuring of Pedagogic Discourse*. London: Routledge.

Bourdieu, Pierre. 1991. *Language and Symbolic Power*. Edited by John Thompson, translated by Gino Raymond and Matthew Adamson. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Bucholtz, Mary. 2011. *White Kids: Language, Race, and Styles of Youth Identity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cazden, Courtney. (1988) 2001. *Classroom Discourse: The Language of Teaching and Learning*, 2nd ed. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Cazden, Courtney, Vera John, and Dell Hymes, eds. 1972. *Functions of Language in the Classroom*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Collins, James, and Richard Blot. 2003. *Literacy and Literacies: Texts, Power, and Identity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cook-Gumperz, Jenny, ed. 2006. *The Social Construction of Literacy,* 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Eckert, Penelope. 1989. *Jocks and Burnouts: Social Categories and Identity in the High School*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Eckert, Penelope. 2000. *Linguistic Variation as Social Practice: The Linguistic Construction of Identity in Belten High*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Heath, Shirley Brice. 1983. *Ways with Words: Language, Life, and Work in Communities and Classrooms*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Heller, Monica. 1999. *Linguistic Minorities and Modernity: A Sociolinguistic Ethnography*. London: Longman.

Hornberger, Nancy. 1988. *Bilingual Education and Language Maintenance: A Southern Peruvian Quechua Case*. Dordrecht: Foris.

Jaffe, Alexandra. 1999. *Ideologies in Action: Language Politics on Corsica*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

LaDousa, Chaise. 2014. *Hindi Is Our Ground, English Is Our Sky: Education, Language, and Social Class in Contemporary India*. New York: Berghahn Books.

Luykx, Aurolyn. 1999. *The Citizen Factory: Schooling and Cultural Production in Bolivia*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Meek, Barbara. 2012. *We Are Our Language: An Ethnography of Language Revitalization in a Northern Athabaskan Community*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.

Mehan, Hugh. 1979. *Learning Lessons: Social Organization in the Classroom*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Menard-Warwick, Julia. 2009. *Gendered Identities and Immigrant Language Learning*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Mendoza-Denton, Norma. 2008. *Homegirls: Language and Cultural Practice Among Latina Youth Gangs*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Philips, Susan Urmston. 1983. *The Invisible Culture: Communication in Classroom and Community on the Warm Springs Indian Reservation*. New York: Longman.

Rampton, Ben. 1995. *Crossing: Language and Ethnicity Among Adolescents*. London: Longman.

Reyes, Angela. 2007. *Language, Identity, and Stereotype Among Southeast Asian American Youth: The Other Asian*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Rymes, Betsy. (2009) 2016. *Classroom Discourse Analysis: A Tool for Critical Reflection*, 2nd ed. New York: Routledge.

Valenzuela, Angela. 1999. *Subtractive Schooling: US Mexican Youth and the Politics of Caring*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Wortham, Stanton. 2006. *Learning Identity: The Joint Emergence of Social Identification and Academic Learning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wortham, Stanton, and Betsy Rymes, eds. 2003. *Linguistic Anthropology of Education*. Westport, CT: Praeger.

Zentella, Ana Celia. 1997. *Growing Up Bilingual: Puerto Rican Children in New York*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.