Some physically-related parts can be avoided or altered with difficulty: the effects of age or asthma are hard to deny, race or gender difficult to change, parenthood not cancellable. Yet even these groups are culturally mediated; the ways that age or sexuality are expressed, the duties of parenthood, the status of particular races. Other parts, however, derive from the way that we have accommodated to and been assimilated by the society in which we find ourselves. To go back to Shakespeare, the whining schoolboy, the lover sighing like a furnace, the justice in fair round belly, all reflect the negotiation of the individual with the social environment to create social identities. A person creates his or her identities as well as being confined by them.

The approach seen in Aneta Pavlenko's chapter reflects then a radical break with earlier SLA research in concentrating on identity in flux. L2 users were often seen as having a fixed set of characteristics as part of the group of L2 users, not as having control over themselves, responding to the pressures around them and having multiple group memberships; variation in linguistic output was seen as failure rather than the normal skill of all speakers in all languages. The poststructuralist approach fits well with the L2 user perspective by starting, not from the native speaker, but from the identities that individuals create for themselves in a second language– how L2 users invest in themselves.

References

Adamson, H. and Regan, V. (1991) The acquisition of community norms by Asian immigrants learning English as a second language: A preliminary study. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 13 (1), 1–22.

Arthur, B., Weiner, M., Culver, J., Young, L. and Thomas, D. (1980) The register of impersonal discourse to foreigners: Verbal adjustments to foreign accent. In D. Larsen-Freeman (ed.) *Discourse Analysis in Second Language Research* (pp. 111–124). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Berry, J.W. (1998) Official multiculturalism. In J. Edwards (ed.) *Language in Canada* (pp. 84–101). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Young, R. (1988) Variation and the interlanguage hypothesis. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 10, 281–302.

Chapter 11

Poststructuralist Approaches to the Study of Social Factors in Second Language Learning and Use

ANETA PAVLENKO

Introduction

While syntactic and psycholinguistic aspects of second language (L2) learning and use are the subject of many competing theories, up until recently social aspects of L2 learning and use have been both under-represented and under-theorised in the literature on second language acquisition (SLA). Some influential SLA volumes and texts (e.g. Archibald, 2000; Ritchie & Bhatia, 1996; Sharwood Smith, 1994) do not even include a separate chapter on social factors. Others present the reader with a laundry list of unrelated social and individual factors or, at best, with a discussion of Schumann's acculturation hypothesis and related sociopsychological studies (e.g. Gass & Selinker, 1994; Spolsky, 1989; for more comprehensive coverage see: Ellis, 1994; Larsen-Freeman & Long, 1991; Mitchell & Myles, 1998). This lack of attention to and interest in social factors is not surprising if we consider the fact that SLA as a field continues to be influenced by the Chomskian view of language as biologically innate rather than a social phenomenon. As a result, until recently, the bulk of research concentrated on the learner's 'black box' and only peripheral attention was paid to 'external factors', which were seen at best as affecting the type and amount of input that goes into the 'box'.

The last decade brought in several new developments in which scholars drew on contemporary poststructuralist theory to understand social influences on L2 learning. The goal of this chapter is to reflect upon the importance of these recent developments for SLA theory from the L2 user perspective. I will start my discussion by outlining the early attempts to theorise social factors in SLA in a sociopsychological paradigm, for three reasons. First of all, it is important to acknowledge that poststructuralist approaches did build on the previous research, even if most of it was criti-

cised for oversimplification. Second, it is equally important to see the criticisms that were raised, in order to examine whether poststructuralist research fares any better. And, third, it is useful to understand the differences between the two approaches, since at times scholars in both frameworks appeal to the same terms, such as 'identity', but use them in very different ways.

Sociopsychological Approaches to L2 Learning and Use

The pioneering studies of sociopsychological variables in L2 learning by Gardner and Lambert (1959, 1972) demonstrated that a positive, statistically significant, relationship could be established between motivation, positive attitudes towards the L2 and its speakers, and the mastery of those aspects of the L2 that are less susceptible to conscious manipulation, such as phonology. Over time, more variables (such as age, gender, ethnicity and social class) were added to the list of sociopsychological factors, culminating in Schumann's (1978, 1986) attempt to theorise the influence of social factors on L2 learning outcomes in his acculturation hypothesis. Schumann's hypothesis suggests that the degree to which the learner (particularly the adult immigrant) acculturates to the target language (TL) group controls the degree to which the learner acquires the TL. In this view, differential language learning outcomes are explained in terms of psychological and social distance between adult learners and the TL group. Another attempt to theorise social factors in L2 learning is Gardner's (1979, 1985) socioeducational model. This model focuses on L2 learning in educational environments and views the learning process both as the acquisition of 'symbolic elements of a different ethnolinguistic community' (Gardner, 1979: 193) and as a re-evaluation of one's self-image and self-identification. The model posits that the social and cultural milieu in which learners grow up determines their beliefs about language and culture (attitude toward the whole learning situation) and, consequently, the extent to which they wish to identify with the TL culture (integrativeness).

Another strand of sociopsychological inquiry examined the relationship between L2 learning and ethnic group membership, drawing on Tajfel's (1974, 1981) theory of social identity. Tajfel viewed social identity as derived from group membership and suggested that, when individuals see their present social identity as less than satisfactory, they may attempt – at times successfully, at times not – to change their group membership in order to view themselves more positively. Based on this view, Giles *et al.* (1977), Giles and Byrne (1982), and Giles and Johnson (1987) developed a theory of ethnolinguistic identity which considers language to be a salient

marker of ethnic identity and group membership. These researchers suggested that members of groups where the in-group identification is weak, in-group vitality low, in-group boundaries open and identification with other groups strong, may assimilate and learn the L2 rapidly. In contrast, members of groups whose ethnolinguistic vitality is high (for instance, strong in-group identification, hard in-group boundaries, etc.) may fear assimilation and achieve a low level of proficiency in the L2, which is seen by them as a threat to their ethnic identity.

While studies conducted within the sociopsychological paradigm did provide some empirical support for the claims made (with the exception of Schumann's acculturation hypothesis), not only did other empirical studies refute the claims, but several critics also raised theoretical objections to sociopsychological approaches, pointing to a number of biases and reductionist assumptions (for example: Husband & Saifullah-Khan, 1982; Norton Peirce, 1995; Syed & Burnett, 1999). I will now outline some of these objections.

(1) It was suggested that the monolingual and monocultural bias underlying the sociopsychological approaches leads them to conceptualise the world as consisting of homogeneous and monolingual cultures, or in-groups and out-groups, and of individuals who move from one group to another. This monolingual bias is most evident in the unidirectional perspective which posits the necessity to abandon one's first language and culture in order to learn the second language and acculturate to the TL group, whether this abandonment is termed 'acculturation' or 'integrative attitude'. As such, sociopsychological approaches do not lend themselves readily to accounting for L2 users who may be members of multiple communities, and do not reflect the complexity of the modern global and multilingual world, where more than a half of the inhabitants are not only either bilingual or multilingual but also members of multiple ethnic, social and cultural communities.

(2) A related problem is the assumption that, in the process of learning a second, or any additional language, L2 learners aspire to acculturate to or to join a particular group. While this may work for particular immigrant settings, in the global picture nothing could be further from the truth, as millions of people learn and use additional languages without giving a thought to those who could be considered a TL group. Taking the example of English in Liberia, Breitborde (1998) found that for the Kru in Monrovia English is becoming a symbol of civilisation and of their own ethnic identity, whereby its use distinguishes them positively from the other ethnic groups. At no point,

however, do these urban Africans think about approximating a group of 'native speakers' of English; rather, they are themselves rapidly becoming native speakers of a new nativised variety of English.

(3) A further problem is the adoption of a reductionist, static and homogeneous view of culture that appears 'to be referring to two specific, identifiable, perpetual cultures – a native culture and a host culture' (Syed & Burnett, 1999: 48). Such an approach does not take into consideration the on-going cultural change in which some cultural patterns (such as those belonging to American popular culture) may be exercising their impact worldwide through the use of the media and the internet. Nor does it consider the bi- or multi-directionality of change whereby various cultures and subcultures continuously influence each other, with host societies also transformed by incoming members.

(4) Another important objection to sociopsychological approaches is the lack of explanatory validity or even insight offered concerning the social causes of particular attitudes, motivations and beliefs. At best, inter-group theorists present us with constructs such as 'identity', 'in-group membership', 'self-identification' or 'accommodation', considering them to be explanatory, whereas in reality these constructs are themselves in need of explanation. For example, Sachdev and Wright (1996) suggest that an in-group self-categorisation by English children causes their negative attitudes toward a variety of Asian languages. What is, however, at the root of that self-identification? What are the ways in which society influences and shapes language attitudes and values?

(5) The causal, unidirectional and stable nature attributed to such constructs as motivation, attitudes, or social distance also creates a problem. As Gass and Selinker (1994), Norton Peirce (1995), and others point out, motivation and social contexts continuously shape and reshape each other, and initial success may prompt a greater investment in the target language, just as a series of failures may result in a diminished learning motivation.

(6) The clear separation assumed in sociopsychological approaches (as well as in much SLA literature in general) between social factors and the individual, or psychological, factors creates a further problem. In reality, many individual factors, such as age, gender or ethnicity, are also socially constituted, so that the understanding and implications of being Jewish or Arab, young or old, female or male are not the same across communities and cultures. Similarly, such seemingly internal and psychological factors as attitudes, motivation or language learning beliefs have clear social origins and are shaped and reshaped by the

contexts in which the learners find themselves. Norton Peirce (1995) argues that early SLA theorists were not successful in dealing with the relationship between the L2 learner and the social world precisely because they lacked a comprehensive theory of social identity that would integrate the learner and the learning context.

(7) With regard to methodology, serious questions were raised about the validity of questionnaires, the key method used in most socio-psychological studies. It was not clear what exactly was measured by the multiple questionnaires that attempted to quantify language attitudes, motivation, acculturation or language proficiency, in particular, when the latter was reduced to self-evaluation. Moreover, it was not clear if questionnaires took adequate account of intervening variables such as the interviewees' desire to look good in the eyes of the researchers.

(8) Many critics also pointed out that most of the studies within the sociopsychological paradigm have been carried out in English-speaking environments in the US, UK and Canada. In other words, they were carried out in environments where most often there was one clearly dominant language and culture (with the exception of some bilingual contexts in Canada). When more research is carried out in other contexts, it may paint a very different picture of the social worlds of L2 users.

(9) The key weakness of the sociopsychological approaches is, however, the idealised and decontextualised nature attributed to language learning, which is presented as an individual endeavour, prompted by motivation and positive attitudes, and hindered by negative attitudes and perceptions. This view led Spolsky (1989: 132) to claim that 'the social context is not directly involved in setting specific conditions for language learning'. In reality, however, no amount of motivation can counteract racism and discrimination, just as no amount of positive attitude can substitute for access to linguistic resources such as educational establishments, work places, or programmes and services especially designed for immigrants and other potential L2 users. The social context, thus, is directly involved in setting positive or negative conditions for L2 learning.

To sum up, I have argued that sociopsychological approaches to SLA do not allow us to theorise social contexts of L2 learning and use, mainly because they neglect 'the historical and structural processes ... which set the parameters of social boundaries' (Williams, 1992: 218). A strong explanatory theory of social contexts in SLA needs to consider the issues of power and

domination in the relationships between majority and minority groups, as well as to find ways of relating the social to the linguistic. As Cameron repeatedly argued, to assume that people behave in certain ways because they are members of certain groups is a correlational fallacy, because the purported explanation is in reality nothing but a descriptive statement:

> The 'language reflects society' account implies that social structures somehow exist before language, which simply 'reflects' or 'expresses' the more fundamental categories of the social. Arguably however we need a far more complex model that treats language as *part of* the social, interacting with other modes of behaviour and just as important as any of them. (Cameron, 1990: 81–82)

Poststructuralist Approaches to L2 Learning and Use

In this section, I will review poststructuralist attempts to theorise social aspects of L2 learning and use. The beginning of poststructuralist inquiry in SLA can be traced to Pennycook's call for a critical applied linguistics for the 1990s, where he argued for the 'need to rethink language acquisition in its social, cultural, and political contexts, taking into account gender, race, and other relations of power as well as the notion of the subject as multiple and formed within different discourses' (Pennycook, 1990: 26). His call was answered in 1995, when Norton Peirce's (1995) study of L2 learning investment of immigrant women in Canada and Rampton's (1995) investigation of code crossing in the multilingual and multicultural UK pioneered new approaches, new questions, new agendas and new terminology in the study of L2 learning and use. Their ground-breaking studies were soon followed by theoretical treatments that attempted to reconceptualise SLA within the poststructuralist framework and by empirical examinations of L2 learning and use conducted in the poststructuralist spirit, both of which will be discussed in this section.

While the terms poststructuralism, postmodernism or critical inquiry serve as an umbrella for various theoretical approaches that have been adopted by different researchers, for purposes of clarity and simplicity this chapter focuses, not on the differences between these various strands (real as they may be), but on the similarities that they share. I see all these approaches as having a common focus on language as the locus of social organisation, power and individual consciousness. Thus, in this chapter, *poststructuralism* is understood broadly as an attempt to investigate and to theorise the role of language in construction and reproduction of social relations, and the role of social dynamics in the processes of additional language learning and use. At the centre of the poststructuralist theory of

SLA are the view of language as symbolic capital and the site of identity construction (Bourdieu, 1991; Gal, 1989; Weedon, 1987), the view of language acquisition as language socialisation (Ochs, 1993; Wenger, 1998) and the view of L2 users as agents whose multiple identities are dynamic and fluid (Lantolf & Pavlenko, 2001; McKay & Wong, 1996; Norton Peirce, 1995; Pavlenko, 2000). This theory allows us to examine how linguistic, social, cultural, gender and ethnic identities of L2 users, on the one hand, structure access to linguistic resources and interactional opportunities and, on the other, are constituted and reconstituted in the process of L2 learning and use. In what follows, I will discuss three key aspects of poststructuralist approaches to the study of social factors in SLA: the view of language, the view of learning and the view of L2 learners.

Language as symbolic capital and a site of identity construction

This section outlines ways in which language is theorised in the poststructuralist framework: as a collection of discourses, as symbolic capital and as a site of identity construction and negotiation. I will also discuss how these views allow us to theorise L2 learning outcomes.

The view of language in the poststructuralist paradigm differs significantly from that espoused in other theoretical frameworks. Going beyond the traditional views of language as consisting of grammar, phonology and the lexicon, or of language as an ethnic identity marker, poststructuralism views language as an array of discourses imbued with meaning. In other words, while the traditional view of language assumes a chain of signs without a subject, produced and seen from an 'objective' position or from nowhere in particular, 'discourses' are viewed as 'practices which form the objects of which they speak' (Foucault, 1972: 49) and serve to reproduce, maintain or challenge existing power and knowledge structures. Discourses may develop around specific topics, such as gender, class or linguistic competence, and compete with each other, creating distinct and often incompatible versions of reality.

Poststructuralist inquiry underscores the idea that not all languages, discourses or registers are equal in the linguistic marketplace: some are 'more equal than others'. Many poststructuralist linguists build on Bourdieu's (1991) view of linguistic practices as a form of symbolic capital, which can be converted into economic and social capital. In this view, the value of a particular linguistic variety (such as a standard or a vernacular form), or a particular linguistic practice (such as literacy) derives from its ability to provide access to more prestigious forms of education and desired positions in the workforce or on the social mobility ladder. The view of language as symbolic capital has a significant advantage over the

notion of 'instrumental motivation', as it allows us to link the individual and the social, tracing the process by which particular linguistic varieties and practices become imbued with values or devalued in the linguistic marketplace. Current research suggests that the key role in the process of value assignment is played by the socioeconomic factors and by ways in which institutional practices legitimise or stigmatise various language varieties. Several recent studies analyse the ideologies underlying representations of languages and ethnicities in discourse, unmasking racist underpinnings of particular scientific, media and educational discourses that discriminate against minority and non-native speakers (Gal, 1989; Heller, 1999; Lippi-Green, 1997; McKay & Wong, 1996). Lippi-Green's (1997) work in particular exposes a number of ways in which ideological underpinnings function in institutional practices, including Disney films which consistently portray positive and attractive characters as speakers of socially mainstream varieties of English and negative characters as speakers of stigmatised varieties. Her study also demonstrates real-world consequences of monolingual biases that create fruitful conditions for job and other forms of discrimination to work against speakers of particular language varieties and speakers with 'accents' that others claim difficult or impossible to comprehend. In this way, poststructuralist work recasts the notion of language attitudes as language ideologies, highlighting their socially derived and dynamic nature, and enabling social critique, resistance and change.

Language in the poststructuralist framework is viewed not only as symbolic capital but also as a site of identity construction. *Identities* are seen as constructed by and in discourses that supply the terms by which identities are expressed (identity performance) and assign differential values to different identities or subject positions. Subject positions, in turn, refer to the intersection of factors that position individuals as single welfare mothers, Chicana lesbians, inner-city youth or middle-class accountants, and entail age, gender, sexuality, class and race, as well as other factors that influence the ways in which we are perceived by others. The subject position is not a stable entity, however: individuals may be collaborating in as well as resisting their own positioning and are continuously involved in the processes of producing and positioning selves and others (Davies & Harré, 1990). Multilingual contexts are particularly fraught with the tensions of identity politics whereby many individuals experience a perpetual conflict between self-chosen identities and others' attempts to position them differently. Thus, it is not surprising that some scholars view all instances of language use in multilingual contexts as 'acts of identity' (Le Page & Tabouret-Keller, 1985; Tabouret-Keller, 1997).

The view of language as a site of identity construction has important implications for theorising L2 learning outcomes. Poststructuralist scholarship views the outcomes as influenced by individuals' identities in two important ways. On the one hand, as will be demonstrated in the discussion of language socialisation, L2 users' subject positions, in particular race, ethnicity, class and gender, mediate their access to linguistic resources available in the L2. On the other hand, as will be discussed later, their agencies and investments in language learning and use are shaped by the range of identities available to them in the L2. At times, the L2 discourses available to L2 users may provide them with unique means of self-representation that prompt them to cross boundaries and assimilate to the new communities or to become members of multiple communities. In other contexts, L2 learners may opt for constructing new and mixed linguistic identities. Yet in other situations, the L2 users may see the new subject positions as unacceptable or incompatible with those they occupied previously. This conflict often occurs in immigrant contexts, where mature adults may suddenly find themselves positioned as incompetent workers or parents (Blackledge, 2000; Norton, 2000). In this case, their desire to acquire the symbolic capital afforded by the new language may be in conflict with their resistance to the range of identities offered to them by that language. This situation may negatively influence any attempts at learning, and learners may limit their L2 learning to the basic proficiency level and refuse to modify their behaviour and reconstruct their identities. Or they may stop attending language classes despite the fact that they realise the importance and value of the new language. Woolard (1985), Gal (1989) and Heller (1992) suggest that, in order to theorise the apparent contradiction between accommodation and resistance to symbolic hegemony, we need to revise and expand Bourdieu's (1991) view of language and to acknowledge that in many contexts minority language speakers resist symbolic domination. Similarly, poststructuralist SLA scholarship points out that, in cases where legitimate identities cannot be fashioned through the second language, L2 learning may be halted despite the high symbolic value of the L2.

The view of language outlined above has clear implications for linguistic competence, which has to entail more than competence in phonology, morphosyntax, lexicon or pragmatics. Norton Peirce (1995) and Miller (1999, 2000) point out that Bourdieu's (1991) view of linguistic competence as 'the power to impose reception' allows us to expand the notion of L2 competence to include 'the right to speak' or, in Miller's terms, 'audibility', which is crucial for a successful learning outcome.

In sum, I suggest that the poststructuralist view of language allows for a more nuanced, complex and context-sensitive understanding of contem-

porary multilingual realities in which all language users have at their disposal multiple means of expressing themselves. Recasting the notion of language attitudes as ideologies allows researchers to examine the discursive construction and functioning of ideologies, to link individual attitudes and belief systems to larger societal processes, and to argue against particular ideologies of language and selfhood seen as biased, racist, discriminatory and harmful. Recasting the notion of identity from unitary and stable into multiple and dynamic allows researchers to examine how identity options afforded by the L2 influence learners' choices and learning trajectories. Finally, the view of language as simultaneously a form of symbolic capital and a site of identity construction allows researchers to theorise conflicts inherent in L2 learning and use, and to expand the notion of L2 competence to include 'the right to speak' and 'the power to impose reception'.

L2 learning as language socialisation

Just as they view language as a social phenomenon and L2 users as socially constituted beings, poststructuralist approaches reconceptualise L2 learning as an intrinsically social – rather than simply cognitive – process of socialisation into specific communities of practice, also referred to as 'situated learning' (Lave & Wenger, 1991; Ochs, 1993; Wenger, 1998). Many researchers argue that 'second language socialisation' is a more accurate description of the process by which individuals not only internalise a particular body of knowledge but become culturally competent members of a particular community (Bremer *et al.*, 1996). At the same time, it is not a one-way process of blind accommodation, but one in which positionings are negotiated between novices and more competent members of a particular community. This section focuses on describing two areas in the study of L2 socialisation: (a) examination of language ideologies and institutional practices that may facilitate or block access to linguistic and interactional resources, and (b) investigation of the process of internalisation of particular discourses available for appropriation by newcomers.

The fact that interaction is crucial for L2 learning has long been accepted in the field of SLA, and became the cornerstone of interactionist approaches to the study of L2 learning. Poststructuralist inquiry confirms the importance of interaction, at the same time finding a number of faults with how interaction has been conceived. Many scholars criticise interactionist approaches for the lack of sensitivity to social contexts and participants' concerns (Firth & Wagner, 1997), for 'premature and over-simplistic attempts at generalisation within and across learners groups' (Mitchell & Myles, 1998: 188), and, most importantly, for equating access to interactional opportunities with motivation (Norton Peirce, 1995). They point

out that, to date, interaction in mainstream SLA research has been explored mainly in language classrooms, rather than in non-instructional settings, and through quasi-experimental designs, rather than natural observation. Longitudinal ethnographic studies conducted in the poststructuralist spirit suggest that no amount of classroom instruction can replace spontaneous interaction in the target language (Miller, 1999, 2000; Moore, 1999; Norton Peirce, 1995). Most importantly, poststructuralist inquiry underscores the idea that unlimited access to linguistic resources and interactional opportunities should not be taken for granted in the study of SLA. It also demonstrates that this access is mediated by the L2 users' gender, race, ethnicity, age, class, social status and linguistic background (for further discussion, see Pavlenko, 2000).

To begin with, some target language speakers may simply refuse to interact with L2 users, perceived by them as incompetent communicators. For instance, a Bosnian ESL student in Australia states: 'So all these Australian people, they are nice but like, now they really won't, you know, talk to you' (Miller, 1999: 157). Her feelings are echoed by a Japanese student learning English in Canada: '... we want desperately to get into the mainstream, but we can't because Canadians don't allow us and also because we know that they look down on us and despise us' (Kanno, 2000a: 7). One of her Canadian classmates even yelled at her: 'Are you deaf or ESL?' (Kanno & Applebaum, 1995: 43). This linguistic gatekeeping is not restricted to English-speaking contexts: as Siegal (1996) points out, Japanese may refuse to interact with non-Asians in Japanese; moreover, even when they do so, they may not provide the necessary feedback about instances of inappropriate pragmatic usage.

Miller's (2000) ethnographic study of ESL students' socialisation into the mainstream in an Australian high school demonstrates that opportunities for interaction may also be mediated by race. It appears that white, often fair-haired, Bosnian ESL students assimilate quickly, appropriating a range of discourses in English and establishing friendships with the English-speaking students, while dark-haired Chinese-speaking students remain isolated from the mainstream. The Chinese speakers in the study felt discriminated against, because in their perception neither their peers nor their teachers acknowledged their legitimacy as L2 users of English in the same way that they acknowledged the legitimacy of their European immigrant classmates, who physically resemble Australians. One of the students, Nora, wrote in her diary: 'I just don't know why the teachers always likes forniger, they always like white skin, gold hairs?' (Miller, 2000: 87). Race in conjunction with gender appears to have limited the interactional opportunities of Misheila, an African-American student on a

study trip to Spain (Talburt & Stewart, 1999). She found herself consistently singled out and sexually harassed by Spanish men, and this, in turn, provoked a negative reaction in her toward Spanish and its speakers. Polanyi (1995), Siegal (1996) and Twombly (1995) describe similar reactions to behaviour that is perceived as sexual harassment in female American students studying abroad, respectively, in Russia, Japan and Costa Rica. Polanyi (1995) links sexual harassment to American women's growing reluctance to interact with Russians and to their subsequent low performance on the Russian Oral Proficiency test, on which male students, who did not experience similar problems, outperformed the females.

Other ways in which identities structure interactional opportunities for L2 users include age, social status and class. Age appears to have limited opportunities for social interaction for Antonio, an older ESL learner from Salvador, who was surrounded by much younger kids in an Australian high school (Miller, 1999). Low social status was found to disempower immigrants in Europe and Canada, limiting their opportunities to interact with interested and friendly interlocutors (Bremer et al., 1996; Heller, 1999; Norton Peirce, 1995). Heller (1999) emphasises that most of the time the factors mediating access to linguistic resources act in combination. Her own ethnographic study of a French-language school in Ontario demonstrates that the most underprivileged students are older female immigrants who have most difficulty gaining access to English. Willett (1995) underscores the notion that class and gender mediate opportunities even for the youngest L2 learners. She studied L2 socialisation of four 7-year old ESL children in a mainstream classroom, and found that the combined effects of differences in boys' and girls' peer cultures and the seating arrangements (which were designed to keep the boys apart but allowed the girls to sit together) favoured the three female learners. The friendship between three ESL girls allowed them to collaborate and support each other, thus earning a high status in the girls' subculture and the status of 'good learners' in the eyes of the teacher. In contrast, the working-class Mexican-American boy, Xavier, was seated separately from other boys in the classroom and was not allowed to get out of his seat to get help from his bilingual friends. As a result, he had to rely on adults for help, thus earning the status of a needy child, unable to work independently. The school personnel also explicitly stated that children from the *barrio* like Xavier were semilingual and that their parents were unable to help their children academically. As a result, though all four children scored the same on the Bilingual Syntax Measure, the three girls were allowed to exit from the ESL class because of their reputation as independent workers and middle-class students, while Xavier was forced to continue with ESL instruction.

Recent studies paint a comprehensive picture of gatekeeping in educational contexts, which ranges from preferences for white European immigrant students (McKay & Wong, 1996; Miller, 2000), to insufficient feedback (Siegal, 1996), to physical arrangements in classrooms and cafeterias that separate students by gender, race, language or ethnic background (Kanno, 2000a; McKay & Wong, 1996; Miller, 2000; Toohey, 1998; Willett, 1995). Moore's (1999) ethnographic study of French language education in a Cameroonian village points to another possible source of gatekeeping, located in the discontinuity between community beliefs about language learning and use and classroom practices. The village in question is multilingual, and productive competence in five or six languages is not unusual. This multilingual competence is considered normal and essential by the villagers, who use the communicative resources of their multiple languages in context-appropriate ways, which at times may include codeswitching. Neither aptitude nor age are considered to be a factor in second language learning, and SLA is viewed simply as a function of exposure and use. As a result of being exposed to multiple languages from birth, local children bring with them to the classroom considerable experience with second language learning and use, and a great motivation to learn French, seen as the language of socioeconomic advancement in francophone Africa. In interviews with the researcher, the students stressed that opportunities to use the language informally with more expert family members and peers, to ask questions, to make errors and to fall back on a stronger language are crucial for successful language learning. At the same time, their French language instruction minimises opportunities for informal interaction, prohibits the use of any other language but French and does not provide the students with sufficient opportunities for participation and interaction. As a result, students rarely succeed in learning French, and teachers blame their failure on low motivation and lack of parental commitment.

Gatekeeping practices in encounters between majority and minority speakers are examined in depth by Bremer et al. (1996). They describe the results of a longitudinal study, funded by the European Science Foundation, of adult L2 learning by migrant workers in several Western European countries (another part of this project is described by Perdue in Chapter 5 of this volume). In the study, the authors focus on unequal institutional encounters between TL speakers and L2 users, and identify a number of explicit and implicit linguistic strategies employed by TL speakers for gatekeeping purposes. In some cases, majority speakers refuse to acknowledge immigrant L2 users as legitimate speakers. Such is the case of a Chilean immigrant in France, Berta, who reported an interaction with the surgeon who had operated on her daughter after an accident at school. As

she arrived at the hospital past visiting time, the surgeon told her that she should leave at once, and did not tell her anything about her daughter's health. Berta interpreted his behaviour as a refusal to consider her as a legitimate speaker and as the mother of the injured child. Frustrated and emotional, she was unable to find French words to protest against such behaviour.

More subtle linguistic strategies were used by the job counsellors in a number of counselling sessions with immigrant interlocutors. These counsellors either spoke too rapidly, or, when speaking slowly, produced long and complex sentences, with no clear pauses or other prosodic cues. They also produced several indirect questions and requests that did not facilitate understanding by the interlocutors with low levels of L2 proficiency. The authors argued that more attention should be paid to power relations between the interlocutors and to the role played by native speakers in miscommunication in encounters between native speakers and non-natives. Put together, the above studies suggest that access to linguistic resources is crucial for successful L2 learning and use. Kouritzin (2000) notes insightfully that this access cannot be simplistically reduced to availability of language classes and other linguistic resources. Her own and Norton's (2000, 2001) examinations of various social contexts in which L2 learning and interaction between immigrant women and Canadians take place demonstrate that even intensive instruction in various aspects of TL is of little value when opportunities to interact with TL speakers are limited.

More recently, a few researchers have also inquired which discourses of a particular community are available for self-representation and for appropriation by beginners in childhood (Orellana, 1994; Willett, 1995) and in adulthood (Pavlenko, 1998; Pavlenko & Lantolf, 2000). In doing so they were guided by Bakhtinian notions of heteroglossia and appropriation that allow for L2 learning to be seen, not only as a process of creative construction of interlanguage, but also as a process of internalisation of others' voices and of 'bending' of these voices to the speakers' own purposes (Norton & Toohey, in press). The analysis by Pavlenko (1998) and Pavlenko and Lantolf (2000) of autobiographies of adults who became writers and scholars in their L2 demonstrates that many of these L2 users describe their L2 learning as the process of appropriation and internalisation of the voices of those around them, often friends and close partners.

The process of appropriation is not limited to adults, as argued in Orellana's (1994) ethnographic study of three 3-year-old Spanish-speaking children who recently moved to the US and started attending a bilingual kindergarten. She found that, while the children spoke Spanish to each other most of the time, they switched to English in play-acting activities

whenever they pretended to be someone else or impersonated characters from popular children's culture, such as Mickey Mouse, Peter Pan, the Little Mermaid, Superman, Supergirl, Spiderman, the Ninja Turtles and Barbie. One of the children, Carlos, also stated (in Spanish) that when he grows up he will speak only English because ... *los Ninja Turtles hablan ingles* ('the Ninja Turtles speak English'). Like no other research, Orellana's study ingeniously demonstrates how symbolic dominance is transmitted by society to its youngest members: 'English is the language of the strongest and most invincible creatures in these children's world' (Orellana, 1994: 188). Appropriating the voices of superheroes allows these children to represent powerful identities, thus, initiating the process of 'becoming the other' in a society that doesn't value bilingualism or the Spanish language. This study clearly shows the social consequences of the media constructions of language and identity analysed in Lippi-Green's (1997) study.

Willett (1995) shows that, while the ESL children she studied also engaged in linguistic experimentation, many of the utterances in their first year of English study can be traced back to regular classroom phrases used by their teachers, teachers' aides and peers fluent in English and to the text used in the classroom. The language these students internalise is also unique to their own positioning within the community. Thus, Xavier first acquired the highly public and sometimes crude language that other boys used to respond to teachers' elicitations, while the girls never repeated the crude utterances used by the boys. Together, these studies suggest that even the youngest learners don't internalise random linguistic items, rather they attend to and appropriate the most powerful discourses in their immediate environment. Toohey's (1998) work puts an interesting spin on the story of appropriation, however, demonstrating that in some contexts children may be discouraged from and even punished for appropriation of others' words, based on the monologic ideology of language, which views words as individually owned rather than as communal resources.

To sum up, I argue that poststructuralist studies, which see L2 learning as a process of socialisation rather than creative construction or interlanguage development, provide new ways of framing the interaction between social contexts and learning processes, which can be productively combined with more linguistically and cognitively oriented interactionist approaches in SLA. In particular, they point to the importance of considering how access to linguistic and interactional resources is mediated by non-native speaker status, race, gender, class, age and social status, and to ways in which discourses appropriated by L2 learners are linked to power and authority.

L2 users as agents

Finally, poststructuralist inquiry in SLA not only reframes the view of language and the learning process, but also reconceptualises the view of the learners. Previously viewed as only minimally social recipients of input and producers of output, poststructuralist L2 users are individual agents whose multiple identities are subject to change over time. Norton Peirce succinctly summarises the shift from the sociopsychological to poststructuralist view of individual L2 users:

> whereas humanist conceptions of the individual – and most definitions of the individual in SLA research – presuppose that every person has an essential, unique, fixed, and coherent core (introvert/extravert; motivated/unmotivated; field dependent/field independent), poststructuralism depicts the individual as diverse, contradictory, and dynamic; multiple rather than unitary, decentered rather than centered. (Norton Peirce, 1995: 15)

The present section, therefore, will first outline the differences between the two views of language learners and then discuss ways in which 'agency' and 'investment' have come to replace 'motivation' in the study of L2 learning outcomes.

Two main differences distinguish poststructuralist conceptualisations of L2 users from those offered in the sociopsychological paradigm. To begin with, poststructuralism allows the researchers to conceptualise and examine identities that are much more complex than simply those of L1 and TL speakers. A good example of this complexity can be found in Japanese returnees, known as *kikokushijo*. These are students who return to Japan after a prolonged sojourn abroad and oftentimes display verbal and non-verbal behaviours that are perceived as different from the norm. For instance, in Japanese situations where a careful and subtle gauging of everyone's preference is the preferred mode of creating a group consensus, they may state their preferences clearly and explicitly. Similarly, when everyone is quietly writing down the teacher's words, they may be actively raising hands, asking questions, and voicing opinions. A closer examination shows, however, that it is an oversimplification to say that *kikokushijo* became Westernised. In a longitudinal narrative study, Kanno (2000a, 2000b) followed the linguistic and cultural development of four *kikokushijo* students first in Canada, and later during the readjustment period in Japan through frequent interviews, letters, and e-mail exchanges. She found that the students' relationship with their languages was much more complex than the one captured in the native language vs. target language dichotomy.

Both in Canada and in Japan the students saw the majority language as a form of symbolic capital that ensured their participation in the local society while their minority language served as an emblem of their uniqueness. Thus, in the North American context most students thought of their English as a handicap that positioned them as secondary citizens. In turn, in Japan they found themselves to be by far the best speakers of English around and, as a result, redefined their relationship with English: 'they started to claim ownership over English and the sociocultural world that goes with it. In Japan, English became *their* language' (Kanno, 2000a: 11). Kanno's work underscores the importance of considering a range of language learning trajectories in order to capture the complexity of L2 users' dynamic relationship with their multiple languages. It also demonstrates once again how the views of language as a form of symbolic capital and as a site of identity construction could be combined to explain the conflicts in the process of L2 learning and socialisation.

The second feature that distinguishes the two approaches is the role assigned to human agency. While various sociopsychological theories view L2 learners as members of homogeneous groups and as passive recipients of input and output, poststructuralist L2 users are portrayed as agents in charge of their own learning. Human agency is the key factor in their learning: in many cases they may decide to learn the second, or any additional, language only to the extent that it allows them to be proficient, without the consequences of losing the old and adopting the new ways of being in the world (Lantolf & Pavlenko, 2001). An individual's will and choice are only part of the story, however, as agencies are always co-constructed. First, they are shaped by particular sociocultural environments, and, second, they are co-constructed with those around the L2 users; thus, individuals may act upon their wishes only if their present environments allow for such agency. As Bremer *et al.* (1996) clearly demonstrate, no matter how much some migrant workers in Western Europe may want to practice their L2 in conversational interaction, if their attempts are continuously rejected, they will not be able to learn the language this way.

McKay and Wong's (1996) study underscores the dynamic nature of agency whereby investments are selective and may shift over time. In a two-year-long ethnographic study, the researchers traced the linguistic and social development of four Mandarin-speaking students in a Californian junior high school. They found that, while all four students realised the importance of learning English, they had invested differently in different linguistic areas, and shifted their investment over time. For instance, Michael, who achieved significant gains in oral fluency, did not invest similarly in written English, and, as a result, was held back from the mainstream

classes. The researchers suggest that, as an excellent athlete and a popular friend (to both Chinese and non-Chinese), Michael was satisfied in his search for self-representation and did not feel further compelled to perfect his academic writing skills. In contrast, Brad, who initially appeared invested in all four skills, did not manage to develop identities that allowed him to feel competent, appreciated and valued as a social being. As a result, he suffered a downward trajectory in his English learning and started misbehaving in and out of school. McKay and Wong's (1996) study is exemplary in that the researchers managed to link a very detailed discussion of discourses that shaped the agencies and investments of the four students with the discussion of the students' linguistic development assessed through oral and writing samples. In a similar vein, Heller's (1999) ethnography explores how the discourses of *francophonie internationale*, class and gender shape institutional practices and language learning outcomes in a Canadian school. Because the new vision of French positions it as a valuable form of linguistic capital rather than as a dimension of individual identity, it is academically successful middle-class males who are most likely to become bilingual in the way envisaged by school. In contrast, working-class speakers of vernacular Canadian French are marginalised by the discourses of *francophonie internationale* and oftentimes stop speaking French at school altogether.

The view of agency as both individual and social is in agreement with the general shift in poststructuralist SLA inquiry from the notions of individual 'attitudes', 'motivation' and 'personality' to socially constituted 'ideologies', 'investment', 'agency' and 'identity'. Norton Peirce (1995), who pioneered this shift, provided several examples of how the notion of 'investment' can capture the complexity of the students' sociocultural histories that was not easily captured through the construct of motivation. While instrumental motivation is a fixed personality trait, investment refers to the complex, socially and historically constructed and dynamic relationship of the learners to the target language and their sometimes ambivalent desire to learn and to practice it (Norton Peirce, 1995; Norton, 2000). The learners hope that this investment may yield a return and give them access, not only to material resources, such as capital goods, real estate and overall financial success, but also to symbolic resources such as education, literature, media or friendships. Thus, instead of asking whether the L2 user has instrumental or integrative motivation, we can start asking more nuanced questions about the ways in which the L2 user's investment in a particular language was shaped, and the ways in which it is being reshaped by his or her present engagement with the language and its speakers.

In sum, the poststructuralist view of L2 users favours the notion of co-

constructed agency as crucial in explaining language learning outcomes. The notions of agency and investment are also seen as dynamic. Thus, as time goes by, the L2 users' investment in their L2 may change, at times leading to higher investment and successful appropriation of new discourses (Norton, 2000; Pavlenko, 1998; Pavlenko & Lantolf, 2000), and at other times to withdrawal and plateauing or even attrition (Heller, 1999; McKay & Wong, 1996; Norton, 2001).

Advantages of poststructuralist approaches

In this section, I will argue that, compared with the sociopsychological approaches, poststructuralist approaches provide a more context-sensitive way of theorising social impact on L2 learning and use. They also appear to avoid a number of problems and biases discussed earlier:

(1) Predicated on the acknowledgment of multiplicity, poststructuralist approaches appear to be well equipped for theorising social aspects of SLA, as they allow SLA researchers to avoid monolingual and monocultural biases, to examine the multilingual reality of the contemporary world, and to see all individuals as users of multiple linguistic resources and as members of multiple communities of practice. Thus, researchers can fruitfully examine complex situations in which transient L2 users move between different contexts or create hybrid identities, rather than 'stay put' in the TL environment and assimilate to the TL group.

(2) Moving away from ethnocentric and multicultural biases toward diversity and multiplicity allows researchers to examine L2 users as legitimate speakers in their own right, rather than as failed native-speakers. A perfect example is Japanese returnees or *kikokushijo* (Kanno, 2000a, 2000b), who do not easily fit into the simplistic NS/NNS dichotomies painted by earlier research and, like other bilinguals and L2 users, cannot and should not be judged by monolingual and monocultural yardsticks.

(3) While sociopsychological approaches theorise cultures as singular and stable, and individuals as making transitions and acculturating to the dominant culture, poststructuralist approaches recognise complex stratification in all societies and communities and acknowledge a range of, possibly multicultural, communities in which L2 users may seek membership. At times, these multiple memberships may coexist rather than be mutually exclusive as posited in the sociopsychological paradigm. This approach also recognises that, in the process of L2 learning, L2 users may be creating new and distinct linguistic and

ethnic identities, or even communities, that had not existed previously and where for a while no one may be a 'native speaker' of a particular language variety. As such, they allow researchers to ask new and more specific questions about particular communities that L2 users may have, seek, or resist memberships in.

(4) The use of social theory contributes towards the interpretive validity of poststructuralist scholarship. No longer satisfied with the deterministic statement that 'individuals use language to express their social identity', poststructuralist research demonstrates that languages delineate and constitute identities of the speakers, at times even despite the speakers' intentions. Bourdieu's (1991) view of language provides a powerful theoretical framework that allows the SLA researchers to examine and explain the functioning of various language ideologies and social processes that shape individual beliefs and behaviours. In doing so, they theorise social context in ways that were lacking in the previous studies of motivation and attitudes. Recasting language attitudes and language learning beliefs as ideologies, poststructuralist inquiry provides an array of answers to questions that went unanswered in the sociopsychological inquiry, in particular, illuminating the socially constructed nature of beliefs previously seen as individual. Thus, the negative attitudes of English schoolchildren toward Asian languages that were elicited in Sachdev and Wright's (1996) study would no longer be explained through a fuzzy and ultimately non-explanatory self-identification construct. Rather, they would be explained through the ways in which everyday social practices in Britain (particularly the media and educational environments), present Asian languages as inferior, and position their speakers as illegitimate and incompetent members of the white middle-class society (Blackledge, 2000; Leung *et al.*, 1997; Rampton, 1995: 325 on images of British Asian pupils in educational texts). Poststructuralist theory also allows us to account for ambiguities and complexities in the learning process. For instance, it explains the pushes and pulls that may exist between an L1 seen as linked to the user's preferred identity and the L2 seen as symbolic capital but also as imposing an identity that the user resists. The concerns with authority and the speaker's right to speak and the power to impose reception allow the researchers to theorise not only crossings between speech communities, but, more generally, acquisition of new discourses by all language users, especially disempowered and minority members who may be struggling for access to discourses of power and legitimacy. As such, poststructuralist approaches allow us to explain

not only regularities in L2 learning and use but also irregularities that at times appear as challenges to particular meanings and resistance to particular practices.

(5) Recasting motivation as investment allows the researchers to examine how individual investments are shaped and reshaped in particular social contexts. Several studies discussed above demonstrate that individual learners in the same social contexts may have distinct experiences as a result of power relations of gender, race and class, which, in turn, may shape different investments, learning trajectories and, ultimately, outcomes. The notion of investment is also sensitive to the fact that different learners invest selectively in different skills.

(6) By no longer assuming a conventional distinction between the social and the individual, poststructuralist approaches theorise ways in which individual subject positions are implicated in societal relations of power. This attention to the links between the social and the individual has led to the development of new approaches to linguistic interaction that see access to linguistic resources as problematic, and examine various gatekeeping ideologies and practices linked to ethnicity, gender, class and race.

(7) Poststructuralist approaches also provide the field of SLA with alternative methodologies for examining L2 learning and use. Unlike sociopsychological studies, which favoured surveys, questionnaires and quasi-experimental designs, poststructuralist investigations favour longitudinal ethnographic studies that examine both the learner language itself and the social contexts of its learning and use. Poststructuralist enquiry significantly expands the SLA repertoire and provides crucial data on learners' actual verbal and non-verbal behaviours in instructional and non-instructional contexts. Three aspects of these methodological approaches are particularly appealing: (a) the insistence on collecting real and, most importantly, longitudinal data; (b) the insistence on the 'emic', that is to say, participant-relevant, view of phenomena, as a result of which the L2 learners' and users' voices and opinions, gathered through interviews and the study of diaries and autobiographies, are heard on a par with those of the researchers; (c) the broadening of the scope of enquiry that at present takes place, not only in English-speaking contexts with one clearly dominant language, but all over the world where additional languages are learned and used – Eastern and Western Europe (Bremer *et al.*, 1996; Polanyi, 1995; Talburt & Stewart, 1999), Asia (Kanno, 2000a, 2000b; Siegal, 1996), and Africa (Breitborde, 1998; Moore, 1999).

(8) The extension of poststructuralist enquiry in language learning and

use to non-Western contexts has resulted in the acknowledgment that seeing L2 learning as a problem is a uniquely Western phenomenon whereas multilingual inhabitants of the Northwestern Amazon, India or the Cameroon may see learning of additional languages as completely unproblematic (see Moore, 1999). Adults in these contexts continue learning additional languages throughout their lives; neither age nor aptitude are considered important factors in the learning process. The key to success is seen in plentiful interactional opportunities, while the desired outcome is multi-competence rather than idealised 'native-speakerness'.

(9) Predicated on a powerful social theory that links socioeconomic and sociopolitical environments with language learning and use, poststructuralist enquiry views social contexts as crucial in understanding L2 learning, and treats language as part of what constitutes these contexts rather than as a separate and independent set of structures. The two-way relationship between language and identity recognises that languages serve to produce, reproduce, transform and perform identities, and that linguistic, gender, racial, ethnic and class identities, in turn, affect the access to linguistic resources and interactional opportunities, and, ultimately, L2 learning outcomes.

Conclusion

To conclude, I have argued that poststructuralist approaches represent a more theoretically advanced way of looking at the social contexts of L2 learning and use. At the same time, I acknowledge that these approaches may not be appropriate for those who view L2 learning as a unified and homogeneous phenomenon that can be explained away by one general theory. The enhanced explanatory value offered by poststructuralist attention to linguistic practices and power relations is balanced out by the fact that poststructuralist theory does not make predictive statements. It thus does not aim to identify a constellation of factors that may predict that, if A, B and C take place, the individual X will become native-like (*sic!*) in language Y. Instead, the researchers working in this paradigm acknowledge that, while they may recognise certain factors that shape human agency, agency in itself is dynamic, and the course of history is unpredictable. Thus, events taking place a year or two down the road may influence the processes of L2 learning and use in ways that no theory is able to predict. Instead, many poststructuralist scholars engage in identifying socioeconomic and sociopolitical factors that impede and/or favour multilingualism and multiculturalism. They advocate language and

educational policies that ensure equal access to linguistic and educational resources, promote multilingualism without imposing 'acculturation' or 'native-like' ability, and raise consciousness about shared responsibility for understanding in cross-cultural encounters between minority and majority speakers (Bremer *et al.*, 1996; Heller, 1999; Leung *et al.*, 1997; Lippi-Green, 1997; Miller, 2000; Norton, 2000, 2001). This socially engaged scholarship resonates with contemporary poststructuralist educational theory and informs many innovative approaches to educational and language policy (Kanno, 2000a; Leung *et al.*, 1997; Rampton, 1995), to critical language pedagogy (Norton Peirce, 1995; Toohey, 1998) and to curricular innovation in L2 and FL classrooms (Kanno & Applebaum, 1995; Moore, 1999; Rampton, 1995; Talburt & Stewart, 1999).

Similarly, poststructuralist approaches that focus on individuals as social actors, rather than on the process of language development, may be of little use to those who, in the words of Roberts (1996: 24) 'assume that it is possible and worthwhile to isolate some aspects of language, and isolate language use from the language user, in order to trace through the acquisition of a particular feature'. As approaches concerned with the social aspects of L2 learning, they do not attempt to account for all aspects of SLA. There is no reason, however, why these approaches cannot be successfully combined with more cognitively and linguistically oriented analyses of L2 learning and use in a way that has already been masterfully accomplished by Bremer *et al.* (1996), McKay and Wong (1996) and Polanyi (1995). They are particularly compatible with the multi-competence perspective, as they paint a complex picture of L2 learning and use in which L2 users are portrayed as investing in bi- or multilingualism, rather than in ubiquitous TL development.

Finally, I would like to emphasise that at no point do poststructuralist researchers want to create a hegemony and replace all other paradigms, as this would contradict the basic premises of poststructuralism, predicated on multiplicity and sensitivity to power relations. Rather, to use Lantolf's (1996) metaphor, poststructuralist approaches will bloom best when surrounded by other flowers in the garden of theory and practice, giving rise to present and future debates and controversies.

References

Archibald, J. (ed.) (2000) *Second Language Acquisition and Linguistic Theory.* Oxford: Blackwell.

Blackledge, A. (2000) *Literacy, Power, and Social Justice.* Stoke-on-Trent: Trentham Books.

Bourdieu, P. (1991) *Language and Symbolic Power.* Cambridge: Polity Press.

Breitborde, L. (1998) *Speaking and Social Identity: English in the Lives of Urban Africans.* Berlin: Mouton De Gruyter.

Bremer, K., Roberts, C., Vasseur, M-T., Simonot, M. and Broeder. P. (1996) *Achieving Understanding: Discourse in Intercultural Encounters*. London: Longman.

Cameron, D. (1990) Demythologising sociolinguistics: Why language does not reflect society. In J. Joseph and T. Taylor (eds) *Ideologies of Language* (pp. 79–93). London: Routledge.

Davies, B. and Harré, R. (1990) Positioning: The discursive production of selves. *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour* 20, 1, 43–63.

Ellis, R. (1994) *The Study of Second Language Acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Firth, A. and Wagner, J. (1997) On discourse, communication, and (some) fundamental concepts in SLA research. *Modern Language Journal* 81 (3), 285–300.

Foucault, M. (1972) *The Archaeology of Knowledge*. London: Tavistock.

Gal, S. (1989) Language and political economy. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 18, 345–367.

Gardner, R. (1979) Social psychological aspects of second language acquisition. In H. Giles and R. St Clair (eds) *Language and Social Psychology*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Gardner, R. (1985) *Social Psychology and Second Language Learning: Attitudes and Motivation*. London: Edward Arnold.

Gardner, R. and Lambert, W. (1959) Motivational variables in second-language acquisition. *Canadian Journal of Psychology* 13, 266–272.

Gardner, R. and Lambert, W. (1972) *Attitudes and Motivation in Second Language Learning*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Gass, S. and Selinker, L. (1994) *Second Language Acquisition: An Introductory Course*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Giles, H., Bourhis, R. and Taylor, D. (1977) Toward a theory of language in ethnic group relations. In H. Giles (ed.) *Language, Ethnicity, and Intergroup Relations*. London: Academic Press.

Giles, H. and Byrne, J. (1982) An intergroup approach to second language acquisition. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology* 5, 291–302.

Giles, H. and Johnson, P. (1987) Ethnolinguistic identity theory: A social psychological approach to language maintenance. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 68, 69–99.

Heller, M. (1992) The politics of codeswitching and language choice. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 13 (1), 123–142.

Heller, M. (1999) *Linguistic Minorities and Modernity: A Sociolinguistic Ethnography*. London: Longman.

Husband, C. and Saifullah-Khan, V. (1982) The viability of ethnolinguistic vitality: Some creative doubts. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 3, 195–205.

Kanno, Y. (2000a) Bilingualism and identity: The stories of Japanese returnees. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* 3 (1), 1–18.

Kanno, Y. (2000b) Kikokushijo as bicultural. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations* 24, 361–382.

Kanno, Y. and Applebaum, S. (1995) ESL students speak up: Their stories of how we are doing. *TESL Canada Journal* 12 (2), 32–49.

Kouritzin, S. (2000) Immigrant mothers redefine access to ESL classes: Contradiction and ambivalence. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 21 (1), 14-32.

Lantolf, J. (1996) SLA theory building: 'Letting all the flowers bloom!' *Language Learning* 46 (4) 713–749.

Lantolf, J. and Pavlenko, A. (2001) (S)econd (L)anguage (A)ctivity Theory: Understanding second language learners as people. In: M. Breen (ed.) *Learner Contributions to Language Learning: New Directions in Research* (pp. 141–158). London: Longman.

Larsen-Freeman, D. and Long, M. (1991) *Introduction to Second Language Acquisition Research*. London: Longman.

Lave, J. and Wenger, E. (1991) *Situated Learning: Legitimate Peripheral Participation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Le Page, R. and Tabouret-Keller, A. (1985) *Acts of Identity: Creole-based Aproaches to Language and Ethnicity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Leung, C., Harris, R. and Rampton, B. (1997) The idealised native speaker, reified ethnicities, and classroom realities. *TESOL Quarterly* 31 (3), 543-560.

Lippi-Green, R. (1997) *English with an Accent: Language, Ideology, and Discrimination in the United States*. London: Routledge.

McKay, S. and Wong, S. (1996) Multiple discourses, multiple identities: Investment and agency in second-language learning among Chinese adolescent immigrant students. *Harvard Educational Review* 66 (3), 577–608.

Miller, J. (1999) Becoming audible: Social identity and second language use. *Journal of Intercultural Studies* 20 (2), 149–165.

Miller, J. (2000) Language use, identity, and social interaction: Migrant students in Australia. *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 33 (1), 69–100.

Mitchell, R. and Myles, F. (1998) *Second Language Learning Theories*. London: Arnold.

Moore, L. (1999) Language socialisation research and French language education in Africa: A Cameroonian case study. *Canadian Modern Language Review* 56 (2), 329–350.

Norton Peirce, B. (1995) Social identity, investment, and language learning. *TESOL Quarterly* 29 (1), 9–31.

Norton, B. (2000) *Identity and Language Learning: Gender, Ethnicity, and Educational Change*. London: Longman.

Norton, B. (2001) Non-participation, imagined communities, and the language classroom. In M. Breen (ed.) *Learner Contributions to Language Learning: New Directions in Research* (pp. 159–171). London: Longman.

Norton, B. and Toohey, K. (in press) Identity and language learning. In R. Kaplan (ed.) *Handbook of Applied Linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ochs, E. (1993) Constructing social identity: A language socialisation perspective. *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 26 (3), 287–306.

Orellana, M. (1994) Appropriating the voice of the superheroes: Three preschoolers' bilingual language uses in play. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly* 9, 171–193.

Pavlenko, A. (1998) Second language learning by adults: Testimonies of bilingual writers. *Issues in Applied Linguistics* 9 (1), 3–19.

Pavlenko, A. (2000) Access to linguistic resources: Key variable in second language learning. *Estudios de Sociolinguistica* 1 (2), 85–105.

Pavlenko, A. and Lantolf, J. (2000) Second language learning as participation and the (re)construction of selves. In J.P. Lantolf (ed.) *Sociocultural Theory and Second Language Learning* (pp.157–180). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Pennycook, A. (1990) Toward a critical applied linguistics for the 1990s. *Issues in Applied Linguistics* 1, 8–28.

Polanyi, L. (1995) Language learning and living abroad: Stories from the field. In B. Freed (ed.) *Second Language Acquisition in a Study Abroad Context* (pp. 271–291). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company,

Rampton, B. (1995) *Crossing: Language and Ethnicity among Adolescents*. London: Longman.

Ritchie, W. and Bhatia, T. (eds) (1996) *Handbook of Second Language Acquisition*. New York: Academic Press.

Roberts, C. (1996) Taking stock: Contexts and reflections. In K. Bremer, C. Roberts, M-T. Vasseur, M. Simonot and P. Broeder *Achieving Understanding: Discourse in Intercultural Encounters* (pp. 207–238). London: Longman.

Sachdev, I. and Wright, A. (1996) Social influence and language learning: An experimental study. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology* 15 (3), 230–245.

Schumann, J. (1978) The acculturation model for second language acquisition. In R. Gingras (ed.) *Second Language Acquisition and Foreign Language Teaching* (pp. 27–50). Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics.

Schumann, J. (1986) Research on the acculturation model for second language acquisition. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 7 (5), 379–392.

Sharwood Smith, M. (1994) *Second Language Learning: Theoretical Foundations*. London: Longman.

Siegal, M. (1996) The role of learner subjectivity in second language sociolinguistic competency: Western women learning Japanese. *Applied Linguistics* 17, 356–382.

Spolsky, B. (1989) *Conditions for Second Language Learning*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Syed, Z. and Burnett, A. (1999) Acculturation, identity, and language: Implications for language minority education. In K. Davis (ed.) *Foreign Language Teaching and Language Minority Education (Technical Report No. 19)* (pp. 41–63). Honolulu: University of Hawaii, Second Language Teaching and Curriculum Center.

Tabouret-Keller, A. (1997) Language and identity. In F. Coulmas (ed.) *The Handbook of Sociolinguistics* (pp. 315–326). Oxford: Blackwell.

Tajfel, H. (1974) Social identity and intergroup behavior. *Social Science Information* 13, 65–93.

Tajfel, H. (1981) *Human Groups and Social Categories*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Talburt, S. and Stewart, M. (1999) What's the subject of Study Abroad? Race, gender, and 'Living Culture'. *The Modern Language Journal* 83 (2), 163–175.

Toohey, K. (1998) 'Breaking them up, taking them away': ESL students in Grade 1. *TESOL Quarterly* 32 (1), 61–84.

Twombly, S. (1995) *Piropos* and friendships: Gender and culture clash in study abroad. *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad* 1, 1–27.

Weedon, C. (1987) *Feminist Practice and Poststructuralist Theory*. London: Blackwell.

Wenger, E. (1998) *Communities of Practice: Learning, Meaning, and Identity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Willett, J. (1995) Becoming first graders in an L2: An ethnographic study of L2 socialisation. *TESOL Quarterly* 29 (3), 473–503.

Williams, G. (1992) *Sociolinguistics: A Sociological Critique*. London: Routledge.

Woolard, K. (1985) Language variation and cultural hegemony: Toward an integration of sociolinguistic and social theory. *American Ethnologist* 12, 738–748.

Introduction to Chapter 12

Second Language Learners' Rights, Francisco Gomes de Matos

VIVIAN COOK

One of the crucial points made in this book is that L2 users matter. They are real people in the real world, whose lives, minds, religious beliefs, careers and social relationships can be profoundly affected by their knowledge and use of a second language. People may be liberated by their second language; Steve Biko insisted for example on English as the language of the Black People's Convention in South Africa (Biko, 1978). Or they may be enslaved and deprived of their own reality by having to use a language other than their own. At one time or another:

> Children were forbidden to speak Basque in Spain, Navajo in the USA, or Kurdish in Turkey; Koreans in Japanese-occupied territories had to adopt Japanese names; the Turkish minority in Bulgaria had to use Bulgarian names. Indeed deaf children have often been made to sit on their hands in class to prevent them using sign language. (Cook, 2001: 163)

In some ways this was acknowledged in the 1990s debate about the use of English as an economic tool (Phillipson, 1992). A language can be used by its native speakers to exert power over L2 users through trade, through making it the language of scientific discourse, through the internet, through international bodies, through television films, just as globalised commerce can result in a Starbucks on every corner and a Coke in every café. This has practical spin-offs for business; the billion students of English represent a gold mine for the producers of teaching materials; income from learned journals exported from the UK in 1999 came to £508 million (Department for Culture, Media and Sport, 2001). For the individual there may be straightforward economic gains to using a second language (Breton, 1998); in hard cash, 'knowledge of the second official language improved the earnings of French-speaking women by 10.2%' in 1991 (Christofides & Swidinsky, 1998).