CONCLUSION

Languaging and Ethnifying

OFELIA GARCÍA

In naming language and ethnicity as a verb instead of a noun, I bring to focus that it is people—individuals and groups—who use discursive and ethnic practices to signify what it is they want to be. The ability "to language" and "to ethnify" is precisely then the most important signifying role of human beings—that which gives life meaning. It is through languaging and ethnifying that people perform their identifying.

Language does not merely exist as an autonomous and a stable skill, and neither is ethnicity a static characteristic. Languaging refers to the discursive practices of people (Shohamy 2006; Yngve 1996). And ethnifying points to the act of signifying and calling attention to an identity by pointing to certain ethnic practices, including languaging. Thus, languaging and ethnifying are practices that are in dialogic relationship with one another. It is through their dialogicity that they signify what the individual and/or the Community wants to engage in interactions considered important (Fishman, this volume, 2010).

The dialogic relationship of languaging and ethnifying is important because as Joshua A. Fishman has repeatedly stated, it illuminates processes of cultural change and continuity. Thus, the contributors to this volume have used language and ethnicity *practices* as the lens to study important processes of how individuals and groups have transformed themselves or remained the same by making languaging practices the focal center of our acts of identity. Le Page and Tabouret-Keller (1985) discuss how these acts of identity are the ways in which individuals project their concepts of language and ethnic identity (and I would say their practices of languaging and ethnifying) on others and thus constitute groups.

In appealing to the concept of languaging, I agree with Makoni and Pennycook (2007) who argue that our present conception of "language" was originally constructed by states that wanted to consolidate political power. To do so, states and

their representatives established language academies; encouraged the preparation of grammars, dictionaries, and treatises to strengthen and standardize languages; and encouraged the enumeration of languages in ways that masked their differences or similarities. Errington (2001) has shown how in colonial contexts it was missionaries and colonial officers who imposed these "invented" monolithic languages onto specific territories. Alexander (this volume) quotes Vail (1991: 12) who says, "thus firm, non-porous and relatively inelastic ethnic boundaries, many of which were highly arbitrary, came to be constructed and were then strengthened by the growth of stereotypes of 'the other.'"

Scholars who work in multilingual communities have also criticized the notion of "a language." Mühlhäusler (2000: 358) has said that the "notion of 'a language' makes little sense in most traditional societies where people engage in multiple discursive practices among themselves." This is also the position held by Suzanne Romaine in speaking about Papua New Guinea. Romaine (1994: 12) says, "the very concept of discrete languages is probably a European cultural artifact fostered by procedures such as literacy and standardization. Any attempt to count distinct languages will be an artifact of classificatory procedures rather than a reflection of communicative practices." Our traditional conception of language is thus socially constructed, and yet, it is a most important way of signifying.

Language, as a social construction, is not only an instrument for communication but also a semiotic and symbolic tool. Bakhtin (1986: 67–68) says that "language arises from man's need to express himself, to objectify himself . . . And if language also serves as a means of communication, this is a secondary function that has nothing to do with its essence." Fishman (1989: 32) puts forward that "language is even more than symbolic of the ethnic message, it is a prime ethnic value in and of itself." That language and ethnicity have something to do with each other is indexed by the fact that they often share the same designation—French for the French, Italian for the Italians, and English for the English. But as Pavlenko and Blackledge (2004: 4) suggest, "languages may not only be 'markers of identity' but also sites of resistance, empowerment, solidarity or discrimination."

By putting alongside each other's contributions on this topic by authors with different disciplinary, methodological, and regional perspectives, this Handbook illuminates how it is that language, ethnicity, and identity are indeed perspectival and contextual and depend on circumstances that modify them, create them, or recreate them. It is through the dialogicity (Bakhtin 1981) of these voices and interactions with languaging and ethnifying practices that we begin to understand what Joshua A. Fishman says in the introduction—that language, ethnicity, and identity are complexly attitudinal and attitudinal complex and that they are performed through their interaction with other meanings and voices, thus conditioning and altering each other.

This chapter, which serves as conclusion, starts by synthesizing how language and ethnic identity have been conceptualized throughout history and using different lenses. These very different positions on language and ethnic identity are all represented in this volume. Although it is presented here in a historical context, it is important to remember that space is as important as time. Thus, different social and national groups have different wishes and aspirations, as we see in the

contributions to this Handbook, resulting in views about language and ethnic identity that are highly diverse.

The chapter ends by addressing three main threads that are intertwined in the many voices in this text:

1. Languaging and ethnifying are manipulable, performed and imagined, and yet important.
2. Languaging and ethnifying are impacted by globalization and also by the local.
3. Languaging and ethnifying can be disrupted or supported by education.

We first turn to the many different positions on language and ethnic identity that are represented in this volume.

Positioning Language and Ethnic Identity

By Ofelia García and Zeena Zakharia

Our conceptions of language and ethnic identity and the links between them have had different meanings throughout history.[1] In premodern pan-Mediterranean and European thought, language and ethnicity were viewed as naturally linked. However, it was not until the eighteenth century that attention was paid to the nature of this link. The German Romantics, and in particular Johann Gottfried Herder (1744–1803), defined ethnic identity as natural and immovable and closely connected to the language people spoke. For Herder, language was the surest way to safeguard or recover the authenticity that people had inherited from their ancestors, as well as to pass it on to the young and future generations. He writes, "without its own language, a *Volk* is an absurdity, a contradiction in terms" (Herder as cited in Fishman 1972: 48).

Johann Gottlieb Fichte (1762–1814) also espoused a strong link between language and ethnic identity. In his *Reden an die Deutsche Nation* (1808), he associates language, nation, and state and says, "Those who speak the same language are joined to each other by a multitude of invisible bonds by nature herself. . . They understand each other and have the power to make themselves understood more and more clearly; they belong together and are by nature one and an inseparable whole" (quoted in Kedourie 1993: 64).

Frank Boas (1858–1942) was the first who offered a nuanced critique of the primordialist positioning of the German Romantics, pointing out that historical, social, and geographic experiences create differences and that human beliefs and activities have to be understood in terms of their own cultures. Around the same time, Max Weber (1864–1920) indicated that belonging to an ethnic group was a belief in a common origin and descent and depends on "consciousness of kind" (Weber 1978: 378).

In thinking about the relationship between language and cognition, Edward Sapir (1884–1939) and his student, Benjamin Lee Whorf (1897–1941), developed another lens to consider the possible links between language and ethnic identity. Sapir asserts that "a particular language tends to become the fitting expression of a

"self-conscious nationality" and that "such a group will construct for itself . . . a race to which is to be attributed the mystic power of creating a language and a culture as twin expressions of its psychic peculiarities" (Sapir 1933 as cited in Sapir 1942: 660). To Sapir, language, culture, and ethnic identity are interconnected. He said, "human beings do not live in the objective world alone, nor alone in the world of social activity as ordinarily understood, but are very much at the mercy of the particular language which has become the medium of expression of their society" (Sapir 1929: 209). His disciple, Whorf (1956), proposed that an individual's thoughts and ways of understanding the world and behaving are influenced by the languages he or she speaks.[2] Despite the heated opposition to the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis and its linguistic determinism, this work laid the groundwork for modern explorations about the links between language and the sense of self.

In the late twentieth century, it is perhaps Joshua A. Fishman, more than anyone, who has studied the relationship between language and ethnic identity. In an essay entitled "Language and Ethnicity," Fishman states, "Language is the recorder of paternity, the expresser of patrimony and the carrier of phenomenology" (Fishman 1977 as cited in Fishman 1989: 32). Later, in remarking that ethnic collectivities will exist as long as human societies exist and that new ones are coming into being, as old ones are rediscovered, Fishman (1989: 32) continues, "[l]anguages will continue to be both symbolic of these collectivities and instrumental for them, with respect to their self-concepts, their antagonisms and their co-operative potentials." Language facilitates an ethnic group's formation as it adopts and adapts the group's subjective belief in a common ethnic identity.

That there is a one-to-one correlation between language and ethnic identity has also been the position of other sociolinguists. Based on this assumption, Giles and Byrne (1982) developed a theory of ethnolinguistic identity in which language is the marker of ethnic identity. Giles and Byrne studied a group's ethnolinguistic vitality and the relationship between ethnic identity and language maintenance, language shift, and second-language acquisition. Another proponent, Gumperz (1982), explored code-switching as indexing different ethnic identities. In a similar vein, Myers-Scotton (1998) proposed the "markedness model" in which she posited that marked or unmarked language choices in code-switching have to do with a negotiation of identities.

Some scholars today have adopted a more fluid positioning of identity, having to do with multiplicity, and managed through discursive practices. Postmodern scholarship has signaled the situational and subjective construction of ethnicity, shifting attention from ethnicity to more hybridized identities (Bhabha 1994) and to the mestizaje and hybridity and plurality of ethnicities affected by new local and global identities. The postmodern study of language and identity pays attention to three considerations (Pavlenko & Blackledge 2004):

1. the role of discourse in the construction of identity;
2. the multiplicity, fragmentation, and hybridity of identity and language practices, developed in third spaces that enable alternative identity options; and
3. the role of imagination in the production of identity.

As such, postmodern identity involves not only "sameness" but also, by extension, "otherness" and the development of hybrid identities, which engage plural language practices. This non-essentialist positioning has also affected the ways in which scholars view language in multilingual communities today, where complex linguistic repertoires exist and where individuals embody or enact multiple identities. For example, many scholars have studied the phenomenon of "code-crossing," the fact that speakers construct different identities using languages in ways that are not those of the group to which they belong (see, e.g., Rampton 1995). And I (García 2009) have referred to the multiple discursive practices in which bilinguals engage to make sense of their worlds as "translanguaging."

Although one can acknowledge the "fractured and fracturing identities" of the postmodern world, May (2001: 42) argues that ethnicity cannot always be hybrid or invented. He raises a most important question, "If ethnicity is invented, why is it that at the same time the news is full of ethnic cleansing and genocide?" (p. 43). May finds the answer by referring to the concept of habitus, a "system of dispositions common to all products of the same conditionings" (Bourdieu 1991: 59) by which the material form of life is "embodied and turned into second nature" (p. 63). Acquired by members of social groups as a result of socialization, habitus is a way of viewing and living in the world. Habitus does not determine behavior, although it orients action by presenting a range of choices. Thus, its effects are real. Bourdieu's concept of "symbolic domination" explains why those who do not control language practices that are considered "standard" begin to consider them as more credible or persuasive than those that they do speak and control.

Influenced by the work of Pierre Bourdieu, some scholars have maintained that attitudes, values, and beliefs about language practices are always ideological and are enmeshed in social systems of domination and subordination of groups, having to do not only with ethnicity but also with class and gender (see, e.g., Irvine & Gal 2000; Pavlenko & Blackledge 2004; Woolard & Schieffelin 1994). There are, thus, some ideologies that are more privileged than others, and some language practices represent some of these more consistently than others. Therefore, language itself is capable of constituting some notions of identity, and not others (see, e.g., French 1999 on Guatemala), and presents itself as a complex site for identity assertion, ideological contestation, and inter- and intragroup negotiation, where asymmetrical power relations exist between groups and individuals (Suleiman 2004). Thus, language practices are ways of communicating that not only link members of a speech community in the present to a (mythical or real) past and an imagined future (Suleiman 2004), but also signal ideological positions and boundary markers of group identity for inclusion and exclusion (Kroskrity 2000) and for constructing and effacing an other (Suleiman 2004).

Heller's (1982, 1995) work in Québec in the 1980s demonstrated that languages are more than markers of particular ethnic identities because language choice involves negotiation in every interaction. For Heller (1987), language is an instrument of identity negotiation that also facilitates or restricts access to powerful social networks. She says:

[T]he first principle of ethnic identity formation is participation in ethnic social networks, and therefore in activities controlled by ethnic group members. Language is important here as a means by which access to networks is regulated: If you do not speak the right language, you do not have access to forming relationships with certain people, or to participating in certain activities. (Heller 1987: 181)

The social context can prevent individuals from accessing certain linguistic resources or adopting new identities (see, e.g., Heller 1982, 1995; Woolard 1998).

Pennycook (2000, 2003) relies on the concept of *performativity* to explain that people do not use language based on their identity but, instead, perform their identity using language. As Pavlenko and Blackledge (2004: 14) make clear, language and identity are mutually constitutive in that language provides "the linguistic means through which identities are constructed and negotiated" and also in that "ideologies of language and identity guide ways in which individuals use linguistic resources to index their identities." Languaging and ethnifying options may be limited or not, or negotiable or not, depending on particular sociohistoric contexts, but individuals are agentive beings, "constantly in search of new social and linguistic resources which allow them to resist identities that position them in undesirable ways, produce new identities, and assign alternative meanings to the links between identities and linguistic varieties" (Pavlenko & Blackledge 2004: 27). According to Le Page and Tabouret-Keller (1985: 181), individual and social identities are mediated by language practices, with speakers creating speech acts as *acts of projection* in which, "the individual creates for himself the patterns of his linguistic behavior so as to resemble those of the group or groups with which from time to time he wishes to be identified, or so as to be unlike those from whom he wishes to be distinguished."

That is, unlike Howard Giles' theory of accommodation, developed in the 1960s and 1970s, which posits that people change the way they speak in a given situation to accommodate to others around them, Le Page and Tabouret-Keller propose that speakers do not adapt to the style of the interlocutor. Rather, they adapt to the *image* they have of themselves in relationship to the interlocutor, and they "language" to "ethnify." Heller (1999) adds that ethnolinguistic minorities in a globalized economy pragmatically access their multiple linguistic and cultural resources as they participate in plural social networks. That is, they decide who they want to be and choose their language practices accordingly.

Despite the dialogicity of voices and positions about language and ethnic identity that are represented in this volume, and the conditioning and alteration of languaging and ethnifying that it produces, as we said before, there are three important principles that could be derived from the contributions:

1. Languaging and ethnifying are manipulable, performed and imagined, and yet important.
2. Languaging and ethnifying are impacted by globalization and also by the local.
3. Languaging and ethnifying can be disrupted or supported by education.

I now turn to discussing each of these threads that are weaved throughout the handbook.

Languaging and Ethnifying as Manipulable, Imagined, and Performed, and Yet Important

Considerations

The contributions in this volume make evident that although language and ethnic practices are manipulable, imagined, and performed, they are nevertheless important. As a consequence of identity and nationalist ideologies, some groups view language and ethnicity as characteristics that are fixed and related to each other in unidirectional fashion, whereas others appeal to the dialogicity of the relationship between language and ethnic identity practices. But all the contributions to this handbook claim the importance of languaging and ethnifying to both individuals and groups.

As we said before, some view language and ethnic identity as autonomous skills and characteristics that are linked. Peltz (this volume) refers to the languages of Jews as conveying "their essence as individuals and as a group" (p. 135), and speaking about Arab and Maghrebian life and thought, Ennaji (this volume) repeats that language and ethnic identity are intimately related. Obeng and Purvis (this volume) referring to sub-Saharan Africa believe that "Sameness of language and ethnicity creates a bond of acceptance and provides a basis for togetherness, for identity, for separateness, for solidarity, and for brotherhood and kinship" (p. 374). And this is certainly the same belief espoused by Ghana's Second Republic Parliament member, A. G. De Souza who said, "Mr. Speaker, language is a solemn thing. It grows out of life, out of its agonies and ecstacies, its wants and weariness. Every language is a temple in which the soul of those who speak it is enshrined" (cited in Amonoo 1989: 42). Although the 'O'odham youth in the chapter by McCarty and Zepeda had only limited knowledge of their heritage language, they claimed the 'O'odham language as their "blood" language. McCarty and Zepeda quote one youth who says that knowing 'O'odham helps him' "not to lose the identity of who I am, of where I come from . . ." (p. 330).

The link between language, ethnic identity, and nation is especially evident in this volume in the new constructions of the Slavic World (Hroch) and those in Central Asia and Azerbaijan (Fierman and Garibova). In both the Slavic World and Central Asia, there are many cases of *ausbau* by which languages that had been previously considered to be one language are now claimed to be autonomous from others as they are linked to specific ethnic identities, thus claiming to be separate nations needing a state.

The contributions in this handbook also make evident that states and political and national institutions that want to maintain power in their hands often manipulate language and ethnic identity. And nations that want to maintain some sort of power or advantage often appeal to the language and ethnic identity link. This is evident in cases in Western Europe such as in the autonomous regions of Spain—in

the Basque Country, Catalonia, and Galicia (Ammon, this volume). This appeal to the language and ethnic identity link is also evident in how Canada protects their "founding" languages—especially English but also French—and yet disregards the claims of Canadian First Nations (Patrick, this volume). An example of a case in which a minority language group, once recognized, refuses to make room for other language and ethnic practices is that of New Zealand. May (this volume) gives evidence of how although Māoris have insisted on their language as their treasure and key to their ethnic identity, they have been slow to recognize the same for the Pasifika people of New Zealand. May argues that the protection of Māori biculturalism and refusal to be inclusive of multiculturalism have to do with protecting the little that the Māoris have gained back from the Pākeha.

Sometimes, the link between language and ethnic identity has not been constructed by political and national institutions but has been developed through participation in popular culture. Speaking about Welsh, Williams (this volume) suggests that it has been the chapel-based social activities and other cultural festivals and activities that actually developed the link between language and cultural identity among the Welsh. This has something to do with what Schiffman has called "linguistic culture," which he defines in this volume as "the sum totality of ideas, values, beliefs, attitudes, prejudices, myths, religious strictures, and all the other cultural ideas and expectations that they [people] bring to their dealings with language from their culture" (p. 454).

Whether the language and ethnic identity link has been forcefully imposed or performed through participation in cultural and social local events, it is claimed by all to be important. Even in cases of language shift such as the one documented for Native Americans (McCarty & Zepeda, this volume) and the Celtic world (Williams, this volume), a "heritage" language is deemed to be important as a marker of ethnic identity. For example, although Williams defends ethnic identity tied to other forms of cultural expression other than language, he also declares the importance of language. He says, "[t]here is a profound need for an indigenous language as a means of communicating shared ideas, values, significant experiences, and literature, and this is why so much of the effort of the Celtic revivalists has concerned language and linguistics" (p. 238). Williams (this volume; p. 252) continues by saying that the future of a group depends on the "strength of the relationship between the language and the contested identity of the people, for nothing is given; the relationship has to be articulated, honed, and integrated into the deep structures of the society for it to last."

That the relationship between language and ethnic identity is sometimes imagined, and nonetheless important, is also described here by Peltz (this volume). Quoting Fishman (1985), Peltz explains how because of psychological and social forces that influenced Jewish ethnic pride, mother tongue claiming for Yiddish in the 1980 US census increased by 65%, although there had been a decrease of 24% in Yiddish speakers between 1970 and 1979.

Psychological and social forces are important in the ways in which people construct their language and ethnic practices. This is the case, for example, of the young people Williams (this volume) describes in Scotland. Williams makes the important point that traditional older Gaelic-speaking communities are geographically

isolated and claim fluent Gaelic practices as a mark of belonging to the community. However, young people in Scotland are conscious of other identities other than those in traditional older Gaelic-speaking communities. Thus, they are often satisfied with a small amount of Gaelic as a symbol of their Scottishness. The young people are proud of their Scottishness and the Gaelic through which they signify it, but they also take pride of their other ethnolinguistic identities, which include English. It is the fluidity of contacts between their multiple ethnolinguistic identities and their many language practices that allows them to claim their limited Welsh practices as authentic, as their own languaging and ethnifying, despite what others might consider "limited."

Despite the importance and dialogicity of languaging and ethnifying, the same language practices by themselves do not guarantee ethnic solidarity, and an ethnicity is not expressed solely through one set of language practices. Obeng and Purvis (this volume) give the example of the Hutu-Tutsi conflicts in Rwanda and Burundi. Both groups speak the same Central Bantu language, named Kinyarwanda in Rwanda and Kirundi in Burundi. Language and ethnic affiliation are not necessarily always coterminous. They say (this volume: p. 375), "There are people who speak a particular language but do not necessarily identify with the ethnic group that the language represents. On the other hand, there are others who love to identify with a particular ethnic group but cannot speak their language."

Some Mechanisms: Renaming and Rewriting

An important mechanism to manipulate, imagine, and perform languaging and ethnifying has been the selection of names, as well as the selection of writing systems for the codified language. For example, there have been numerous debates about language names in Central Asia and Azerbaijan. Fierman and Garibova (this volume) remind us that in a very different political environment, leaders could have created a "greater Turkish language." After independence in Azerbaijan, the state language was first identified, in 1992, as "Turkish" (türk dili). But there were also competing names proposed, "Azerbaijani," "Azerbaijani Turkic" and "Azerbaijani." In the 1995 constitution, the name "Azerbaijani" was chosen. Thus, renaming the language emphasized the link between language and a separate Azerbaijani nationhood. Similarly, in Tajik, the 1989 language law referred to the language as "Tajik (Farsi)." But in 1999, the Word "Farsi" was removed from the state language law, emphasizing separateness and autonomy as a nation.

The selection of names for languages has also figured prominently in recent changes in the Slavic World, as is evident by the naming of language practices that were previously considered one language as Serbian, Croatian, Bosnian, and Montenegrin, for example. Another example of the power of naming and renaming in manipulating ethnic identity is the case of Chinese authorities who insist that the many languages spoken by Han Chinese are all "dialects" of Chinese despite the fact that they are mutually unintelligible (Zhou, this volume).

An additional important mechanism by which to manipulate, imagine, and perform different language practices and thus ethnify is by the selection of alphabets. The most famous of these cases is the decision made by Atatürk of discarding

the Arabic script in which Turkish was written for the Latin alphabet. It is on similar ideological grounds that today Kazkh, Kyrgyz, and Tajik are still written in Cyrillic, although Azerbaijani, Turkmen, and Uzbek are now written in the Latin alphabet (Fierman & Garibova, this volume). Similarly, Obeng and Purvis (this volume) remind us that the choice of the Latin script for the Oromo language, as opposed to Ge'ez script used for Amharic and Tigrinya, has also enhanced the psychological liberation of the Oromo people.

That people language and ethnify by adopting different discursive and semiotic practices is evident. Language and ethnicity are not "innocent" skills and static characteristics but are negotiated in action by people through their dialogicity. But again it is important to emphasize that as semiotic beings, the language and ethnic practices in which people engage constitute the most important sign system of human beings. Just because it is people who act upon language and ethnicity does not render them less important. On the contrary, languaging and ethnifying are most important for our lives as social human beings.

Languaging and Ethnifying as Globalized and Yet Localized

Fettes ([2001] 2003: 37) summarizes the geopolitical changes brought about by globalization and their effect on the ways in which people language:

National economies have become far more integrated in the global economy; money and workers have become much more mobile; the pace of technological change has accelerated to an unbelievable extent; and the explosive growth of communication and information networks is on the verge of "annihilating space."

Increasingly, every language community must become aware of its position in a "dynamic world system of languages" characterized by vast and expanding differences in status and use.

As new economic trading blocks and new socioeconomic and sociopolitical organizations have come into being, there have been dramatic population shifts. As a result of the movements of people, information, and goods, language and ethnic practices have shifted and changed. Bilingualism and multiple language and literacy practices are at the heart of much of the languaging of people today. Thus, language practices are much more heteroglossic (Bakhtin 1981), adjusting to the multilingual multimodal terrain of particular communicative acts in what I have called "translanguaging" (García 2009).

These more hybrid languaging make the study of language and ethnic identity more complex. Ennaji (this volume) points out that it was easier for Berbers to claim their connection to Amazigh (Berber) language and identity when they were monolinguals. But today, when many are bilingual and also speakers of Arabic, the claim is not as easily made. In this volume, Huss and Lindgren also discuss the situation more complex but not language and ethnic practices of today, making the situation more complex but not less important. In the twenty-first century, it is important to recognize the identifying character of hybrid language and ethnic practices in multilingual contexts.

Globalization and the transnationalism that it encompasses have made it more difficult to define a static space where language and ethnic identity correspond to each other. Diasporas have always existed, but today, they are multiple and dynamic. In trying to look at the link between the German language and German heritage, Dow (this volume) points out that it is impossible to limit his chapter to those who are within a political boundary. Omoniyi (this volume) notes that the intercommunal zones of the borderlands have been extended today beyond national boundaries to encompass imaginary borderlands in which transnationals live. These more hybrid spaces have become important sites of negotiation of language and ethnic identities.

In the context of Canada, Patrick (this volume) examines how the link between language and ethnic identity has become greater and more complex as globalization has altered the terrain on which language and cultural practices and policies had been founded. That is, although in the past it might have been possible to separately study each of the elements—language and identity on the one hand and English and French on the other—the situation is much more dynamic and complex today, especially with the growth of immigrant communities and the greater claims being made by Canadian First Nations. As Ammon (this volume) explains, the global and transnational coexist with the national and the local, demanding that individuals and groups respond to the three levels—transnational, national, and local—simultaneously and in intertwined ways. Language and ethnic practices are today dynamic and often fused, generating new structures, subjectivities, objects, and practices.

Despite the forces of globalization, Appadurai (1996) reminds us that globalization from below is also important, and Canagarajah (1999, 2005) insists on the persistent importance of the local in the global. As national identities have become fragmented, the relationship between languaging and ethnifying is more relevant today than ever. Fishman (2001: 460) has said:

Some of the very processes of globalization and post-modernism that were supposed to be most deleterious to purportedly "parochial" identities have actually contributed most to their re-emergence as "part-identities." The increasing ubiquity of the civil state, of civil nationalism and, therefore, of a shared supra-ethnic civil nationalism as part of the identity constellation of all citizens, has resulted in more rather than less recognition of multiculturalism at the institutional level and a more widespread implementation of local ethnicity as a counterbalance to civil nationalism at the level of organized part-identity.

The local is today more important than ever. Speaking of the spread of Putonghua and of a Chinese national identity, Zhou (this volume) makes evident that this in no way has threatened the ethnic or local identity of the Chinese, even in the case of the Han group. Thus, local practices exist alongside more global ones. Advances in technology have also made it possible for scholars to analyze very large data sets. But as Extra (this volume) points out, the data obtained are local manifestations of the distribution and vitality of language, as core values of local ethnic identity. Thus, globalization has expanded and made languaging and ethnifying more complex, but by doing so, it has magnified and called attention to their importance.

both in the local and in the global scene. Roland Robertson has referred to glocalization "as the simultaneity—the co-presence—of both universalizing and particularizing tendencies" (quoted in García 2009: 30). Languaging and ethnifying become meaning-making by simultaneously putting alongside each other both the local and the global. In so doing, the full range of languaging and ethnifying acts are acknowledged as important for identity, regardless of hybridity.

Languaging and Ethnifying as Disrupted, Shaped, and Supported in Education

Most national school systems have responded to the multiple languages and literacies that students bring to school by imposing punishment on those whose language practices differ from those of schools. Obeng and Purvis (this volume) relate how students in Ghana were forced to wear a sign on their chest that said, "I'm stupid. I spoke a vernacular on the school's premises today." And this is the experience of most indigenous children throughout the world (Skutnabb-Kangas, this volume), whether in Canada (Patrick, this volume), Latin America (García et al., this volume), the United States (McCarty & Zepeda, this volume), Scandinavia (Huss & Lindgren), Japan (Tomozawa & Yoshimura, this volume), or Aotearoa/New Zealand (May, this volume). It is also the experience of autochthonous minorities throughout Europe (Ammon, this volume; Williams, this volume) or autochthonous majorities in Africa (Alexander, this volume; Obeng & Purvis, this volume). Immigrant children throughout the world, and especially in the United States, have also been punished for speaking their home languages in school (Wiley, this volume). And until very recently, Deaf children were educated through oralism, which insisted on developing speech production and forbade them to use sign language (Baker, this volume). The "linguistic shaming" that language minority and indigenous people have experienced, and continue to experience, in school is partially responsible for their educational failure.

The extent to which schools have forcefully tried to take home language practices away from students has led Skutnabb-Kangas (2000) to speak of "linguistic genocide." In some cases, schools have been successful in making children give up their language practices, whereas in other cases, children have been merely left without an education while resisting to relinguify.

It is often children whose language practices are said to be "dialects" of the standard languages spoken in school that are more resistant to relinguifying while failing to be educated. This is the case of African Americans and the efforts to get them to give up what Lanehart (this volume) calls their African American language. Lanehart quotes Milroy and Milroy (1999: 40) when they say, "Any attempt to eliminate or stigmatize a nonstandard variety will not work, and will be seen as a direct attack on the values and social identity of the speaker."

Many education systems throughout the world ignore research that supports the use of the child's home language in his/her education (August & Shanahan 2006; Cummins 2000; García 2009). Skutnabb-Kangas (this volume) makes clear that good education is always multilingual and adds: "We now know

from comprehensive studies in Second Language Acquisition . . . in Scandinavia, Australia, Russian Federation, India, North America, and especially in Africa that it takes 6–8 years to learn enough L2 to be able to learn through the L2." (p. 192)

Although school systems throughout the world continue to resist giving all children in the twenty-first century the bilingual education they all deserve, there is a new consciousness among teachers of second languages that they can no longer ignore the impact of languaging and ethnifying for their students (Spolsky, this volume). Norton (2000) has argued that language learning is constitutive of, and constituted by, a speaker's identity and that, thus, language learning is also an investment in their own social identity. And the recent work of Cummins (2006) and his colleagues surrounding "identity texts" sustains the importance of supporting the child's home language practices and ethnic identities in educating them.

Education has a very important role in fighting against social "linguicism," that is, what Skutnabb-Kangas (this volume) defines as "racist ideologies, structures and practices which are used to legitimate, effectuate and reproduce an unequal division of power and (both material and non-material) resources between groups which are defined on the basis of . . . language" (p. 200). Education is also important in preserving the ability of youth to language and ethnify in ways that are meaningful to themselves and their communities. For example, in language minority communities that have undergone significant language shift, it has been formal education that has been most responsible for helping to stop the tide. Schools in Aotearoa/New Zealand have had an important impact on the rise of Māori (May, this volume). And Williams (this volume) makes evident that although Irish is used as a community language less than in the past, its use in schools means that many more young people claim that they know it. That is, languaging through Irish (and English) has moved beyond traditional communities and families and has found its way to schools. Thus, school is an important place for developing the link between language practices and ethnifying.

But as I have pointed out elsewhere (García 2009), supporting the home language and ethnic practices of language minority and other bilingual children will depend on the degree to which schools are able to consider bilingualism in its complexity and dynamism and the multiple language practices of all children in their dialogicity. If schools insist that children perform only monolingual and monocultural roles, whether it is done in one or two languages will not make a difference. Bilingual education will only succeed if schools take into account the importance of languaging and ethnifying for children's learning and if schools support tolerance toward all the language and ethnic practices of all the children. Bilingual education programs must go beyond the additive linear bilingualism that they have promoted in the past to include the more heteroglossic dynamic bilingualism (García 2009) that is prevalent in the twenty-first century. That is, bilingual education programs must remain open to embrace the plurilingualism of all the children to go beyond the "bi/two" to encompass the multiple language practices by which children signify. Only then will education systems build on the dynamic languaging and ethnifying of diverse children to extend social justice for all.

both in the local and in the global scene. Roland Robertson has referred to glocalization, "as the simultaneity—the co-presence—of both universalizing and particularizing tendencies" (quoted in García 2009: 30). Languaging and ethnifying become meaning-making by simultaneously putting alongside each other both the local and the global. In so doing, the full range of languaging and ethnifying acts are acknowledged as important for identity, regardless of hybridity.

Languaging and Ethnifying as Disrupted, Shaped, and Supported in Education

Most national school systems have responded to the multiple languages and literacies that students bring to school by imposing punishment on those whose language practices differ from those of schools. Obeng and Purvis (this volume) relate how students in Ghana were forced to wear a sign on their chest that said, "I'm stupid, I spoke a vernacular on the school's premises today." And this is the experience of most indigenous children throughout the world (Skutnabb-Kangas, this volume), whether in Canada (Patrick, this volume), Latin America (García et al., this volume), the United States (McCarty & Zepeda, this volume), Scandinavia (Huss & Lindgren), Japan (Tomozawa & Yoshimura, this volume), or Aotearoa/ New Zealand (May, this volume). It is also the experience of autochthonous minorities throughout Europe (Ammon, this volume; Williams, this volume), or autochthonous majorities in Africa (Alexander, this volume; Obeng & Purvis, this volume). Immigrant children throughout the world, and especially in the United States, have also been punished for speaking their home languages in school (Wiley, this volume). And until very recently, Deaf children were educated through oralism, which insisted on developing speech production and forbade them to use sign language (Baker, this volume). The "linguistic shaming" that language minority and indigenous people have experienced, and continue to experience, in school is partially responsible for their educational failure.

The extent to which schools have forcefully tried to take home language practices away from students has led Skutnabb-Kangas (2000) to speak of "linguistic genocide." In some cases, schools have been successful in making children give up their language practices, whereas in other cases, children have been merely left without an education while resisting to relinguify.

It is often children whose language practices are said to be "dialects" of the standard languages spoken in school that are more resistant to relinguifying while failing to be educated. This is the case of African Americans and the efforts to get them to give up what Lanehart (this volume) calls their African American language. Lanehart quotes Milroy and Milroy (1999: 40) when they say, "Any attempt to eliminate or stigmatize a nonstandard variety will not work, and will be seen as a direct attack on the values and social identity of the speaker."

Many education systems throughout the world ignore research that supports the use of the child's home language in his/her education (August & Shanahan 2006; Cummins 2000; García 2009). Skutnabb-Kangas (this volume) makes clear that good education is always multilingual and adds: "We now know

from comprehensive studies in Second Language Acquisition . . . in Scandinavia, Australia, Russian Federation, India, North America, and, especially in Africa that it takes 6–8 years to learn enough L2 to be able to learn through the L2." (p. 192)

Although school systems throughout the world continue to resist giving all children in the twenty-first century the bilingual education they all deserve, there is a new consciousness among teachers of second languages that they can no longer ignore the impact of languaging and ethnifying for their students (Spolsky, this volume). Norton (2000) has argued that language learning is constitutive of, and constituted by, a speaker's identity and that, thus, language learners' "investment" in a second language is also an investment in their own social identity. And the recent work of Cummins (2006) and his colleagues surrounding "identity texts" sustains the importance of supporting the child's home language practices and ethnic identities in educating them.

Education has a very important role in fighting against social "linguicism," that is, what Skutnabb-Kangas (this volume) defines as "racist ideologies, structures and practices which are used to legitimate, effectuate and reproduce an unequal division of power and (both material and non-material) resources between groups which are defined on the basis of . . . language" (p. 200). Education is also important in preserving the ability of youth to language and ethnify in ways that are meaningful to themselves and their communities. For example, in language minority communities that have undergone significant language shift, it has been formal education that has been most responsible for helping to stop the tide. Schools in Aotearoa/New Zealand have had an important impact on the rise of Māori (May, this volume). And Williams (this volume) makes evident that although Irish is used as a community language less than in the past, its use in schools means that many more young people claim that they know it. That is, languaging through Irish (and English) has moved beyond traditional communities and families and has found its way to schools. Thus, school is an important place for developing the link between language practices and ethnifying.

But as I have pointed out elsewhere (García 2009), supporting the home language and ethnic practices of language minority and other bilingual children will depend on the degree to which schools are able to consider bilingualism in its complexity and dynamism and the multiple language and ethnic practices of all children in their dialogicity. If schools insist that children perform only monolingual and monocultural roles, whether it is done in one or two languages will not make a difference. Bilingual education will only succeed if schools take into account the importance of languaging and ethnifying for children's learning and if schools support tolerance toward all the language and ethnic practices of all the children. Bilingual education programs must go beyond the additive linear bilingualism that they have promoted in the past to include the more heteroglossic dynamic bilingualism (García 2009) that is prevalent in the twenty-first century. That is, bilingual education programs must remain open to embrace the plurilingualism of all the children to go beyond the "bi/two" to encompass the multiple language practices by which children signify. Only then will education systems build on the dynamic languaging and ethnifying of diverse children to extend social justice for all.

Conclusions

In this last chapter, I put at the center people as actors who signify differently by performing different language practices and ethnic practices. Thus, the importance of languaging and ethnifying becomes central, not as a scholarly or disciplinary interest but as a most important issue for the lives of people.

In the ten years since the publication of the first edition of this handbook, globalization has shaped language practices and ethnicity practices, and yet, local practices continue to be most important. This is why schools today must tend to both the local and the global, giving students access to a meaningful education that gives them entrée to many languages and literacies but doing so through meaningfully using the students' many ways of languaging and ethnifying. Education has an important role in supporting the most important signifying role of human beings that gives life meaning—the ability to language and ethnify. As the chapters in this volume make evident, it is the continuous dialogicity between languaging and ethnifying, as well as the many possibilities and varieties in which to do so, that makes the study of language and ethnic identity important.

Notes

1. This section is based on an article authored by Ofelia García and Zeena Zakharia titled "Language, Ethnic Identities and the Education of Language Minority Children" (unpublished).

2. The Sapir-Whorf hypothesis, as it has become known, has a "strong" version—claiming linguistic determinism or the idea that language determines thought, which has been mostly discarded as untenable—and a "weak" version of linguistic relativity.

Selected Bibliography

Amonoo, Reginald F. (1989). *Language and Nationhood: Reflections on Language Situations with Particular Reference to Ghana*. Accra, Ghana: Ghana Academy of Arts and Sciences.

Appadurai, Arjun (1996). *Modernity at Large: Cultural Dimensions of Globalization*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

August, Diane and Timothy Shanahan (2006). *Developing Literacy in Second-Language Learners*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Bakhtin, Michel (1981). *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays*. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.

Bakhtin, Michel (1986). *Speech Genres and Other Late Essays*. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.

Bhabha, Homa (1994). *The Location of Culture*. London, UK: Routledge.

Bourdieu, Pierre (1991). *Language and Symbolic Power*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Canagarajah, Suresh (1999). *Resisting Linguistic Imperialism in English Teaching*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Canagarajah, Suresh (2005). *Reclaiming the Local in Language Policy and Practice*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Cummins, Jim (2000). *Language, Power and Pedagogy: Bilingual Children in the Crossfire*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Cummins, Jim (2006). Identity texts: The imaginative construction of self

Fishman, Joshua A. (ed.) (2001). *Can Threatened Languages Be Saved?* Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Fishman, Joshua A. (forthcoming). *The Rise of European Languages of Vernacular Literacy. An Introductory Historical and Sociolinguistic Perspective.* Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Fishman, Joshua A. (1989). *Language and Ethnicity in Minority Sociolinguistic Perspective.* Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Fishman, Joshua A. (1985). *The Rise and Fall of the Ethnic Revival: Perspectives on Language and Ethnicity.* Berlin, Germany: Mouton de Gruyter.

Fishman, Joshua A. (1972). *Language and Nationalism: Two Integrative Essays.* Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

French, Brigittine (1999). Imagining the nation: Language ideology and collective identity in contemporary Guatemala. *Language and Communication* 19: 277–287.

García, Ofelia (2009). *Bilingual Education in the 21st Century: A Global Perspective.* Malden, MA, and Oxford, UK: Wiley/Blackwell.

Giles, Howard and Jane Byrne (1982). An intergroup approach to second language acquisition. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 3(1): 17–41.

through multiliteracies pedagogy. In *Imagining Multilingual Schools: Languages in Education and Globalization*, Ofelia García, Tove Skutnabb-Kangas, and Maria Torres-Guzmán (eds.), 51–68. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Errington, Joseph (2001). Colonial linguistics. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 30: 19–39.

Fettes, Mark (2003). The geostrategies of interlingualism. In *Languages in a Globalising World*, Jacques Maurais and Michael A. Morris (eds.), 37–46. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press. (Original work published 2001)

Fishman, Joshua A. (1972). *Language and Nationalism: Two Integrative Essays.* Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Gumperz, John (ed.) (1982). *Language and Social Identity.* Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.

Heller, Monica (1982). Negotiations of language choice in Montreal. In *Language and Social Identity*, John Gumperz (ed.), 108–118. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.

Heller, Monica (1987). The role of ethnic identity in the formation of ethnic identity. In *Children's Ethnic Socialization*, Jean Phinney and Mary Jane Rotheram (eds.), 180–200. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Heller, Monica (1995). Language choice, social institutions, and symbolic domination. *Language in Society* 24: 373–405.

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

Irvine, Judith and Susan Gal (2000). Language ideology and linguistic differentiation. In *Regimes of Language: Ideologies, Polities and Identities*, Paul V. Kroskrity (ed.), 34–84. Santa Fe, NM: School of American Research Press.

Kedourie, Elie (1993). *Nationalism.* Oxford, UK: Blackwell.

Kroskrity, Paul V. (2000). Regimenting languages: Language ideological perspectives. In *Regimes of Language: Ideologies, Polities and Identities*, Paul V. Kroskrity (ed.), 1–34. Santa Fe, NM, and Oxford, UK: School of American Research Press and James Currey.

Le Page, Robert B. and Andrea Tabouret-Keller (1985). *Acts of Identity: Creole-Based Approaches to Language and Ethnicity.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Makoni, Sinfree and Alistair Pennycook (2007). *Disinventing and Reconstituting Languages.* Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

May, Stephen (2001). *Language and Minority Rights. Ethnicity, Nationalism*

and the Politics of Language. Essex, UK: Pearson.

Milroy, James and Lesley Milroy (1999). Authority in Language: Investigating Language Prescription and Standardisation (3rd edition). London, UK: Routledge.

Mühlhäusler, Peter (2000). Language planning and language ecology. Current Issues in Language Planning 1(3): 306–367.

Myers-Scotton, Carol (1998). Structural uniformities vs. community differences in codeswitching. In Codeswitching Worldwide, Rodolfo Jacobson (ed.), 91–108. Berlin, Germany/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Norton, Bonnie (2000). Identity and Language Learning: Gender, Ethnicity and Educational Change. London, UK, and New York: Longman/Pearson.

Pavlenko, Aneta and Adrian Blackledge (2004). Negotiation of Identities in Multilingual Contexts. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Pennycook, Allistair (2000). English, politics, ideology: From colonial celebration to postcolonial performativity. In Ideology, Politics and Language Policies: Focus on English, Thomas Ricento (ed.), 107–119. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Pennycook, Allistair (2003). Global Englishes, rip slyme, and performativity. Journal of Sociolinguistics 7(4): 513–533.

Rampton, Ben (1995). Crossing: Language and Ethnicity among Adolescents. London, UK: Longman.

Romaine, Suzanne (1994). Language in Society: An Introduction to Sociolinguistics (2nd edition, 2001). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Sapir, Edward (1929). The status of linguistics as a science. Language 5: 207–214.

Sapir, Edward (1942). Language and national antagonisms. In When People

Meet: A Study in Race and Culture Contacts, Alain Locke and Bernhard J. Stern (eds.), 659–661. New York: Committee on Workshops, Progressive Education Association. [Excerpted from original work: Sapir, Edward (1933). Language. In Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences, Volume 9, Edwin R. Seligman and Alvin Johnson (eds.), 155–169. New York: Macmillan.]

Shohamy, Elana (2006). Language Policy: Hidden Agendas and New Approaches. London, UK: Routledge.

Skutnabb-Kangas, Tove (2000). Linguistic Genocide in Education, or Worldwide Diversity and Human Rights? Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Suleiman, Yasir (2004). A War of Words: Language and Conflict in the Middle East. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Vail, Leroy (ed.) (1991). The Creation of Tribalism in Southern Africa. Berkeley, CA, and Los Angeles, CA: University of California Press.

Weber, Max (1978). Economy and Society: An Outline of Interpretive Sociology. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Whorf, Benjamin (1956). In Language, Thought, and Reality: Selected Writings of Benjamin Lee Whorf, John Carroll (ed.), Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Woolard, Kathryn A. (1998). Introduction: Language ideology as a field of inquiry. In Language Ideologies: Practice and Theory, Bambi Schieffelin, Kathryn Woolard, and Paul Kroskrity (eds.), 3–47. New York: Oxford University Press.

Woolard, Kathryn A. and Bambi Schieffelin (1994). Language ideology. Annual Review of Anthropology 23: 55–82.

Yngve, Victor (1996). From Grammar to Science: New Foundations for General Linguistics. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.