Introduction

The nexus of migration and language

The emergence of a disciplinary space

Suresh Canagarajah

This handbook explores the interface between language and human mobility, which is gaining considerable geopolitical significance and generating scholarly inquiry. While language and semiotic resources are becoming important in mediating, regulating, and shaping migrant processes, mobility is also motivating a lot of rethinking on the understanding of language uses and forms. As scholars from the humanities and social sciences undertaking migration studies are beginning to address the role of language, applied linguists are borrowing from constructs in migration studies to understand communicative practices in mobile contexts. Such work is taking place in different academic and social spaces as it relates to particular themes and issues of interest to diverse scholars. This handbook endeavors to home in on the language/mobility nexus so that interdisciplinary scholars can take stock of the emergent scholarship for critical reflection and further development.

   Published under a series in applied linguistics (i.e., Routledge Handbooks in Applied Linguistics), this volume's disciplinary scope is somewhat bounded. The handbook brings together scholars in the field of applied linguistics (including cognate fields like sociolinguistics, anthropological linguistics, literacy, language policy and planning, and language teaching) to review the way language/migration nexus shapes their work. The handbook doesn't feature scholars from other fields in the humanities and social sciences (such as comparative literature, geography, sociology, or anthropology) who are engaged in studying mobility, though their work has significantly influenced the scholarship and theorization of applied linguists represented here. The purpose of the handbook then is to critically reflect on how applied linguists study the language/migration nexus in order to sharpen their tools, methods, and theoretical frames. Scholars in other fields will find the linguistic constructs presented in the handbook useful to conduct their own work. Additionally, the handbook introduces scholars from the cognate fields within applied linguistics to the work in their own discipline, as applied linguists in diverse parts of the world studying this nexus don't necessarily enjoy a shared scholarly identity or disciplinary space.

Migration and language

Why has the language/migration nexus emerged as significant? Scholars are talking about a "mobility turn" or "mobilities paradigm" in diverse disciplines (Urry 2000; Buscher, Urry, and Witchger 2011; Faist 2013). Though it is not a new experience, migration has attracted considerable recent attention due to new social, technological, and geopolitical developments. These developments have intensified the space/time compression (Harvey 2005) we see in contemporary social life. Texts, languages, and semiotic resources are crossing boundaries easily as diverse temporal and geographical zones are brought closer. People too are shuttling across borders more frequently, thanks to these developments. As the mobility of things and ideas as well as people intensifies in relation to these changes, territorialized (i.e., spatially rooted and circumscribed) ways of conducting social ties, identities, and community life are receiving less significance. Transcending localized, physically fixed, and placed definitions, we are aware of fluid, changing, and socially constructed ways in which these features are defined. Distant and virtual forces shape identities, communities, and social ties. In this context, language and semiotic resources become important for how these social constructs and experiences are defined and practiced. For example, my identity as a Sri Lankan Tamil, my ties with people belonging to this group, and our collective identity are primarily established and experienced through communicative media (i.e., via telephone, email, Skype, and FaceTime). This is because we live in different lands nowadays, having fled Sri Lanka during its ethnic conflict, losing the luxury of constant and direct physical contact. Even family life is transnational and semiotic. My siblings and I conduct our family life through digital media, as we live in different time zones and national borders in the UK, United States, Australia, and Sri Lanka. Language thus gains significance as a resource that mediates, shapes, and builds such relationships. It is not that language didn't play this role before in history. It is simply that its role is more salient now, in the context of the facilities that enable us to compress the space/time diffusion.

This compression has also given importance to "simultaneity" (Levitt and Glick Schiller 2004: 1003). Beyond crossing boundaries, we are able to collapse boundaries, and bring to bear diverse ties, identities, and communities on a single interaction or relationship. These relationships of "layered simultaneity" (Blommaert 2005: 237) also gain a semiotic dimension, enabled primarily by language and communication. From this perspective, one enjoys multiple identities and community memberships, which might gain salience differently in mobile interactions, further challenging territorialized, essentialized, and primordial ways of defining such social relationships. We are also able to conduct social ties and activities in diverse locations at the same time, drawing from multiple identities simultaneously, transcending our physical location.

Such developments are contributing to relationships and affiliations that are diversified and changing, built on hybrid and fluid semiotic resources. Social scientists have coined a new term, *superdiversity* (Vertovec 2007), to describe the more fluid forms of community being established by migrant communities in European urban spaces. People from diverse national and ethnic groups that settle in an urban space are able to form new communities with mixed features from their languages becoming a new shared repertoire to conduct their social life in the new habitation. These superdiverse communities are more layered and mixed compared to the separated ethnic enclaves that characterized previous waves of migrant settlement. Other terms such as *diaspora* are also being used in more expansive ways to index the experience of newer and more diverse migrant groups spread beyond their traditional homelands (Hall 1997). *Cosmopolitanism* is being adopted to index the

dispositions that facilitate cultural and linguistic engagement between diverse communities in contexts of mobility (Vertovec and Cohen 2002).

Migration and language have also received new impetus in the contemporary neoliberal economy built on production and marketing relationships that value mobile workers, capital, and products, facilitated by cross-border flows. To facilitate these flows, language has become an important form of human capital. Communicative repertoires are critical for enabling and managing such production and marketing. An important dimension of this form of economy is labor migration (Kuznetsov 2006). Talented people from diverse countries are encouraged to move across borders by industries in developed communities to contribute to their technological innovation. Language and communication become important for this domain as well, as workers from different nationalities collaborate in shared workplaces and production and marketing networks. Furthermore, the primary means of production in the neoliberal economy has shifted to tertiarization (Heller and Duchene 2012). Departing from the earlier focus on obtaining raw materials for industrialization, and the secondary stage of synthetic production, the focus of current production is on symbolic work. Tertiarization involves work on innovation, branding, client service, and marketing, all providing an important role for language and communication, in globally expansive economic relationships. Consider that in earlier forms of industrialization talk was censored and punished on the factory floor (Boutet 2012). What was expected then was physical labor for efficient material production. Now talk is encouraged as workers are expected to think outside the box to innovate and brand products in creative ways for the global multilingual market. For all these reasons, language repertoires have become an important form of human capital in neoliberal forms of mobility.

While language is important for mobility, mobility has also changed our understanding of language. Here again, it is not that the forms and functions of language being theorized are new. Mobility has simply made visible new communicative practices. Scholars are attempting to document, analyze, and theorize these practices with new terms and constructs. While I will discuss these new realizations later, it is good to introduce here the many new terms being coined and the debates regarding their relevance. Paralleling the "mobility turn," applied linguists now talk of a "multilingual turn" (May 2014). To index the more intense forms of contact that transcend labeled, territorialized, and separated languages, and the synergy of new meanings and grammars being generated through this mobility of codes, some scholars have adopted the term *translanguaging* (see Blackledge and Creese, this volume). Other labels such as *plurilingualism* (García 2009), *metrolingualism* (Pennycook and Otsuji 2015), and *transidiomaticity* (Jacquemet 2005) have also been coined by applied linguists, befitting their purposes and contexts, for roughly the same idea. As people borrow language features from diverse communities to index new identities and affiliations in mobility, even when they don't have full or advanced competence in the borrowed language, Rampton (2008) has coined terms such as *crossing* and *styling* to refer to this activity. Blommaert (2010) has coined the term *truncated multilingualism* for a competence that involves adopting bits and pieces of diverse languages for communicative functions in diverse migrant spaces.

We have to be cautious of claiming any kind of novelty to what is being indexed by these neologisms in this disciplinary space (see Pavlenko forthcoming for a critique). Though some scholars have treated sedentariness as traditional and mobility as modern (Zelinsky 1971), others have demonstrated that mobility is not a new human experience. There have been different, but equally complex, forms of mobility, transnationalism, and globalization in the past (Hoerder 2002; Faist, Fauser, and Reisenauer 2013: chap. 3; Han this

volume), including in premodern times (Anthony 1990, 2007; Cameron 2013). Similarly, languages have always been in contact, generating synergies of new meaning and grammar (see examples from before modernity and colonization in Pollock 2006; Canagarajah 2013: chap. 3). As Faist et al. (2013) argue, recent social and technological changes have simply intensified mobility, contact, and diversity rather than initiating them. However, this new visibility has changed the discourse in productive ways. In the place of territorialized, bounded, and static ways of talking about language and social practices, we are now adopting constructs that index their mobile, hybrid, and constructed nature. It is the discourse that is new, not the migration experience. Attempts to move inquiry beyond static, primordialist, and territorialized perspectives do require a creative and meaningful language. While acknowledging that mobility and translanguaging are not new human experiences, I see a need to construct new terms and models to correct the previously reductive discourses in scholarship and inquiry.

Rather than romanticize mobility as novel, what needs to be examined is the changing configurations of boundaries and flows in different social formations through history. There have always been policies and institutions that regulated flows to serve the interests of different social groups. There have never been unrestricted possibilities or unqualified scope for mobility. Therefore, Faist (2013) paradoxically states that mobility is a form of boundary management. Boundaries have always channeled mobility in particular ways for different groups of people. Consider, for example, the capitalist formation accompanying modernity. Capitalism found mobility useful for the economic and social world it was constructing, facilitating greater mobility for the middle class, relative to the restrictions of feudalism. The previous feudal order thrived on a more stable noble/vassal relationship, with caste-like reification of social hierarchies reproduced through generations, in privately owned land. Mobility unleashed the potential for knowledge and entrepreneurship by freeing many from the static and permanent feudal relationships and the bounded places they were locked in. However, precisely because of this social fluidity, mobility had to be regulated. Mechanisms had to be set up to protect capital, property, and ownership. Nation-states and citizenship territorialized subjects and identities. As I will argue later, the ideologies and discourses promoted by modernity were motivated by controlled mobility. Similarly, though the late-modern formation characterized by contemporary neoliberalism might appear to provide more scope for mobility across borders, it comes with its own boundaries to channel the flows in specific ways, giving access to certain people to certain spaces, as I will discuss in detail later.

Migration and mobility

Before we discuss the ways migration studies and applied linguistics have influenced each other to generate new theoretical constructs and analytical methods, a word about the connection between migration and mobility. The title of this handbook references migration rather than mobility. This is because the handbook focuses specifically on human mobility. Mobility as a general term includes the movement of many other resources and objects beyond human agents. The circulation of capital, products, information, and knowledge are part of the general term of mobility. A handbook on mobility, therefore, would feature different topics and scholarship than those represented in this one. This handbook places the spotlight on human mobility. Though the contributors to this handbook do discuss the ways diverse factors participate and are implicated in human mobility, they are not focusing on them for their own sake. As they consider the geographical movement of people, the

contributors are interested in examining how applied linguistics can be informed by broader paradigms of spatiotemporal mobility.

There are other distinctions we need to be aware of in the way the term *migration* is used in order to appreciate the scope of the term *mobility*. In policy and public discourse, the privileged who enjoy the resources and access for travel are considered mobile, and the less privileged are referred to as migrants. The mobile are welcome everywhere and have the resources to shuttle across borders as they please; migrants seek opportunities and refuge elsewhere. Reflecting on the biases behind this distinction, Faist (2013: 1640) observes:

> In the welfare-competition state, the movement of persons is dichotomized in public debate into mobility and migration, with mobility connoting euphemistic expectations of gain for individuals and states, and migration calling for social integration, control and the maintenance of national identity.

It is important to problematize the distinction between these terms, and examine questions of inequality in mobility in this handbook.

We have to also distinguish between vertical and horizontal mobility. This handbook is primarily concerned with horizontal (that is, geographical and spatial) mobility. Note, however, that mobility has also been used as synonymous with social (i.e., class and, thus, vertical) mobility in some scholarly contexts (see, for example, Graff 1991). Furthermore, vertical mobility has been implicated in horizontal mobility. There are social discourses that associate the desire for or possibility of geographical mobility as a sign of social/class mobility. Being sedentary or rooted is associated with lack of resources, being conservative, or the refusal to better one's prospects. Reflecting this bias, Bauman notes: "Local in a globalized world is a sign of social deprivation and degradation" (Bauman 1998: 2–3). This distinction too must be problematized. Geographical mobility doesn't always lead to social mobility. Many types of geographical mobility (including labor, climate-induced or conflict-driven displacement, and political exile) result in people ending up in worse economic and social status than what they enjoyed before migration. Though focused on horizontal mobility, this handbook examines the unequal chances for different migrant groups in vertical mobility (see Block, this volume).

Finally, both mobility and migration are volitional in connotation. The terms assume agency on the part of those moving outside their usual habitations. Traditionally, push/pull factors have been adopted to explain such human movement (Anthony 2007). While some factors, such as lack of opportunities for social or economic betterment serve as push factors, the possibility of advancement in the new places of habitation serve as pull factors. However, there are many migrant groups that have moved involuntarily in history. In consideration of these groups that experienced only push factors, usually of the most life-threatening kind, some scholars have preferred less volitionist terms such as "population circulation" (see Schachner 2010; Cameron 2013). Though the handbook uses the term *migration*, several contributions explore involuntary displacement to provide a balanced perspective.

Theoretical shifts

The greater visibility of mobility, and attendant social and communicative changes, has generated epistemological shifts that have affected social sciences and linguistics alike. Treating "mobility as method," we must approach mobility as not just a topic to be discussed under existing paradigms, but explore how it shapes the way we study and interpret social

and communicative practices. In framing it thus, I follow Mezzadra and Neilson (2013), who coin "border as method" to explore borders not only as a research object but also as an epistemic framework, with illuminating outcomes. I now outline these theoretical shifts in applied linguistics before identifying the analytical constructs and methods emerging for the study of language and communication. Though inspired by mobility, these constructs are beginning to have an impact on all aspects of language studies beyond the theme of migration.

The dominant discourses of modernity promoted paradigms that assumed territorialization, structure, and stability. They were influenced by such geopolitical developments as nation-state formation, private property, and colonization which had an interest in fixing communities and individuals in particular locations and identities despite (or because of) the increasing mobility unleashed by technological changes. As a specific example of the discourses of modernity, consider the "Herderian triad" (Bauman and Briggs 2000). This ideology made an equation between language, community, and place. In effect, German language identifies the German people who are placed in the nation-state of Germany. The language represents the spirit of the people which emerges from the soil of the land. Those who speak this language from elsewhere are therefore interlopers, as they cannot represent the spirit of the land that informs the language and its people. As we can see, this ideology territorializes language. Language is also turned into a static system that cannot move to other places or locations without losing its essential character. Many effects follow – and are still with us. People are located in specific lands/places with the language that naturally belongs to them. A person migrating from Turkey in childhood and speaking German as her most proficient language would perhaps still be considered an interloper in the language, unable to represent the original or pure spirit and values of the Germans in their language, thus considered a "non-native speaker." As we can see, the Herderian triad accounts for ideological constructs such as native speakerism, language ownership, essentialized/unitary identities, and exclusive/bounded community memberships.

Mobility disturbs many of the assumptions behind the Herderian triad. As people move across borders, they are taking their languages with them and also appropriating new semiotic resources for their identities and communication. With such changes, we must also go beyond considering each person as an owner of a single language. It is possible for speakers to claim intimate and proficient relationship with multiple languages simultaneously. We should be open to considering how diverse languages might represent hybrid, changing, and situated identities for individuals. We should also grapple with changing configurations of community relationships and affiliations for individuals. More importantly, people's social ties extend beyond local communities and physical boundaries to occupy *transnational social fields* (i.e., spaces that transcend nation-states; Faist et al. 2013). As the locus of social ties beyond national borders or physical places, these spaces might be imagined, socially constructed, and semiotically mediated. In other words, language plays an important role in establishing and enabling transnational social fields.

As people's relationship with territorialization changes, place itself is getting diversified. Scholars have begun to study the dynamic relationship between place and space. Though variously defined (see Higgins, this volume), virtual *space* sediments into geographical *place* through ongoing human activity; however, there are social *spaces* people construct to establish alternate and oppositional communities, countering the dominant groups and traditional norms of a *place*. These distinctions help us also move beyond territorialized constructs and consider home making, community formation, and place making as ongoing activities in mobility, often mediated and regulated by language. These considerations also

allow us to redefine the language implications for identity and community. We treat these constructs as mediated and constructed by language, not independent of them, allowing for changing, mobile, and situated representations of identity and community.

Just as people's relationships with languages change with mobility, our understanding of language is also changing. This is because not only people, but language is also mobile, whether accompanied by people or not. Mobility has challenged the static, objective, and bounded ways in which we perceived social or communicative activities. Structuralism, arguably the legacy of linguistics to many other fields such as sociology and anthropology, motivated scholars to treat language as a sui generis system that explained its own coherence in the way it was tightly structured, without the need to consider other domains such as society, culture, history, or geography. In adopting this framework, language was turned into a static, abstract, and autonomous system suitable for objective analysis. This tendency has also led to perceiving each labeled language as having its own system, separated from others. Similar shifts occurred in other fields in relation to their objects of inquiry, such as social structure or cultural systems, which were treated as autonomous and stable.

In the context of mobility, scholars are considering languages unbound – that is, they are endeavoring to understand the flows across time and space of semiotic resources, unfettered from an imposed structure. In order to do so, they treat these resources (of which verbal resources are also a part) as floating signifiers. They can be appropriated by people in a specific time and place for their meaning-making purposes. They become sedimented into grammars, and index values and norms over time, through a history of social use. Such a perspective would resist the territorialization of labeled languages as belonging to one place or community, with static norms and meanings deriving from a preconstructed structure. This shift is behind Blommaert's claim that we should perceive communication as shaped by "mobile resources" and not "immobile languages" (2010: 49). From this perspective, we shouldn't treat labeled languages as the starting point for the analysis of social and communicative practices. We should consider how diverse verbal resources (unrestricted by their labels) are taken up by people to establish meanings and negotiate relationships. The metaphor of resources also adds a functional perspective to the study of language. Communicative activity is the framework within which language forms should be analyzed. Norms and meanings emerge in relation to the functions people perform in situated interactions. This effort to go beyond labeled, autonomous, and separate languages, and consider the synergy between verbal resources in meaning-making activity, is behind the shift to translanguaging.

As we treat communicative activities as facilitated by mobile resources, we are also paying more attention to the way language works in tandem with diverse semiotic resources, social networks, and material conditions to produce meaning. Beyond questioning labeled languages as autonomous, we are now ready to consider language itself as embedded in social and material features, thus questioning the autonomy of language as a meaning-making system. In addition to including diverse semiotic resources in our consideration of meaning, we are also treating meaning as multimodal and multisensory, by including affective, imaginative, aesthetic, and material considerations in our analysis. It is in this way that we are able to explain the communicative success of "truncated multilingualism" and "styling." Since verbal resources are aligned with other social and material affordances to make meaning, a full and advanced competence in a single language is not required. Migrants are able to use the available verbal resources strategically, in relation to the diverse and social ecological affordances in their context, for effective communication that might deviate from the norms of native speakers or grammar books.

These orientations on language as a mobile resource are moving us away from the structuralist tradition that treated language as an autonomous and perhaps superior system for meaning-making. We are learning a lot from models that resist structuring to understand meaning-making practices. Many of these models have been better articulated in fields beyond linguistics, such as the social sciences or philosophy. Influenced by practice-based orientations (De Certeau 1984), we are treating communication as an activity. Such a functionalist orientation enables us to consider how norms and meanings emerge in relation to the situated and social functions people perform over space and time. In adopting this perspective, we are also open to considering meanings and norms as shaped by an "assemblage" of diverse resources. Drawing from this construct articulated by Deleuze and Guattari (1987) and Latour (2005), we now consider diverse social networks, ecological resources, and material objects as going into the construction of meaning in dynamic ways. We benefit from a "flat ontology" (Marston, Jones, and Woodward 2005), to guard against prioritizing specific factors, such as cognition or language, as more important than others for meaning-making activity. We consider all the factors that contribute to the emergence or construction of meaning without preconstructed boundaries, exclusions, or hierarchies. We distinguish the assemblages that gain changing significance in situated activities and are open to the different affordances and resources that contribute to meaning. From these perspectives, we are also reconsidering the place of material resources in social and communicative life. Posthumanist thinking and object-oriented ontologies have made us aware of the agency of things and objects (Barad 2007; Braidotti 2013), and the way they shape cognition and communication. We cannot treat material resources as inactive or merely instrumental for human communicative interests. Things have a life of their own, and significantly influence human thinking and communicative activity.

As we thus treat verbal and semiotic resources as mobile and situate them in spatial and temporal contexts, removed from their autonomy in predefined and abstract structures, applied linguists are searching for theoretical paradigms beyond structuralism. Many scholars are persuaded to adopt a spatial paradigm as better attuned to mobility. Influenced by the thinking of geographers (like Massey 2005; Thrift 2007), the spatial orientation to communication would involve the following assumptions:

- Acknowledge space as agentive, shaping social activities in significant ways;
- Treat space as diverse, dynamic, and changing, involving reconfigurations of space and place;
- Consider communication as an activity embedded fully in the environment, situated in space/time conditions;
- Understand communicative activities as fully material, treating diverse objects, artifacts, and physical nature as shaping meaning;
- Take into consideration all the affordances and constraints in the context (i.e., diverse semiotic resources, social networks, and material conditions) as equally shaping the communicative activity.

As we treat space as the starting point of our analysis of communicative activities, or orientate to space as the locus and frame of our inquiry into meaning, this shift enables us to problematize other constructs such as language, community, nation-state, and human cognition. It helps scholars consider the emergence of these constructs they traditionally took for granted or defined before the analysis (see Glick Schiller and Caglar 2011b who adopt a similar approach towards urban migration). Constructs such as identities, community, and

meaning can be considered for the manner in which they are put together through diverse material, social, and ecological factors, or emerge as an assemblage through diverse semiotic resources.

Spatiality enables us to counteract the dominant "metaphysics of presence" (Buscher et al. 2011: 5), which treats only those phenomena that are immediate, local, and physical as worthy of analysis. Those that are not immediately available to the senses are not treated as shaping talk or texts in this approach. The metaphysics of presence is also informed by the modernist bias towards empirical and positivist inquiry. However, as we grapple seriously with simultaneity, we are aware that factors in other times and places influence meaning-making and social activities. We cannot discount the influence of factors that are invisible, distant, or non-present on identity, meaning, and communication. Spatiality brings a sensitivity to the ways diverse spatial and temporal scales impinge on texts and talk.

Such a shift involves moving from grammar as the primary meaning-making system to a consideration of *spatial repertoires* (as they are beginning to be conceptualized by many scholars; see Fast 2012; Otsuji and Pennycook 2015; Canagarajah forthcoming b). They are different from grammars in the sense that they involve diverse semiotic resources. They are spatial in the sense that the resources are defined by and embedded in the space/time contingencies in which activities occur. They are different from genres, as genres have been traditionally defined in terms of largely verbal resources and are somewhat fixed and predefined. We can understand the notion of spatial repertoires as an alternative to grammatical structure for explaining the competence of language users. Communicative activities require certain objects, words, discourse conventions, physical movements, gestures, body postures, and participant frameworks for interactional success. Though interlocutors don't need the ability to form complete grammatical sentences, they must know how words align with objects, people, and contexts to be meaningful. We have to think of spatial repertoires as a heuristic or a template to guide interactions, rather than as fixed rules. They are situated, ecological, negotiated, and emergent. Participants must know how to adopt reciprocal strategies with interlocutors in contexts of spatial variation.

Spatial repertoires put the focus on practices and strategies rather than on norms, patterns, and structures for communicative success. Mobility requires a qualitatively different orientation to meaning-making and competence in order to explain the paradoxical features of fixity and fluidity, stability and change, order and emergence in communication. It requires a focus on the processes, practices, flows, links, and assemblages involved in meaning-making, beyond a focus on meaning as a product or pre-established norms. While we focused on the *what* earlier, we are now more concerned about the *how*. We now realize that how meanings are negotiated, established, and achieved is key to communication and social life. The earlier focus on meanings and identities in a product-oriented manner was informed by a static, territorialized, and homogeneous treatment of communication and language. The current shift is informed by the move toward *non-representational* thinking in many fields (Thrift 2007). While representational thinking focused on the *what* as the objective of inquiry, non-representational thinking focuses on the *how* (among other differences). The former lends itself to essentializing meanings and identities. As we become sensitive to diversity, fluidity, and complexity in mobility, the focus is more on the practices and processes, and affective and material factors, which explain the way meanings and identities are constructed. It is significant that scholars are now treating social and communicative constructs not as nouns (to index meanings and products), but as verbs, as in grammaring, translanguaging, place making, homing, and meaning-making.

As we have seen, mobility has provided more complexity to communicative activity, compelling us to develop new theoretical orientations to the analysis of language. We have had to develop new constructs for inquiry, analysis, and interpretation. The constructs I have introduced in this brief narrative, such as simultaneity, spatiality, transnational social fields, non-representational thinking, assemblage, and translanguaging, will inform the chapters in the handbook and become fleshed out in the discussions.

Research and analytical methods

These shifts in theoretical orientations have generated new questions about the scope and focus of analysis in communicative interactions. There are two fundamental challenges for research and inquiry as applied linguists move forward. They can be explained as follows:

1 *Scope of analysis*: What is the scale, scope, or boundary of the interaction that should be analyzed? In short, what is a relevant unit of analysis for communicative interactions? This decision becomes problematic when we consider diverse spatial and temporal scales as mediating interactions, compounded by the simultaneity that introduces layers of meanings, identities, and investments from different times and places in the same interaction. Where do we draw the line on a text, talk, or interaction that is a valid object or artifact for analysis?
2 *Focus of analysis*: What verbal and semiotic features should be included in our analysis? Now that we are open to considering communication as translingual, multimodal, material, and spatial, an infinite number of features can become meaning-making resources. However, certain resources might be more salient than others in specific interactions.

To understand the significance of these questions, let us consider how we addressed these concerns traditionally and how they are called into question in a mobile orientation to semiotic resources and interactions.

To consider the first question, recall that scholars in applied linguistics and many other fields often treated the nation-state as the default and implicit boundary for communicative and social interactions. This bias is referred to as "methodological nationalism" (Wimmer and Glick Schiller 2002). The possibility of transnational social fields suggests that our social ties and interactions exceed the nation-state and adopt liminal spaces as their locus. From this perspective, methodological nationalism might turn out to be an irrelevant and reductive framing for certain interactions. A similar framing is the community – treated often as an ethnic group that shares certain norms and values about language and communication. In applied linguistics, scholars operationalized this framing as a *speech* or *discourse community*. Some have critiqued this framing as the "ethnic lens" (Glick Schiller and Simsek-Caglar 2011b: 65). Pratt (1987) has argued that these assumptions of shared group norms are a "linguistic utopia" that ignore that all social spaces are contact zones where people with diverse norms engage in communicative activities.

While the nation-state or the community framed the unit of analysis at the macro level, we defined the object of analysis at the micro level in a slightly different way. Applied linguists have treated the verbal resources of two or more individuals in a face-to-face interaction as the relevant micro unit of analysis. Meanings should be recoverable from the language used in the immediate interaction. Any interpretive resource brought from outside the immediate interaction was secondary. They were admitted only when the resources in the immediate/local verbal interaction were inadequate to explain what was going on. Similarly, in literacy,

the bounded text and the physical activity of writing by an author or collaborators, or the reading activity of an individual or group, were considered the scope of analysis. Individuals who are not present in the face-to-face conversational interaction or literacy event were not considered relevant. Other non-human influences on language or the expanded spatiotemporal flows of words and texts did not actively influence interpretation. This analytical orientation was influenced by the "metaphysics of presence" that valued immediately available sensory data as permissible evidence for knowledge claims.

However, as we discussed, there are many shaping and constraining influences on the conversational interaction or text from outside the immediate participants and interaction. Consider the non-present human agents who might also be part of the communicative interaction. Blommaert, Spotti, and Van der Aa (this volume) discuss a refugee interviewee in their study in Belgium being influenced by a family member who was overhearing their interview via Skype (through a laptop that was always in her hands during the interviews). When the researchers accidentally discovered this distant and invisible "participant," they realized that the meanings and content of the interview were shaped by this family member as well. In the context of time/space compression and the resulting simultaneity, our inquiry now has to be open to influences from participants outside the immediate physical context of interaction. The participants in a study could themselves be relating their meanings and identities to other places and times beyond the situated interaction.

Many resources and factors presumed to be lying outside the focus on the verbal data were relegated traditionally to "context." The construct "context" enabled us to draw the line on what we considered "talk," "text," or "interaction" that merited close analysis. From an expanded spatiotemporal perspective on communicative interactions, we run into problems in separating context from text. Traditionally, for reasons explained earlier, we treated the immediate physical and temporal environment of a face-to-face interaction as belonging to the text; all other spatiotemporal influences and factors were relegated to context. Two dominant metaphors have been adopted to characterize the text/context relationship. The classic metaphors of figure and background are implicit in many studies. The figure (i.e., text) receives primary focus. The background only brings it into relief, and perhaps contributes secondary and contingent meanings from the context. A slightly different metaphor that was applied in certain other studies is that of the context as container. From this perspective, the context shapes the meaning of the text which is contained. This application can be a bit deterministic, with what is considered context controlling the possible choices of interpretation.

Though both metaphors acknowledge some influence from the context on talk/text, they are characterized by certain limitations:

- The influence of context is one-sided. Not much attention is given to the possibility that language and/or speakers can renegotiate, reconstruct, and recontextualize the interaction in dynamic ways throughout the talk or interaction. In fact, language or text can constitute its own context. Furthermore, interlocutors can reframe how social and material context are made relevant to their talk or texts as they interact.
- Context is treated as somewhat static. This probably comes from the bias that material environment lacks agency. The work of posthumanist theorists makes us realize that the material/physical environment is changing, dynamic, and agentive. Material life also shapes human interactions, considerably qualifying human agency. From this perspective, objects and the environment can mediate and shape language and cognition in complex ways.

- Context is monolithic. Its multiplicity or diversity is not acknowledged. The notion of layered simultaneity acquaints us to the fact that there are multiple scales of influence, from places and times of different distance and proximity. The contexts or factors that mediate and shape multilingual interaction can belong to different scales of consideration, nested or overlapping with one another. For example, a classroom interaction is regulated by the institution (school); shaped by policies of the larger state, regional, or national educational administration; and nested within global educational systems. We have to determine which contextual scale becomes relevant at what point. It is not also acknowledged that context is relative. What is global or local (or immediate or distant) in an interaction might differ for each participant, and also change as the interaction proceeds. This distinction becomes especially problematic when we consider that the local and global interpolate each other (see Wortham and Reyes 2015 for a discussion).
- Context is treated usually as geographical, without adequate attention to temporal influences. Features of the setting, such as place, community, or nation-state, are acknowledged, accommodating related notions such as culture or social structure. But the influences from time are not given attention beyond the generalized notion of "historical context." Time would explain the mobility of people and semiotic resources through diverse scales (i.e., present but also past and future) often all scales coming together in layered simultaneity.
- What is included in context is largely impressionistic and arbitrary, rarely treated as an empirical question that needs to be ascertained. Context is assumed before the data collection or analysis without being problematized. Researchers rarely keep the relevant spatiotemporal frames for analysis open throughout the diverse stages of the study, sensitive to how context may itself be changing at different stages of the interaction as well as their study.
- Finally, the binary distinction of context/text is misleading and irrelevant when we consider that communicative practices involve diverse resources across many levels of time and space with different horizontal and hierarchical influences. The binary collapses this amalgamation of influences into two, with one given more importance than the other in our analysis. The spatial orientation would consider how meaning is an emergence of diverse resources across different scales of space and time. From this perspective, the contexts of interaction are very expansive. They can involve unlimited time and space considerations shaping the focused interaction.

The way we have traditionally circumscribed our unit of analysis, by making an arbitrary context/text distinction, also shapes our understanding of what semiotic features we take into consideration as meaning-making resources. Our focus of analysis is the verbal resource from a single language we consider as enjoying meaning-making potential in the interaction. Everything else is relegated to insignificant context. The spatial orientation would complicate our focus of analysis. As in Latour's (1987) telling metaphor, there is an "Ariadne's thread" of diverse networked resources from ever-expanding spatiotemporal scales that shape talk. Applied linguists are already pushing back against the "lingual bias" in our field (Block 2014) that treats verbal resources as the only or superior medium of communication.

  Note that even in studies of multilingual interactions the focus of analysis is still one language at a time. In studies in second language acquisition, interactions in other languages are treated as side sequence to resolve problems in the language being learned (see Firth and Wagner 2007 for a critique). In studies of English as a lingua franca (ELF), the use of

languages other than English was traditionally ignored in favor of describing the corpus of English used by multilingual speakers (Seidlhofer 2004). Other verbal resources were not analyzed for the possible synergy with English or the new indexicalities of meaning beyond labeled languages. Similarly, the less obvious cognitive or affective influence of diverse languages on the use of English by multilinguals as they shuttle between languages was also not treated as ascertainable or relevant. If we accommodate language contact and the new meanings produced out of this synergy, along the orientation to translanguaging, we should include the meshing of codes from diverse separately labeled languages and consider deviation from established norms as part of the indexicalities of meaning.

Studies in mainstream applied linguistics also treat non-verbal resources in limited ways. In some analytical traditions, para-verbal resources have been excluded as tainting the analysis. For example, ELF has prioritized words (see Pitzl 2010: 92 for her justification on focusing on words and accommodating non-verbal resources in limited exceptional cases). Though laughter and silence have been addressed in some studies, they have been largely treated as para-verbal cues that point to the more important language work in the interaction (see Matsumoto 2015 for a critique). Silence can indicate lack of uptake of the previous utterance, for example. But it has rarely been considered as a semiotic resource in its own right for producing meaning that complements or enriches the verbal (see Glenn 2004 and Matsumoto 2015 for such a demonstration). Similarly, laughter has been treated as a face-saving strategy for filling silence or marking lack of uptake, without considering how it might contribute to additional meanings (see Matsumoto 2015 for a corrective).

To move further, features of the body (such as gaze, gesture, posture, proximity, and positioning) have also not been given adequate significance in multilingual interactions (see Goodwin 2000 for a notable exception). Despite a small group of scholars in applied linguistics focusing on gesture as complementary to talk (see Smotrova and Lantolf 2013 and Matsumoto 2015 for emergent work in classroom contexts), a majority of studies have largely treated gesture as a compensatory strategy, but not as a meaning-making resource in its own right. It has also not been considered as complementary to verbal resources, conveying meaning beyond words, as a separate channel of communication. Other features of the body should also be considered more closely for the way they function as semiotic resources, conveying meanings that parallel, constrain, or enrich verbal communication. Interactions in multilingual and migrant professional settings suggest that because of workplace contingencies (i.e., noise, speed of production, wearing masks) a lot of effective and efficient communication occurs without words or with minimal language use (see Kleifgen 2013). Not including them in the focus of analysis would mean losing significant information on the meaning of these interactions.

Much of the work on non-verbal resources gets addressed under the field of multimodality. However, the spatial orientation expands multimodal analysis. Multimodality has hitherto addressed certain predefined modes and features scholars have considered as "communicative," such as gestures, sound, images, and visuals (see Kress 2000; Stein 2000). Spatial orientation goes beyond to include all material and social affordances, such as objects, artifacts, and social networks as equally communicative (Rickert 2013; Pigg 2014). In fact, anything can become communicative, based on the indexicality achieved in situated interactions over time. There is also a tendency in multimodal analysis to systematize communicative modes for their norms and patterns in meaning-making (see Kress 2010 for an attempt); but spatiality adopts a more open orientation to modes as an assemblage. In this sense, multimodality still makes a distinction between context/text,

distinguishing communicative modes from non-communicative contexts; but spatiality considers all the environmental/spatial resources as potentially entextualized in complex and subtle ways into the emergence of meanings. Furthermore, multimodality considers communicative modes and resources as already endowed with certain meanings, while spatiality considers how modes that are not necessarily considered communicative (such as machines or artifacts in a workplace) might index meanings in situated social activity (see Canagarajah forthcoming a, for an analysis). Finally, multimodal scholars adopt an agentive orientation to consider how people use multimodal resources for their communicative intentions; however, spatiality considers the way the alignment between people and modes shape meanings. There is greater acceptance of the shaping influence of things and other semiotic resources on human cognition and verbal facility in the spatial orientation.

It is salutary that scholars in applied linguistics do address strategies of communication beyond meanings and identities. This move towards *procedural* (rather than *propositional*) competence (see Byram 2008) is a gesture towards non-representational thinking. It is possible to presume that a focus on communicative strategies would bring a broader social and material orientation to interactions, giving greater significance to diverse semiotic resources. However, communicative strategies are largely analyzed in relation to the negotiation of verbal meanings in many fields in applied linguistics (see Bjorkman 2014 for a recent state of the art on how strategies are studied in ELF). That is, interlocutors are observed for the strategies they adopt to anticipate or repair communicative breakdown in words. Also, the strategies they adopt are deployed verbally. How they might use the body, objects, or other resources in the setting to repair breakdown is not considered as part of the analysis or their communicative competence. (In fact, competence and meaning are defined in terms of grammatical control.) More importantly, how communicative strategies might enrich or complement verbal meaning by bringing other social and material resources into communication is not explored.

To appreciate the scope of resources that can be included in a spatial orientation, consider the treatment of *alignment*, a construct that is used in different applied linguistic models to address procedural competence. As it is used in conversation analysis (see Steensig 2013), it refers to the strategies interlocutors adopt (such as back channeling cues) to indicate focus on the interaction and uptake of words. However, alignment could also be indexed by proximity, gaze, or positioning. It can also mean how resources in the communicative ecology (such as objects and artifacts) are marshaled to complement meaning. The latter possibilities are addressed in the sociocognitive model (Atkinson, Churchill, Nishino, and Okada 2007: 171), which is salutary for exploring the "mind-world-body" connection. However, a limitation of the sociocognitive orienation is that the resources taken into consideration are situated in the here-and-now (adhering to the metaphysics of presence). Also, the alignment is eventually studied for its effects on cognitive and grammatical control one language at a time. Other models, such as the communities of practice (Wenger 1998), study alignment in relation to resources and social networks that are distant in time and space. From this perspective, alignment can mean how one positions oneself in relation to social networks, objects, and semiotic resources that are not immediately present in an interaction to perform an activity. However, there is a strong sense of human agency in this orientation, treating the strategies as adopted by individuals and groups. Spatial orientation would posit that alignment can accommodate diverse objects in the material and social environment to be strategically configured to generate meanings that are beyond cognitive control and that are not fully under the competence of the

individual. Alignment in the latter sense is an adaptation to diverse semiotic resources that requires bodily and affective dimensions beyond the cognitive for meaning and identity construction. To move away from the cognitive bias in terms such as *alignment* and *competence*, some scholars in the spatial orientation adopt the terms *emplacement* (Pigg 2014) or *ambience* (Rickert 2013). These terms connote that meanings emerge with greater shaping influence from bodily alignment and material resources. From this perspective, human agents may have to contend with the constraining influence of material factors to strategically work with available resources to negotiate possible meanings. As it is evident, the spatial orientation on mobility compels a qualified view of human agency, verbal facility, and cognitive mastery in meaning-making activity (see Canagarajah forthcoming a, for a fuller discussion).

Methodological ways forward

Though expanding the scope and focus of analyses is important, we have to recognize that there are ways in which the scale and resources are delimited in each interaction. Sometimes, interlocutors cue how they want the interaction to be framed. Certain semiotic resources might become more salient than the others for a variety of reasons. Furthermore, a "flat ontology" doesn't fully contend with the fact there are power inequalities, which might place certain scales and semiotic resources as more important than the others in certain interactions. Hierarchies and boundaries are obdurate social facts. Therefore we have to turn to the question of which contexts of consideration and which semiotic resources should be included in a given analysis. I review a few approaches applied linguists have come up with in response to this question, as we continue to engage with these methodological challenges.

Scalar analysis is becoming useful for applied linguists to address the emerging analytical questions (see Prinsloo, this volume). This is a construct applied linguists have recently borrowed from anthropology and political science. Scales enable us to consider how participants and analysts frame texts or interactions. Scales remind us of Goffman's (1983) notion of *frames*. But scalar analysis enables us to address frames in more layered and complex ways. Furthermore, scales enable us to address non-visible and non-immediate features that Goffman left out because of his prioritization of the local in his treatment (see Lempert 2012 for a critique). Though there are significant debates on the definitions and operationalization of scales (see Canagarajah and De Costa 2016 for a review), we can orientate to scalar analysis as follows:

Scales are both spatial and temporal. More importantly, they help us consider how they are dynamically implicated in each other. Bakhtin's (1986) metaphor of chronotopes reminds us that spatiotemporal scales have to be addressed as connected and interrelated.

Scales are layered. There are not only many scales, thus opening up "context" to diversity, they are also relative to each other. For example, scales can accommodate nested or ladder relationships, providing possibilities to consider communication as shaped by layered influences. Though nesting and ladder are somewhat linear and hierarchical (i.e., one scale is more global or determinative than the other), some treat scales as rhizomatic to avoid those implications. Rhizome suggests that scales might influence talk in non-linear, unpredictable, and non-synchronous ways. We can thus invoke frames of different levels or magnitude for the way they relate to meanings and communicative outcomes. Scales enable us to move beyond the traditional binary of macro and micro or global and local, considering them as relative and interpolating each other in fluid ways.

Scales are semiotic. They are not objectively out there, thus existing before analysis or interactions. They are constructed by institutions and people to understand or explain social interactions. They are mediated, negotiated, and established through semiotic activity.

Scales are changing. As scales are constructed and negotiated, social institutions and actors are actively involved in rescaling interactions.

Scales also help us address the distinction made between agency and structure in more complex ways. Agency is often assumed to thrive in the local scales, while the global is associated with more deterministic structures in traditional understandings of context. However, the nested and ladder orientation to scales help us understand how translocal scales shape the local. Similarly, the rhizomatic orientation to scale helps us understand how new structural arrangements may emerge from different spaces between the local and the global, reconfiguring each in unpredictable ways. More importantly, material environment is itself agentive and can rescale interactions, going beyond the notion of context as passive or human actors as fully agentive.

The distinction of scales as a *category of analysis* and *category of practice* can help us triangulate data and perspectives to home in on the appropriate unit and focus of analysis. Scales as a category of analysis is the frames that researchers adopt to study an interaction. Scales as a category of practice is the way participants frame and rescale their interactions. Though these uses of scales have been debated as conflicting (see Lempert 2012), they can also be productively brought together. While the scaling activity of participants provides an emic perspective on the interaction, we have to be open to the possibility that researchers can also adopt different scales as relevant, based on the questions they pose or problems they are trying to address. That is, the story researchers want to tell and the objectives they want to accomplish by analyzing communicative interactions would determine which scales become relevant and which semiotic resources are significant for that scale of consideration. Of course, they have to triangulate the data and analysis with the participants' own categories of practice, and evidence from extended and close fieldwork. Furthermore, the participants' perspective can be limited. The spatial orientation would suggest that the participants themselves are not always aware of all the environmental resources shaping and constraining their talk. Besides the reality of ideologically influenced misrecognition, we have to also contend with the limitations of human agency and cognitive control. Therefore certain non-visible scales of institutional or translocal relationships that shape our interaction should be accommodated in the analysis.

Other approaches have also been adopted to figure out the appropriate unit and focus of analysis in mobility. Blommaert, Spotti, and Van der Aa (this volume) suggest that the expanded fieldwork of ethnography would help researchers understand which scales and features become relevant for an interaction. Multisited and longitudinal studies that are sensitive to all variables in a communicative situation might help researchers to problematize the unit of analysis without predefining what is relevant for a given interaction. As they thus empirically determine the scales that are relevant, they would also attune themselves to the semiotic resources that play an important role in each scale in meaning-making activity. Blommaert et al. also mention that critical moments in an interaction (or a study) can make relevant certain unexpected semiotic features or scales that researchers hadn't considered before. The narrative mentioned earlier on how they accidentally discovered the online and virtual presence of the relative of their participant constituted a critical moment. Thereafter, they had to accommodate this distant and invisible member's presence in their interviews to understand the interactions appropriately.

Wortham and Reyes (2015) propose a "discourse analysis beyond the speech event" that would situate meaning-making activities in an expanded spatiotemporal scale and

problematize the indexicality of semiotic resources. They outline a hermeneutic process whereby semiotic resources can be tracked across time and space for the ways they acquire and change meanings, beyond the immediate face-to-face encounter. In this way, they develop a method for tracing emergent and achieved indexicality across time and space, beyond the traditional demarcations of physically circumscribed context or predefined meanings and norms. Though Wortham and Reyes discuss the construction of verbal meanings in diverse media (spoken, written, digital), they don't apply their model to extra-verbal resources (such as objects, images, or gestures). It is not impossible to imagine ways in which we can adopt their analytical method to diverse semiotic resources beyond those accommodated typically in verbal or multimodal analysis.

As we thus expand our focus and unit of analyses, we are also challenged to come up with new methods for observing interactions and collecting data. There are of course many challenges here that require creative resolutions. For example, though we know that meanings and interactions might be realized or enacted in diverse spatial and temporal scales simultaneously, researchers are physically limited to being in only one place at a time. Besides, there are resource limitations that might prevent researchers from studying interactions in multiple locations or employing collaborators in diverse places. A study of mobility requires observing flows, processes, and changes in diverse places and times simultaneously. Creative methods are being devised to overcome these challenges. The following are some examples of methodological innovations coming into prominence, which would be discussed in greater detail in the chapters in the handbook:

> *Multisited ethnography*: As a corrective to traditional ethnography in which scholars studied cultural practices in a single location by becoming saturated into the practices of a community over a long period of time, scholars are spending shorter but more intensive periods of observations in multiple locations to study the continuities or connections in communicative practices. Though there is an attempt to develop an insider and emic perspective, there is also the realization that meaning or activity transcends the immediate context (see further Dick and Arnold, this volume).
>
> *Mobile methods*: Within this label introduced by Buscher et al. (2011), research methods involve following participants, artifacts, or semiotic resources through multiple locations and times. In these methods, the researchers are themselves mobile, considering the liminal *spaces* of mobility (beyond the physical *place* or location) as their research setting. The authors review some illustrative approaches such as: following people, either directly by shadowing them or covertly "stalking" them (Buscher et al. 2011: 8); participating in people's movement through a walk-along or ride-along to experience the contexts and activities of subjects; obtaining time-space diaries from subjects to plot people's movements; exploring virtual mobility through blogs, emails, listservs, and tweets to capture the flow of texts and their meanings; and using mobile positioning devices which involve cell phones or other tracking devices to plot people's movements, networks, and frequencies. Obviously, there would be challenges in obtaining institutional approval and participant consent for some of these methods.
>
> *Participatory research*: Many scholars are treating subjects themselves as co-researchers to gather information on their flows and movements, in addition to unveiling attitudes and experiences that researchers can't always have access to. These methods turn out to be full-bodied, providing access to participants' affect and imagination, beyond impersonal facts and figures. For example, researchers are gathering useful

information from creative literature or dramatic performances written by migrants, which sometimes provide fictional representations that still provide significant insights into migrant experiences. Drama, autobiographies, and novels are useful texts for relevant data (as Baynham shows in his chapter in this volume). Along the same lines, narratives have emerged as significant tools for exploring experiences, attitudes, and relationships, often elicited by researchers themselves through sensitive but strategic interview questions (see DeFina and Tseng, this volume).

Mixed methods: A modest proposal is to adopt mixed methods to capture simultaneity. Boccagni (2012) proposes this as an approach to sample demographic movements through survey and quantitative methods, while zeroing in on specific locations for a qualitative study of migrant experiences.

Disciplinary implications

As we can see, migration and mobility have generated new orientations to language and social inquiry. They have helped scholars question some of the territorialized, bounded, static, and representational thinking in applied linguistics as in other fields in humanities and social sciences. The expansion of the scope and focus of analysis have resulted also in greater interdisciplinarity. There is a lot of borrowing and sharing of theoretical constructs and research methods in applied linguistics, humanities, and the social sciences. As we have seen in the preceding discussion, applied linguists has been borrowing theories and methods from diverse other disciplines to strengthen their inquiry. We have reviewed constructs from geography (i.e., Massey, Thrift), philosophy (Deleuze and Guattari, Bardotti), sociology (Latour, Urry), anthropology (Glick Schiller), and physics (Barad) in the preceding pages. However, other disciplines have not always benefited from the scholarship of applied linguistics. The latter is often treated as a service discipline to teach languages to migrant families, students, and workers, rather than valued for making intellectual contributions of its own. In this section, I want to articulate some ways in which migration studies can benefit from the scholarship of applied linguists.

First we have to acknowledge that applied linguistics has itself a lot of work left for redefining and retheorizing basic constructs in its field. After a period of positivistic/empirical inquiry when scholars moved in a settled trajectory towards final answers on key questions, adopting the structuralist and experimentalist orientation, there is now a realization that we might have to start all over again in the context of mobility. The observations of Kramsch on foreign language pedagogy are relevant to many other areas in applied linguistics:

> There has never been a greater tension between what is taught in the classroom and what the students will need in the real world once they have left the classroom. In the last decades, that world has changed to such an extent that language teachers are no longer sure of what they are supposed to teach nor what real world situations they are supposed to prepare their students for.
>
> *(Kramsch 2014: 296)*

Beyond pedagogy, her statement points to basic questions in proficiency and competence remaining unresolved. As we have discussed here, when meaning-making practices involve negotiating diverse semiotic resources in different spatiotemporal scales, we have to ask what it means to be proficient in a language. Is it relevant to define competence one language at a time, when people are shuttling between languages and, in fact, treating verbal resources

as floating signifiers that can be taken over for their communicative functions with desired indexicalities? Can we separate grammatical knowledge from the competence to use diverse other semiotic resources in achieving our communicative objectives? Is a language proficiency developed in terms of grammatical/verbal resources for separately labeled languages appropriate when communicative unpredictability is the norm, with interactions always involving interlocutors with diverse codes in mobility? Is it possible to define competence in terms of propositional knowledge when mobile spaces always present a diverse mix of participants with no norms or values shared for communication (thus requiring procedural knowledge)? As people are compelled to keep expanding their resources constantly, with new genres and changing communicative norms, we have to ask whether we can ever define a threshold level for assessing proficiency when one can stop learning or consider him/herself competent. There are similar questions for other domains in applied linguistics, such as language policy, testing, and literacy, which have been based on territorialized language norms and identities, with reductive notions of language as an autonomous and static system. We have to explore these questions in relation to diverse contexts, disciplinary insights, and emergent paradigms in ongoing inquiry.

As language has become important in mobile contexts for shaping identities, communities, and social practices, applied linguistics too has much to offer other disciplines. In recognition of this, many scholars in diverse fields are already using linguistic constructs in their disciplinary inquiry. Scholars in fields such as migration studies, geography, sociology, and anthropology are addressing language in their work. However, because they don't have familiarity with linguistics, their work is sometimes superficial or questionable. Though a formal training in applied linguistics is too much to ask for, an understanding of work relevant to their research questions might be convenient to obtain – as in this handbook. Next, I give examples of recent work in migration studies that can benefit from greater engagement with applied linguistics.

Consider the study of highly skilled migration. As mobile professionals are becoming key to innovation and productivity in the neoliberal economy, there has been considerable research interest on how language proficiency correlates with employment success in a new country. These studies have been conducted by those in geography and social sciences adopting quantitative and statistical approaches. These demographic studies show a positive correlation between those who are proficient in the dominant language of the host country and their economic success (see Dustmann 1994; Chiswick and Miller 1995, 2002, 2007; Dustmann and van Soest 2002; Dustmann and Fabbri 2003; Bleakley and Chin 2004). Many of these studies show that those who are proficient in English tend to be better employed, considering English as the global professional language. They also suggest that those who are from countries which provide an important place for English in their education or society (such as former British colonies, India or Singapore) are more successful, while those from countries which have lacked English exposure (i.e., West Asian or East European countries) tend to be less so. Williams and Balaz (2008: 29), reviewing many studies of this nature, summarize the rationale behind this body of research thus:

> The classic human-capital perspective suggests that immigrants tend to adapt to their host countries via accumulating human capital. A critical element of human capital is fluency in the host country's language, which mediates their integration into that country's labor market.

These demographic and quantitative studies, however, overlook significant complicating information that applied linguists are aware of. They don't explore what languages are

actually involved in professional communication (i.e., though subjects might be proficient in English, is that the only language they are using in their workplace?); the attitudes of the migrants towards the languages they use (i.e., though subjects might be proficient in English, do they value it over their other repertoires?); and the other forms of social capital that languages may or may not provide access to (i.e., is English the critical factor in professional success, or is it the social connections and professional status subjects may enjoy through English?). This tradition of migration studies has to be qualified by knowledge from interactional sociolinguistics and ethnographies on attitudes and practices in workplace communication (see for example Kubota 2013; Canagarajah 2016; Kirilova and Angouri, this volume; Lising, this volume). Such studies point to the following. To begin with, languages cannot be essentialized. For example, English is not a monolithic or homogeneous language. The Englishes spoken by Indians and Nigerians are very different from the varieties that are privileged by native speakers in the UK or United States. Besides, there are strong biases against the varieties spoken by postcolonial subjects in native speaker communities. Therefore, treating the proficiency of the speaker and the norms of the host community as equal is misleading. Furthermore, applied linguists who study language negotiations and social practice in situated interactions would question the equation of formal proficiency (judged in terms of standardized tests such as TOEFL or IELTS) with actual communicative practices and outcomes in workplaces. The communicative practice in situated social interactions can have little relevance to the grammatical norms in tests. Workplace communication studies show many diverse possibilities (see Kubota 2013; Canagarajah 2016); that is, transnational and multilingual workers may not use the privileged languages or norms in their interaction; they typically use truncated multilingualism (i.e., bits and pieces of diverse languages successfully); and verbal resources may matter less where material and physical resources (artifacts, gestures, etc.) might be more important. Therefore, an understanding of the diversity of communicative practices from applied linguistics would fruitfully complicate demographic studies and correlationist claims in migration studies, leading to more triangulated data and nuanced interpretations.

The social scientific research cited earlier also tends to shape policy and pedagogy. Based on the assumption that a proficiency in host country language is important for professional relationships, policies on workplace employment in many countries emphasize a formal proficiency in English. There are policies of English Only or monolingualism in many workplaces that penalize nonnative varieties or other languages in professional communication (see Kirilova and Angouri, this volume; Lising, this volume). Employment policies in many countries (such as Canada, Australia, the UK, and New Zealand) mandate a high score on the IELTS (International English Language Testing System) for qualification or selection. Immigration to such countries on work visas also emphasize a high score on such tests. Under pressure to perform well in these requirements, there is a global scramble to learn English (Piller and Cho 2013). There is a belief that English is the linguistic capital everyone needs for success in the neoliberal economy, leading to the commodification of English and marketization of testing instruments such as TOELF and IELTS. However, applied linguistics studies on workplace interactions (as reviewed earlier and presented in the chapters in this volume) and interviews with migrant professionals (see Kubota 2013; Canagarajah 2016) show that workplace communication is much more multilingual, multimodal, and polysemiotic, differing from the normative and formal requirements of these tests and policies. Multilingualism can account for efficiency and productivity, countering the policy perspective that shared codes and universal norms lead to such outcomes (as reviewed critically by Grin 2001). More importantly, beyond

language norms, we are finding that dispositions of tolerance, lifelong learning, and collaboration are more critical for social and employment success as migrants are able to engage with diversity and expand their repertoires for a diverse workplace and society. Therefore, a greater familiarity with the qualitative and situated interactional studies of applied linguists will help formulate more relevant pedagogies and policies for professional migration.

To consider another line of inquiry in migration studies, the tradition of studies on social adjustment of migrant students in host country schools adopts the construct linguistic distance/similarity to explain their success. These studies project how students who come with a language background that is similar to the language of schooling in the host community are more successful (see Beenstock, Chiswick, and Repetto 2003; Chiswick and Miller 2005). From this perspective, German students from Germany would be considered more successful in the United States, as English and German belong to the same family of languages, unlike Tamil students whose language family is Dravidian. However, claims about difficulty of acquisition based on language distance have been debunked in applied linguistics (Li Wei 2000). It is quite possible for similar languages to generate challenges in keeping them apart during learning. It has also been argued that projections of language similarity or distance are subjective and impressionistic. Furthermore, the pedagogical implications are based on the linguistic interference hypothesis, which ignores additive and dynamic orientations to acquisition that posit languages enabling each other and leading to more complex competencies (see García 2009). Projecting interference and difficulty based on language structure is unduly deterministic.

Another area of migration studies which might benefit from applied linguistic scholarship is scalar analysis on how cities, economies, communities, and institutions are being rescaled in the context of mobility (see collection of studies in Glick Schiller and Simsek-Caglar 2011a). For example, small American or European towns are integrated into global capital flows with the influx of migrants. So far, geographers, anthropologists, and political scientists have adopted broad social and material factors (such as new social relationships, institutions, and artifacts – see Swyngedouw 1997; Uitermark 2002; Glick Schiller and Simsek-Caglar 2011a) to demonstrate rescaling. However, applied linguists are able to demonstrate how fine-grained semiotic resources are adopted by subjects for rescaling purposes (Clonan-Roy, Rhodes, and Wortham 2016; Dong and Blommaert 2016). Features such as contextualization cues (lexical, syntactic, and phonological switches), semiotic processes (such as narratives, language ideologies, social positioning), and framing devices (such as participant structures) may help social scientists attend to the ways scaling processes take place at the micro-social level. They can provide fine-grained evidence at the level of micro-analysis of talk on how subjects orient to particular scalar dimensions in their interactions. For example, Lempert (2012) demonstrates the rescaling practices of his subjects by drawing from linguistic cues as well as physical postures, material resources, and institutional changes, exemplifying the value of applied linguistic tools for social scientists.

Though there is evidence that researchers in migration studies are beginning to borrow from work in applied linguistics (see Valentine, Sporton, and Bang Nielsen 2008; Fast 2012; Bailey, Mupakati, and Magunha 2014), more sharing and collaboration will facilitate interdisciplinary synergies – which we hope this handbook generates. The separation of scholarly fields is itself a result of the territorialization and boundary making designs of modernity, which mobility problematizes. Those attuned to mobility have advocated "border thinking" (Mignolo 2000) or "nomadic theory" (Braidotti 2013) that engages the liminal spaces between disciplines and paradigms for knowledge making.

Cautions and qualifications

As we continue explorations on this productive disciplinary space at the nexus of language and mobility, we have to be also cautious of exaggerating the mobility turn. How wise it is to adopt mobility as the dominant construct to perceive social and communicative life? Faist asks, "Is mobility really a human universal, as anthropologists tell us?" (Faist 2013: 1644). We have to first recognize that a desire to be "placed" (i.e., establishing homes, valuing rootedness, and inhabiting sovereign geopolitical spaces) is equally human. Rather than treating mobility and sedentariness as dichotomies, we should consider them as relational and interconnected. Even as people are mobile, they are constructing new homes. Migrants construct new in-groups and diaspora communities that celebrate heritage languages and cultures (though not without changes to the way they have been traditionally defined). Migrants are also constructing new homes, neighborhoods, and communities constituting diverse people and languages, going beyond their traditional identities and affiliations. These examples show that place, home, and community are compelling needs for everyone. What is different from previous paradigms is that these spaces and habitations are not treated as essentialized, homogeneous, bounded, or primordial. In other words, these spaces are socially and linguistically constructed in mobility. They are also relational, constructed relative to other social groups. They exist side by side with other communities and feature diversity. Therefore, such homes and spaces are constructed from *within* mobility, contact, and diversity – not outside. Consider the Arabic neighborhoods in many European cities that feature a mix of Middle Eastern communities, with different ethnicities, religious practices, languages, and sects, but still consider themselves cohesive and placed.

It is also important to theorize forms of immobility as we study mobility. There are new forms of border making that are coming up to prevent and surveil certain groups in mobility. The discourses of securitization and policies of surveillance are gaining more ground in Europe and other Western countries. The surge of refugees from conflict zones is not only an unpleasant form of mobility that is less studied or theorized in scholarly circles; it is also generating new policies that restrict movement. Discourses of citizenship and nationalism are also counteracting the treatment of mobility as desirable. One might say that intensified forms of mobility are generating intensified resistance in the form of increased policies and regulations for border control, boundary making, and sovereign spaces. Furthermore, we shouldn't ignore differential material access for mobility. There are people who don't have the resources or possibilities for geographical or social mobility.

However, all this doesn't mean that people occupy a static and homogeneous social space. The mobility paradigm helps us to consider how all of us are implicated in mobility, even those who don't move. All of us inhabit spaces marked by and shaped by mobility, though some may experience relative immobility. For example, even though some long-standing local residents in my American university town have not traveled much, their lives are shaped by diversity and contact as they live side by side with students and faculty members who are international. They are starting businesses that cater to mobile citizens, develop languages and cultural values from elsewhere, and inhabit a place marked by diversity around them. On the other hand, many of my compatriots in Sri Lanka who don't have the resources to flee elsewhere as refugees still receive remittances from their relatives abroad, implicating their lives in mobility. Therefore, we have to examine the different causes and consequences of relative immobility for some in an economy and geopolitics based on migration. However, both mobile and relatively immobile people live in spaces marked by transnational relations

and contact zones. In that sense, mobility does shape everyone's life, whether physically migrating or not.

We have to also interrogate the current neoliberal dispensation, in which mobility has been treated as a new and desirable norm for everyone. There is a tendency to consider mobility as more progressive, and sedentariness as backward and traditional. Neoliberal discourses also treat mobility as an economically and socially equalizing global process. These assumptions are bolstered by neoliberal ideologies which treat open competition in the free market, sometimes transcending nation-state boundaries, as ensuring opportunities for everyone. Therefore, Faist asks "whether mobility is a new norm, that is, whether nomadism is replacing sedentarism as one of the dominant principles of social order" (Faist 2013: 1644). As we consider this question, we have to grapple with the fact that mobility is unequal and reproduces inequality. For example, in labor migration, while educated professionals are considered "wanted and welcome," less skilled workers are "wanted but not welcome" (Zolberg 1987). While both groups of workers participate in mobility, they receive differential treatment and economic rewards. We have to also understand how certain social groups pay a higher cost for mobility. It is well known that mobility in this way is gendered. There are cases of men migrating for work, letting women alone in the home country to manage the family. In reverse, there are occupations such as maids and nurses where women are more mobile and their caregiving disposition is abused for labor. They then receive less time and opportunity to care for their own families. Their children too pay the price for this mobile work opportunity.

In the hands of neoliberalism, mobility is becoming exploitative for the profit-making interests of a few (see collection of critical articles in Glick Schiller and Faist 2010). Mobility is regulated by neoliberal establishments for their own profit. From this perspective, certain trajectories and channels of migration are preferred (i.e., certain types of work in certain locations) while others are dispreferred (i.e., the movement of refugees to Europe). The global flow of talent and resources, with a translocal network of production and marketing, is playing into neoliberal hands to be orchestrated by those with resources to control these flows. As production places are moved from place to place in search of cheap labor and resources, local communities are losing their share of material benefits. We also know that local communities find their ecological and cultural resources exploited or destroyed in the name of production. Mobility can thus be a threat to local communities and ecologies. Consider also the way local communities find their relationships rescaled and integrated into translocal production and economic networks, in the face of mobile companies and networks, losing their sovereignty.

From these perspectives, it is important to approach language and mobility from nuanced, balanced, and critical perspectives as we collaborate across disciplines to study this important human experience. As mobility becomes increasingly discoursed this productive disciplinary space should lead to more inclusive scholarly constructs and policy proposals.

Organization

This handbook is structured into four parts. Part I examines how basic constructs such as community, place, language, diversity, identity, nation-state, and social stratification are being retheorized in the context of human mobility. The authors examine the limitations of traditional assumptions as they explore the implications of new theoretical realizations for the way we study familiar applied linguistic concerns such as competence, pedagogy, and policy.

Part II considers diverse trajectories and flows of human mobility in relation to language. The authors explore South/South mobility as much as the better discussed South/North mobility; less skilled and indentured workers as much as skilled professionals; displacement in many forms to balance agentive mobility; new linkages in the form of diaspora communities; and different trajectories such as chain, step, circular, and return migration.

Part III samples emergent research methods for studying language and mobility. Contributors examine ways of conducting ethnography in multiple sites, redefining the relationship between context/text in more complex ways, adopting expressive literature and arts to study the role of affect and desire in mobility, utilizing narratives and scalar analysis for studying mobility, and charting the trajectories of traveling texts in literacy.

Part IV deals with policy implications as they pertain to language and mobility. Contributors examine policies in schools, workplaces, service agencies, and governmental and nongovernmental institutions. The section also examines the implications of mobility for education and pedagogy in diverse levels of learning.

The handbook brings together international applied linguists with affiliations in diverse universities around the world and homes in different academic departments. The contributors come from institutions in Australia, Belgium, Canada, China, Denmark, Germany, the Netherlands, New Zealand, the Philippines, Singapore, South Africa, Spain, and Switzerland, in addition to the UK and United States. They boast of social backgrounds and research experience around the world. Given this diversity, there is the need to introduce their scholarship to each other. An important function of this handbook is that it becomes a "who's who" in the study of language and migration in applied linguistics. The authors have adopted a language and style that makes the chapters accessible to graduate students and advanced scholars in cognate fields in applied linguistics and those engaged in exploring language and mobility in diverse disciplines.

References

Anthony, D. W. (1990). Migration in archaeology. *American Anthropologist* 92(4): 895–914.

Anthony, D. W. (2007). *The Horse, the Wheel, and Language: How Bronze-Age Riders from the Eurasian Steppes Shaped the Modern World*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Atkinson, D., Churchill, E., Nishino, T. and Okada, H. (2007). Alignment and interaction in a sociocognitive approach in second language acquisition. *Modern Language Journal* 91: 169–188.

Bailey, A., Mupakati, L. and Magunha, F. (2014). Misplaced: Language, remitting and development practice among Zimbabwean migrants. *Globalisation, Societies and Education* [online]. doi:10.1080/14767724.2014.937404

Bakhtin, M. M. (1986). *Speech Genres and Other Late Essays* [Translated by V.W. McGee]. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Barad, K. (2007). *Meeting the Universe Halfway: Quantum Physics and the Entanglement of Matter and Meaning*. Durham: Duke University Press.

Bauman, R. and Briggs, C. L. (2000). Language philosophy as language ideology: John Locke and Johann Gottfried Herder. In P. V. Kroskrity (ed.), *Regimes of Language: Ideologies, Polities, and Identities* (pp. 139–204). Oxford: James Currey.

Bauman, Z. (1998). *Globalization: The Human Consequences*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Beenstock, M., Chiswick, B. R. and Repetto, G. L. (2003). The effect of linguistic distance and country of origin on immigrant language skills: Application to Israel. *International Migration* 39(3): 33–60.

Bjorkman, B. (2014). An analysis of polyadic English as a Lingua Franca (ELF) speech: A communicative strategies framework. *Journal of Pragmatics* 66: 122–138.

Bleakley, H. and Chin, A. (2004). Language skills and earnings: Evidence from childhood immigrants. *Review of Economics and Statistics* 84(2): 481–496.

Block, D. (2014). Moving beyond "lingualism": Multilingual embodiment and multimodality in SLA. In S. May (ed.), *The Multilingual Turn: Implications for SLA, TESOL, and Bilingual Education* (pp. 54–77). New York: Routledge.

Blommaert, J. (2005). *Discourse: A Critical Introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Blommaert, J. (2010). *The Sociolinguistics of Globalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Boccagni, P. (2012). Even a transnational social field must have its boundaries: Methodological options, potentials and dilemmas for researching transnationalism. In C. Vargas-Silva (ed.), *Handbook of Research Methods in Migration* (pp. 295–318). Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.

Boutet, J. (2012). Language workers: Emblematic figures of late capitalism. In A. Duchene and M. Heller (eds.), *Language in Late Capitalism* (pp. 207–229). New York: Routledge.

Braidotti, R. (2013). *The Posthuman*. Cambridge: Polity.

Buscher, M., Urry, J. and Witchger, K., eds. (2011). Introduction: Mobile methods. In *Mobile Methods* (pp. 1–19). London: Routledge.

Byram, M. (2008). *From Intercultural Education to Education for Intercultural Citizenship*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Cameron, C. (2013). How people moved among ancient societies: Broadening the view. *American Anthropologist* 115(2): 218–231.

Canagarajah, A. S. (2013). *Translingual Practice: Global Englishes and Cosmopolitan Relations*. London: Routledge.

Canagarajah, A. S. (2016). *Translingual Practices and Neoliberal Policies: Attitudes and Strategies of African Skilled Migrants in Anglophone Workplaces*. Berlin: Springer.

Canagarajah, A. S. (forthcoming a). The unit and focus of analysis in Lingua Franca English interactions: In search of a method. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*.

Canagarajah, A. S. (forthcoming b). English as a spatial resource: Explaining the claimed competence of Chinese STEM professionals. In *World Englishes*.

Canagarajah, A. S. and DeCosta, P. (2016). Introduction: Scales analysis, and its uses and prospects in educational linguistics. *Linguistics and Education* 34: 1–10.

Chiswick, B. R. and Miller, P. W. (1995). The endogeneity between language and earnings. *Journal of Labour Economics* 13(2): 246–288.

Chiswick, B. R. and Miller, P. W. (2002). Immigrant earnings: Language skills, linguistic concentrations and the business cycle. *Journal of Population Economics* 15(1): 31–57.

Chiswick, B. R. and Miller, P. W. (2005). Linguistic distance: A quantitative measure of the distance between English and other languages. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 26: 1–11.

Chiswick, B. R. and Miller, P. W. (2007). *The International Transferability of Immigrants' Human Capital Skills*. IZA Discussion Papers 2670, Institute for the Study of Labor (IZA). Retrieved from ftp://repec.iza.org/RePEc/Discussionpaper/dp2670.pdf [Accessed 24 February 2011].

Clonan-Roy, K., Rhodes, C. and Wortham, S. (2016). Moral panic about sexual promiscuity: Heterogeneous scales in the identification of one middle-school Latina girl. *Linguistics and Education* 34: 11–21.

De Certeau, M. (1984). *The Practice of Everyday Life* [Translated by S. Rendall]. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Deleuze, G. and Guattari, F. (1987). *A Thousand Plateaus*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Dong, J. and Blommaert, J. (2016). Global informal learning environments and the making of Chinese middle class. *Linguistics and Education* 34: 33–46.

Dustmann, C. (1994). Speaking fluency, writing fluency and earnings of migrants. *Journal of Population Economics* 7: 133–156.

Dustmann, C. and Fabbri, F. (2003). Language proficiency and labour market performance of immigrants in the UK. *Economic Journal* 113: 695–717.

Dustmann, C. and van Soest, A. (2002). Language and the earnings of immigrants. *Industrial and Labor Relations Review* 55(3): 473–492.

Faist, T. (2013). The mobility turn: A new paradigm for the social sciences? *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 36(11): 1637–1646.

Faist, T., Fauser, M. and Reisenauer, E. (2013). *Transnational Migration*. Cambridge: Polity.

Fast, H. (2012). *Language-use as Spatial Experience: Migrants' Non-fluent Participation in Stabilisations of Linguistic Practice*. Master's thesis, Department of Geography, Utrecht University, Utrecht.

Firth, A. and Wagner, J. (2007). Second/foreign language learning as a social accomplishment: Elaborations on a reconceptualized SLA. *Modern Language Journal* 91: 798–817.

García, O. (2009). *Bilingual Education in the 21st Century: A Global Perspective*. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.

Glenn, C. (2004). *Unspoken: A Rhetoric of Silence*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.

Glick Schiller, N. and Simsek-Caglar, A., eds. (2011a). *Locating Migration: Rescaling Cities and Migrants*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Glick Schiller, N. and Simsek-Caglar, A. (2011b). Locality and globality: Building a comparative analytical framework in migration and urban studies. In N. Glick Schiller and A. Simsek-Caglar (eds.), *Locating Migration: Rescaling Cities and Migrants* (pp. 60–84). Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Glick Schiller, N. and Faist, T. (2010). *Migration, Development and Transnationalization: A Critical Stance*. New York: Berghahn Books.

Goffman, E. (1983). The interaction order. *American Sociological Review* 48: 1–17.

Goodwin, C. (2000). Action and embodiment within situated human interaction. *Journal of Pragmatics* 32: 1489–1522.

Graff, H. (1991). *The Literacy Myth: Cultural Integration and Social Structure in the Nineteenth Century*. New York: Transaction.

Grin, F. (2001). English as an economic value: Facts and fallacies. *World Englishes* 20(1): 65–78.

Hall, S. (1997). Old and new identities, old and new ethnicities. In A. D. King (ed.), *Culture, Globalization, and the World System* (pp. 41–68). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Harvey, D. (2005). *A Brief History of Neoliberalism.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Heller, M. and Duchene, A. (2012). Pride and profit: Changing discourses of language, capital, and nation-state. In A. Duchene and M. Heller (eds.), *Language in Late Capitalism* (pp. 1–22). New York: Routledge.

Hoerder, D. (2002). *Cultures in Contact: World Migrations in the Second Millennium*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Jacquemet, M. (2005). Transidiomatic practices: Language and power in the age of globalization. *Language and Communication* 25(3): 255–277.

Kleifgen, J. (2013). *Communicative Practices at Work: Multimodality and Learning in a High-Tech Firm*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Kramsch, C. (2014). Teaching foreign languages in an era of globalization: Introduction. *Modern Language Journal* 98(1): 296–311.

Kress, G. (2000). Multimodality: Challenges to thinking about language. *TESOL Quarterly* 34(2): 337–340.

Kress, G. (2010). *Multimodality: A Social Semiotic Approach to Contemporary Communication*. New York: Routledge.

Kubota, R. (2013). "Language is only a tool": Japanese expatriates working in China and implications for language teaching. *Multilingual Education* 3(4): 1–20.

Kuznetsov, Y., ed. (2006). *Diaspora Networks and the International Migration of Skills*. Washington, DC: World Bank.

Latour, B. (1987). *Science in Action: How to Follow Scientists and Engineers through Society*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Latour, B. (2005). *Reassembling the Social: An Introduction to Actor-network-theory*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Lempert, M. (2012). Interaction rescaled: How monastic debate became a diasporic pedagogy. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly* 43(2): 138–156.

Levitt, P. and Glick Schiller, N. (2004). Conceptualizing simultaneity: A transnational social field perspective on society. *Annual Review of Sociology* 33: 129–156.

Li Wei (2000). Dimensions of bilingualism. In Li Wei (ed.), *The Bilingual Reader* (pp. 2–21). London: Routledge.

Marston, S., Jones, J. and Woodward, K. (2005). Human geography without scale. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 30(4): 16–432.

Massey, D. (2005). *For Space*. London: Sage.

Matsumoto, Y. (2015). *Multimodal Communicative Strategies for Resolving Miscommunication in Multilingual Writing Classrooms*. Dissertation submitted to Penn State University.

May, S., ed. (2014). *The Multilingual Turn: Implications for SLA, TESOL, and Bilingual Education*. New York: Routledge.

Mezzadra, S. and Neilson, B. (2013). *Border as Method, or, the Multiplication of Labor*. Durham: Duke University Press.

Mignolo, W.D. (2000). *Local Histories/Global Designs: Coloniality, Subaltern Knowledges, and Border Thinking*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Pavlenko, A. (forthcoming). Superdiversity and why it isn't: Reflections on terminological innovation and academic branding. In *Sloganizations in Language Education Discourse*.

Pennycook, A. and Otsuji, E. (2015). *Metrolingualism: Language in the City*. Abingdon: Routledge.

Pigg, S. (2014). Emplacing mobile composing habits: A study of academic writing in networked social spaces. *College English* 66(2): 250–275.

Piller, I. and Cho, J. (2013). Neoliberalism as language policy. *Language in Society* 42: 23–44.

Pitzl, M.-L. (2010). *English as a Lingua Franca in International Business*. Saarbrucken: Verlag.

Pollock, S. (2006). *The Language of the Gods in the World of Men: Sanskrit, Culture, and Power in Premodern India*. Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Pratt, M.L. (1987). Linguistic utopias. In N. Fabb, D. Attridge, A. Durant and C. MacCabe (eds.), *The Linguistics of Writing: Arguments between Language and Literature* (pp. 48–66). Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Rampton, B. (2008). *Language in Late Modernity: Interaction in an Urban School*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rickert, T. (2013). *Ambient Rhetoric*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.

Schachner, G. (2010). *Population Circulation and the Transformation of Ancient Zuni Communities*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.

Seidlhofer, B. (2004). Research perspectives on teaching English as a Lingua Franca. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics* 24: 209–239.

Smotrova, T. and Lantolf, J.P. (2013). The function of gesture in lexically focused L2 instructional conversations. *Modern Language Journal* 97(2): 397–416.

Steenstig, J. (2013). Conversation analysis and affiliation and alignment. In C. Chapelle (ed.), *Encylopedia of Applied Linguistics* [Online]. Wiley-Blackwell. doi:10.1002/9781405198431.wbeal0196

Stein, P. (2000). Rethinking resources: Multimodal pedagogies in the ESL classroom. *TESOL Quarterly* 34(2): 333–336.

Swyngedouw, E. (1997). Neither global nor local: Glocalization and the politics of scale. In K.R. Cox (ed.), *Spaces of Globalization: Reasserting the Power of the Local* (pp. 137–177). New York: Guilford Press.

Thrift, N. (2007). *Non-representational Theory: Space, Politics, Affect*. London: Routledge.

Uitermark, J. (2002). Re-scaling, "Scale fragmentation" and the regulation of antagonistic relationships. *Progress in Human Geography* 26(6): 743–765.

Urry, J. (2000). *Sociology beyond Societies: Mobilities for the Twenty-First Century*. London: Routledge.

Valentine, G., Sporton, D. and Bang Nielsen, K. (2008). Language use on the move: Sites of encounter, identity, and belonging. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 33: 376–387.

Vertovec, S. (2007). Super-diversity and its implications. *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 30(6): 1024–1054.

Vertovec, S. and Cohen, R., eds. (2002). *Conceiving Cosmopolitanism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Wenger, E. (1998). *Communities of Practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Williams, A. M. and Balaz, V. (2008). *International Migration and Knowledge*. London and New York: Routledge.

Wimmer, A. and Glick Schiller, N. (2002). Methodological nationalism and beyond: Nation-state building, migration, and the social sciences. *Global Networks* 2(4): 301–334.

Wortham, S. and Reyes, A. (2015). *Discourse Analysis beyond the Speech Event*. Abingdon: Routledge.

Zelinsky, W. (1971). The hypothesis of mobility transition. *Geographical Review* 61(2): 219–249.

Zolberg, A.R. (1987). "Wanted but not welcome": Alien labor in western development. In William Alonso (ed.), *Population in an Interacting World* (pp. 36–73). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.