

2

Transglossia: From Translanguaging to Transglossia

The transglossic framework that is central to this book brings together two related traditions: the recent blossoming of work under various ‘trans’ labels—the *new translanguistics* (translanguaging, translingual practices and so on)—and the older emphasis of Bakhtinian work on heteroglossia. The idea of *transglossia* refers to ‘the fluid, yet stable, language practices of bilingual and multilingual societies that question traditional descriptions built on national ideologies’ (García 2014, p. 108). The ways we look at the kinds of postings or interactions discussed in the previous chapter and below owe much to the recent shift in contemporary sociolinguistics towards the idea of translanguaging. Canagarajah (2013, p. 6) argues that the term *translingual* ‘highlights two key concepts of significance for a paradigm shift’: on the one hand, ‘communication transcends individual languages’, that is to say we use repertoires of linguistic resources without necessary recourse to the notions of languages; and on the other hand ‘communication transcends words and involves diverse semiotic resources and ecological affordances’, that is to say we draw on a wide set of possible resources to achieve communication.

For Blommaert (2013, p. 621), the recent shifts in sociolinguistic thinking—this ‘post-Fishmanian’ turn that is reorienting thinking about language culture and identity and bringing in new understandings of social-semiotic practices in contemporary contexts—suggest a ‘paradigm shift in sociolinguistics’ comprising a sociolinguistics aimed at understanding society as well as language, viewing language as one amongst ‘a richer and more faceted configuration of semiotic resources deployed in events’ and a richer understanding of contexts in temporal, spatial and mobile terms. García and Li Wei (2014, p. 19) suggest that we are witnessing a ‘translanguaging turn’ with a new focus on ‘both the complex language practices of plurilingual individuals and communities, as well as the pedagogical approaches that use those complex practices’.

Based on an educational as much as a sociolinguistic imperative, *translanguaging* is ‘firmly rooted in the multilingual and multimodal language and literacy practices of children in schools in the twenty-first century’ (García 2009a, p. 8). Translanguaging thus ‘requires an epistemological change in which students’ everyday languaging and school languaging is expanded and integrated, and in so doing blends ways of knowing which are traditionally found in different spaces’ (García and Li Wei 2014, p. 69). In Canagarajah’s (2013, p. 191) view, pedagogy needs to ‘be refashioned to accommodate the modes of performative competence and cooperative disposition we see outside the classroom. Rather than focusing on a single language or dialect as the target of learning, teachers have to develop a readiness in students to engage with the repertoires required for transnational contact zones’. Likewise, based on their studies of the mixed language practices of heritage language classes, Blackledge and Creese (2010, p. 201) advocate ‘teaching bilingual children by means of a bilingual pedagogy’, and argue for a ‘release from monolingual instructional approaches’ through translanguaging.

Central to these proposals is an acknowledgement of the complex and mixed language practices of bilingual worlds—those ‘forms of hybrid language use that are systematically engaged in sense-making’ (García et al. 2011, p. 5)—and the need for language classes to start to resemble these worlds more. García and Li Wei (2014, p. 2) explain translanguaging as ‘an approach to the use of language, bilingualism and the education of bilinguals that considers the language practices of bilinguals

not as two autonomous language systems as has been traditionally the case, but as one linguistic repertoire with features that have been socially constructed as belonging to two separate languages’.

In relation to literacy, Hornberger and Link (2012, p. 274) call for the need to focus on ‘practices that recognize, value, and build on the multiple, mobile communicative repertoires, translanguaging and transnational literacy practices of students and their families’. For Li Wei (2011, p. 1234), it is important to think in terms of translanguaging *spaces* that allow for and are produced by translanguaging practices. The focus of much of the work on translanguaging is oriented towards a critique of the narrow focus on separable languages in educational contexts and the need instead to understand that ‘[e]ngaging in translanguaging may hold transformative power to shift students’ and teachers’ dominant monolingual ideologies toward more pluralist understandings of the wider linguistic repertoire students bring to literacy practices and beyond’ (Martin-Beltrán 2014, p. 226).

Canagarajah (2013, p. 7) argues for the idea of translingual over multilingual because of the associations of separate languages, separate cognitive compartments and separate language groups that have become aligned with the term *multilingual* which ‘doesn’t accommodate the dynamic interactions between languages and communities envisioned by translingual’. Related to this broad translingual turn, other terms and approaches have also been proposed. In their studies of mixed language use in Copenhagen schools (Jørgensen 2008a, b), similar questions arose for the researchers concerning the use of descriptions such as bi- or multilingual. ‘What if the participants do not orient to the juxtaposition of languages in terms of switching?’ Møller (2008, p. 218) asks ‘What if they instead orient to a linguistic norm where all available linguistic resources can be used to reach the goals of the speaker?’ If this is the case, Møller argues, ‘It is not adequate to categorise this conversation as bilingual or multilingual, or even as language mixing, because all these terms depend on the separability of linguistic categories. I therefore suggest the term polylingual instead’ (Møller 2008, p. 218).

The focus on *metrolingualism* (Otsuji and Pennycook 2010; Pennycook and Otsuji 2015) is part of an attempt to understand linguistic resources in relation to the city, to show how everyday language

practices are related to urban space, and how the spaces and rhythms of the city operate in relation to language. Metrolingualism makes central the relations between language and place (spatial repertoires), language and activity (metrolingual multitasking) (Pennycook and Otsuji 2014) and the broader context of the city. Like trans- and poly-langaging, the focus is on the mixed resources people deploy in daily interaction, while the contexts of study are places of work across the city rather than educational contexts. While the emergence of these new terminologies has met with mixed responses (for some this is a paradigm shift, for others a mass of unhelpful new terminology) (cf. Pennycook 2016), they do suggest that because of changes to how language is being used and described, we need to take an era of translinguistic analysis seriously Lee (2017).

These approaches generally share a number of features: all express a desire to move away from the language of bi- or multilingualism, castigating earlier work for operating with the idea that multilingualism is the sum of several, separate languages. All focus on contexts of multiple, mixed language use with an interest in talking in terms of repertoires of linguistic (and non-linguistic) resources (Blommaert and Backus 2013) (or *features* in Jørgensen's and Møller's terms) rather than code-mixing or code-switching. There is also a largely shared view that we need to think in terms of *langaging* to capture the fact that 'human beings use language to change the world' (Jørgensen 2008b, p. 180; cf. Jørgensen et al. 2011). Li Wei (2011) likewise aligns his use of the term *translangaging* with this understanding of an active process of achieving things through language. And all focus on language practices, on what people actually do with the linguistic resources at their disposal.

This, then, is one aspect of the 'trans' in *transglossia*, a focus on the already-mixed language worlds of our participants, not in terms of code-mixing, code-switching or bilingualism, but in terms of collected resources for meaning-making. García (2009a, p. 304) proposes a move from diglossic (via 'transdiglossic') to transglossic, to capture the way languages are blended and mixed rather than used in isolation. She goes on to suggest that transglossia 'could offer flexible spaces for language practices that are associated with making meaning and improving communication among participants who are different, and yet participate

more equally' (2009b, p. 148). This notion takes on a more dynamic, transgressive form in her subsequent formulation where transglossia 'has the potential to release ways of speaking of subaltern groups that have been previously fixed within static language identities and hierarchical language arrangements and that are constrained by the modern/colonial world system' (García 2014, p. 108).

Building on the transgressive implications of transglossia—where the focus is not only on the mixed and dynamic language resources of translanguaging but also on the potential for such language practices to challenge linguistic identities and hierarchies—our approach to transglossia (Sultana et al. 2015) develops García's insights in several directions. Rather than the 'glossia' of diglossia—with its focus on the separation of two languages or dialects (high 'H' and low 'L') in a community—the glossia of our transglossia refers to Bakhtinian (1981) heteroglossia. Thus, while we are very much in accord with García's emphasis on the mixing rather than the separation of languages (in both everyday practice and for analytic purposes), the notion of transglossia developed here adds further dimensions of *voice* that are part of the heteroglossic framework (Sultana 2015; Sultana et al. 2015).

It has already been suggested that much of what has been done under the label of the new translinguistics might equally be captured by retaining a Bakhtinian notion of heteroglossia. As Blackledge and Creese (2014) suggest, the recent observations about mobility, resources, repertoires and unbounded languages might just as readily be approached through 'Mikhail Bakhtin's theoretical and practical notion of "heteroglossia" as a lens through which to view the social, political and historical implications of language in practice' (p. 1). The *glossia* of heteroglossia was never a concern with languages but rather with voices and variability in speech: the translation of the original Russian term 'Разноречие' (*raznorechiye*, literally 'varied speech') has somewhat obscured Bakhtin's focus. The original term never bore the more 'language'-oriented overtones of 'glossia' but was always oriented towards language practices. As Bailey (2007, p. 272) explains, heteroglossia has to do with understanding the social meaning of talk 'rather than in terms of formal systems, such as codes, that can veil actual speakers, uses and contexts'. It is equally possible to look at translanguaging from within a

framework of heteroglossia (García and Leiva 2014), or to follow a framework of heteroglossia without reference to translanguaging or the other current terminologies (Pietikäinen 2013; Pietikäinen and Dufva 2014). A case might therefore be made that these new terminologies are only reiterating what had already been said under the label of heteroglossia.

Clark and Holquist (1984) in fact describe Bakhtin's language philosophy as a form of *translinguistics*. Addressing language beyond its systematic and formal features, Bakhtin makes an attempt to close the gap in the 'old and apparently unbridgeable dichotomy between the obviously systematic features of language, such as syntax, grammar, or the relatively fixed meanings of words, and their unsystematizable contexts, which interact with such stable features in any actual conversation' (Clark and Holquist 1984, p. 214). Bakhtin's (1981, 1986) heteroglossic understanding of language helps illuminate the differences, variety, alterity, plurality and otherness in language as well as its social, historical and political nature. Recent studies in multilingual contexts show that heteroglossia is manifested in the mixture of languages, registers, styles and symbols, which play an ideological role in reproducing and sustaining subcultural affiliations of class, gender, religion, demographic background, interests and so on (see also Androutsopoulos 2010, 2011; Bailey 2007).

Malinowski and Kramsch (2014, p. 156) suggest that heteroglossia for Bakhtin was a 'multifaceted concept that strove to counteract the single-voiced official discourse of the 1920s in the Soviet Union and remind readers of the fundamentally multivoiced nature of literary texts, and, by extension of all language use in everyday life'. This multifaceted understanding of language includes the embodied nature of cognition, the constitutive and ideological nature of language in shaping thought, belief and action, and the importance of dialogism and the relation to others (Holquist 1990). The notion of heteroglossia can therefore do much of the work that concepts such as translanguaging do, though it brings a particular focus on voice, and the fact that as Bakhtin famously put it 'Our speech, that is all our utterances,' are therefore 'filled with others' words' (Bakhtin 1986, p. 89). This idea has particular salience in our studies of popular culture since, as we see in the following chapters,

young adults frequently take up the voices and words of others, with important linguistic and cultural implications.

To operationalize his interpretation of language, Bakhtin (1981, 1986) identifies several basic notions as the foundation of the dialogic process including *multivocality* and *double-voicing*. Multivocality refers to the ‘simultaneously present and consecutively uttered plurality of independent and unmerged voices and consciousness’ (Nikulin 1998, p. 382). On the one hand, multivocality describes language with reference to individual meaning, intention and socio-ideological conflict and contradiction, and on the other, it brings forth the ‘autonomous and unmerged voices’ of the speaker that throb beneath the neat symmetric amalgamation of different languages. ‘Multivocality in discourse [is] both axiomatic and heuristic’ (Wilce 1998a, p. 231) and an important dynamic of individuals’ negotiation of identity. Another significant dimension, double-voicing, refers to the words of others inserted by speakers into their own discourses, as if these words existed within invisible quotation marks. ‘In such discourse, there are two voices, two meanings, and two expressions. And all the while these two voices are dialogically interrelated’ (Bakhtin 1981, p. 324).

Double-voicing transforms the semantic potentiality of *voices* and ‘reaccentuates’ them according to the intention of the speaker (Bakhtin 1986, p. 89). Stylization, parody, *skaz*, reported speech, ironic intention and statements, quotations, and hybridization are examples of double-voicing (Bauman and Briggs 1990). Hill (1993), for example, identifies how a film tagline, ‘Hasta la vista, baby’, was appropriated by Anglo-Americans with exaggerated pronunciation for pejorative purposes. People may use a variety of linguistic and non-linguistic resources to produce different multivocal forms of identification. As Wilce (1998a, b) shows, Muslim communities may deconstruct the notion of ‘monolithic Islam and the univocal, one-dimensional Muslim’ identity (Wilce 1998a, p. 118). A Bangladeshi woman, for example, using the socio-culturally accepted norm of lamenting or ‘tuneful weeping’ in a rural village, expresses resistance to the norms of the patriarchal society and breaks away from the conventional gendered Bangladeshi identity by uttering various stylized and reported speech invocations of Allah and Mabud (Lord), and Arabic terms widely used amongst Bangladeshis.

Thus, multivocality and double-voicing are methodologically significant for analysing the difference, variety, alterity, plurality and otherness inherent in language, and are productive for dealing with differences in language beyond the restricted notions of monolingualism, bilingualism and multilingualism (Weiss 1990). Voice and multivocality also reveal the ‘double-code-ism’ and conflicts of social consciousnesses in language, questioning the viability of the prescribed norms of identification, i.e. women, Bangladeshi or Muslim. In other words, a discursive construction of identity cannot be defined in terms of speakers’ social or professional roles, or linguistic, educational and national backgrounds. These research studies have become significant in recent years to address the new focus on hybridity, multiplicity and simultaneity in communication. As Lin (2014, p. 133) shows in the ‘heteroglossic translanguage practice’ of a Hong Kong rapper’s mixed English and Cantonese lyric, his double-voicing ‘simultaneously evokes structures of feelings of glossy metropolitan English subjects (“Do you know me?!”) and grassroots local Hong Kong Cantonese-speaking subjects (“Diu meih louh mei?!”)’ (2014, p. 132).

A focus on voice, parody and stylization has become crucial in this book to draw attention to the ways young adults take up stylized translingual voices of popular culture, aligning with some and parodying or distancing themselves from others (Rampton 2006; Blackledge and Creese 2014). While we see the significance of voices in heteroglossia in unravelling the intricate relationship between codes, modes and genres as well as between language and identity, we nonetheless find it useful to replace the ‘hetero’ (diversity) of heteroglossia with ‘trans’ since our notion of ‘trans’ does much more work than simply suggesting crossing or mixing. Here, we draw on transgressive theories of language (Pennycook 2007). As García (2014, p. 116) suggests from a pedagogical point of view, it is important that schools ‘build transglossic spaces where students’ multiple language practices are acknowledged and used’ so that the separation of languages and language hierarchies can be challenged. From our perspective, looking at on- and offline language practices amongst young adults, it is equally important to challenge the ways mixing language resources and the takeup of diverse forms of popular culture are seen as either deviant or compliant practices.

The ‘trans’ in our formulation of transglossia therefore does at least three types of work: from a *translinguistic* perspective, it focuses on language not as a separate code, or self-standing product, but as a translinguistics, gathering meanings both spatially and temporally, within and across past and present contexts in their historical, local, discursive and interpretive elements. From a *transmodal* perspective, it draws attention to the diversity of semiotic modes at play in online and offline contexts, from the use of emoticons to the indexicality of specific signs (such as Louis Vuitton, Example 1.1), from the movement across different modes (e.g. creating filmic voices in the online environment) to the engagement with space and place (calling across the courtyard, 1.2). From a *transtextual* perspective, it introduces a set of analytic tools involving *pretextual* history—sociohistorical associations of the text; *contextual* relations—the physical location, the participants, the indexical pointing to the world; *intratextual* forms—the use of words and phrases within the text; *subtextual* meaning—the ideologies, cultural frames and relations of power that affect the interaction; *intertextual* echoes—the covert and overt references to other voices and texts; and *posttextual* interpretation—the young adults’ interpretations of their language practices (cf. Pennycook 2007, pp. 53–54).

This transglossic framework thus works on multiple levels: at the broadest level, it draws attention to the transgressive nature (rather than just the heterogeny or multiplicity) of semiotic diversity. Transglossic language practices concern not so much individuals as the ways in which individuals come to terms with their personal, social and historical ideas in relation to others’ contradictory and conflicting ideas (Pujolar 2001). In order to understand the fluidity in language created by the mixed codes, modes and genres and the social dynamics of language caused by the political, historical and ideological associations of language, we therefore seek to understand language practices not so much through separate linguistic codes (though they remain significant for understanding the nature of the language practices), but rather by unveiling the voices from our field work and unzipping the translinguistic complexities of meanings. The transglossic framework allows us to unravel the voices within a voice and the processes by which individuals use the voices to reflect their own personal, social and historical ideas in relation to others’

contradictory and conflicting ideas. Thus, we have a better understanding of the reasons behind young adults' preferences for specific voices and multiple voices (Sultana 2015).

Young adults' inclination towards recycling linguistic and semiotic resources from popular culture, their dexterity in bringing several voices into one single utterance, and their sophisticated ways of connecting the past with the present with intertextual and subtextual references can best be understood if we can transcend the linguistic forms of a language through a 'social semiotics of transsignification' (Pennycook 2007, p. 54). While addressing the continual 'embodiment, flow and location of meaning... in the complexity of their relations', transgressive theories put forward a social semiotics in which signs 'need to be understood productively, contextually and discursively' (Pennycook 2007, p. 50 and p. 53). And here, the transtextual analysis gives us a set of tools to look more closely at the ways these diverse texts operate. These different levels of analysis also have implications for research practices since they necessitate not merely textual or discursive analysis but also the contextual layers of linguistic ethnography. We shall return to a discussion of research below. First, however, it may be useful to unpack this form of analysis in the next section with several examples.

Transtextual Analysis: 'Chi Teguu Waity Katie Meduuu'

The entry point into any analysis (though not necessarily the starting point) may be the pretextual history: What do we know about what has been going on before? Here, it is important to know that this conversation occurs between two best friends Ganaa (20) and Naayaa (19), undergraduate students, majoring in English at the National University of Mongolia. They have known each other for some time and are comfortable in their mutual joking and teasing. Moving on to the contextual relations of this casual conversation—where does it take place? What time of day? What else is going on?—it is important to observe that it took place during a class break. It is therefore framed by the classes

Excerpt 2.1 Language guide: regular font = Mongolian; *italics* = *English*; **bold** = **Russian**

Casual conversation	Translation
1. Ganaa: huue <i>honnney</i> ! Chi odoo <i>wacko jacko</i> shig tsav tsagaan boltson baihiin heterhii tsagaan haragdjiin honey ((giggles))	Ganaa: Hey honey! You look like wacko jacko! Too white honey, looking way too white
2. Naayaa: Yagshd! chi teguul <i>waity katie</i> meduu ((bursts into laughter))	Naayaa: Yeah, Right! You are Waity Katie then
3. Ganaa: huush yaadiin dorogaya : ugaasaa hariu udku irnee <i>cracko whacko</i> mini duugui bai... ((laughter overlaps Ganaa & Naayaa))	Ganaa: That's alright, darling! I'm sure I will get a reply from him very soon. You cracko whacko just need to shut up!

either side of it and by the shift in mood from study to sociality, with the discussion revolving around topics of make-up and romantic relationship (Dovchin et al. 2015) (Excerpt 2.1).

Intratextually, the conversation is an example of ‘interactional poetics’ (Maybin and Swann 2007, p. 506), an episode where the speakers play with words through manipulation of linguistic form as part of their everyday linguistic creativity, and ‘immediate co-construction’ of semantic formation (responding quickly through reinventing new phrases). Part of this playfulness involves intertextually echoing phrases associated with American/British celebrities. The collaborative humour and common shared subtextual knowledge of artists and their histories, as they playfully relocalize the derogatory celebrity names, points us back to the pretextual close relationship between the speakers. Meanwhile, their later comments about this interaction can be seen in terms of posttextual relations: the importance of finding out how texts are interpreted by the participants or others.

In this particular context, Ganaa teases his friend for applying heavy (‘too white’) make-up base, looking as unnaturally white as Michael Jackson. Here, the speaker intertextually echoes the derogatory English tabloid nickname for the late Michael Jackson, ‘Wacko Jacko’, often associated with allegations of plastic surgery and associated behaviours of physical transformation. The accused responds quickly to her friend’s allegation, immediately echoing another English phrase, a derogatory

nickname for the Duchess of Cambridge, ‘Waity Katie’, dubbed by British media to mock Kate Middleton for her long wait for Prince William to propose. Here, Naayaa teases her gay friend Ganaa, for waiting too long for his boyfriend’s reply to his SMS. The intertextual echoes of English derogatory phrases then continue with Ganaa’s reference to his friend ‘Oh Shut Up, cracko wacko’, using the English phrase, ‘cracko whacko’ and also echoing the earlier (‘Wacko Jacko’) based on a popular term coined by the late American singer Whitney Houston, ‘*crack is whack*’.¹ The appropriation of ‘crack is whack’ therefore is relocalized here through integrating the interfix ‘o’ (‘crack(o)’, ‘whack(o)’). Naayaa was a loyal fan of Whitney Houston, and Ganaa is manipulating this situation through subtextually teasing her as ‘cracko whacko’ for listening to music like Whitney Houston, because the singer is apparently perceived as ‘cheesy and corny’² by Ganaa (Dovchin et al. 2015).

Alongside this playful deployment of derogatory English names, the whole conversation is also constructed by the combination of not only English and Mongolian, but also Russian linguistic resources. Ganaa, for example, takes up both the English ‘honey’ and the Russian ‘dorogaya’ (‘dear, darling, sweetie’) repeatedly to refer to his female friend during the conversation (1; 3). He demonstrates strong syllabic stress on the consonant ‘n’ in ‘honnney’, and long vowel ‘/ya:/’ in ‘dorogayaaa’. Calling the opposite gender ‘honey’ or ‘darling’ is a rare linguistic practice amongst young Mongolians, unless the speakers are involved in a romantic relationship. Here, Ganaa, despite being male, is using those words platonically to his female friend, which can be read as a subtextual reference to his being gay. As Ganaa posttextually interprets his incorporation of affectionate terms, ‘this is one of the characteristics of me being a proud gay person’ (Post-Group Discussion Interview, September 10, 2010, Ulaanbaatar, Mongolia).

Ganaa further uses the Russian-influenced Mongolian adverb ‘udku’ (‘soon’) as part of his gay subtextual reference: the Russian morpheme ‘-ku’ replacing the Mongolian morpheme ‘-ahgui’, producing ‘udku’. The Russian suffix ‘-ku’ is often used in combination with other Mongolian vowels, [‘k]a’, [‘k]i’, [‘k]o’ as the vowels used in the suffix are consistent with the vowels in the core word (e.g. ‘Bat + ka = Batka’—male

Mongolian nickname; ‘Nomin + ko = Nomiko’—female Mongolian nickname). Many of the male research participants in the group discussion claim that the practice of using the Russian suffix ‘-ka’ with Mongolian words is ‘only for girls’ (only girls speak like this to sound more ‘babyish’, ‘childish’ or ‘cute’), associating the linguistic practice with the construction of gender identity. This is perhaps related to the fact that the Russian suffix ‘-ka’ is often added at the end of the Russian female personal names (Masha + ka = Mashka) to show affection (Dovchin et al. 2015).

This is confirmed by the female participants: ‘I tend to put the Russian “-ka” at the end of my words when I feel “feminine”, or “beautiful”. It’s like when I’m getting dressed up, putting my make up on, wearing high heels and so on’, associating the use of Russianized Mongolian words with a ‘feminine way of talking’. This way of talking, however, is not new in Mongolia, as many ‘pre-1990s Mongolian women used to play with the Russian suffix ‘-ka’ to sound different or distinctive’, says professor of linguistics, Dorjgotov (Interview, August 4, 2010, Ulaanbaatar, Mongolia). The use of ‘udku’ in this particular conversation then is implemented through gender-bending practice, where male gender is using female-oriented words in daily linguistic practice to perform a different gender identity.

The use of Russian here also subtextually raises the issues of class position and education. This is identified by the interview accounts of several other classmates of the speaker, Ganaa: ‘We all know he is gay but we absolutely respect him. He has his own class. He’s very sophisticated and educated. He knows pretty much about everything. So we call him our ‘encyclopaedia’. I think he’s like that because he speaks fluent Russian and was educated at a Russian secondary school’ (Erdenesaikhan, Group Discussion, September 28, 2010, Ulaanbaatar, Mongolia). Ganaa was introduced as one of the top A+ students in his class. He is seen as well-educated and sophisticated amongst his classmates because of his attendance at the Russian secondary school, before starting his degree at university. This is also related to the fact that when Mongolia was a communist nation, the children who used to attend prestigious Russian high schools would often be known as ‘elitists’ (e.g. the parents are often diplomats, high-ranking officials).

This tradition is still alive in current Mongolia: Russian high schools are still considered as one of the most prestigious educational institutions in Mongolia (cf. Billé 2010).

Overall, this conversation extract illustrates how derogatory English phrases may be used to present different meanings from the original through the playful and humorous mode of friendly teasing, and the relocalization within the context of girls' make-up and gay men's relationship issues. The speakers 'negotiate meanings to co-construct situated new norms' (Canagarajah 2013, p. 106) by manipulating the cultural and linguistic resources available to them. The role of English, however, is further intertextually entangled with Mongolian and Russian linguistic resources, with the combination of Russian/English indexing part of the speaker's gender identity, while the use of Russian mixed with Mongolian and English may also present part of the speaker's class/education background. The transtextual relations of this extract therefore show not only how the participants engage in playful linguistic creativity but also how the transglossic manipulation of linguistic resources and popular cultural references enable a range of other associations, from sexual orientation and identity to class background and educational history. While all of this is going on simultaneously, transtextual analysis allows us to pick apart some of the elements of the interaction, from prior history to current location, from use of linguistic resources to references to popular culture, from shared knowledge and ideological underpinnings to participants' own views on what is going on (Dovchin et al. 2015).

Transtextual Analysis: 'Mohila, Meye, Murgi R Bachcha... :-/'

A second example of online interaction (Sultana et al. 2015) can shed further light on how the transglossic framework can work. The entry point into the analysis is the pretextual history: What do we know about what has been going on before? The following conversation takes place between the research participants, Bonya and her friends. Bonya (female, 23, born and

brought up in Dhaka, a third-year student at the UOE) studied in a Bangla-medium school and, later on, shifted to an English-medium high school. Since they have been studying in the same department and University for several semesters, they have known each other for a long time and are comfortable enough to tease and pull each other's legs.

Moving on to the contextual relations of this conversation, we need to ask—where does the conversation take place? What else is going on? This conversation takes place on FB. We know that the computer-mediated multimodal environment in the virtual space allows freedom to speakers to choose and reconfigure power in terms of language and identity (Darvin and Norton 2015). Varis and Wang (2011, p. 71) define virtual space as 'a superdiverse space par excellence' that has 'seemingly endless possibilities for self-expression, individual life projects and community formation'. The computer-mediated multimodal environment in the virtual space allows freedom to young adults to choose a variety of semiotic resources, and they do not need to restrict themselves to linguistic resources to express themselves. Other multimodal features, such as images, music videos, photographs, links to new articles, tag lines and characters from popular culture, play vital roles in their communication and negotiation of identities (Sultana 2016a). This means, when we are looking into this FB conversation, we have to analyse not only linguistic features, but also other linguistic and cultural resources used by Bonya and her friends. In addition, we know that digitally mediated interactions are 'quasi-synchronous' and turns may be delayed and carefully composed. Consequently, interlocutors may be reflexive and may engage in a more creative and self-aware identity performances (Tagg 2016). Therefore, the language Bonya and her friends use and the identity they perform may be considered as carefully crafted.

What else do we know about Bonya from our ethnographic and netnographic observations that may help us in understanding the virtual conversation? Bonya has an intense engagement with popular culture, very much obvious in her conversations about and references to Japanese manga and video games; Korean drama; and American TV serials, cartoons, movies and music (Excerpt 2.2).

Excerpt 2.2 Language guide: regular font = Bangla; *italics* = *English*; underlined = Hindi film name

FB conversation	Translation
1. Sabbir: Aike ami amar 4 ta <i>hoobies</i> khuje pelam..... <i>Women, Girls, Chicks and Babes.....lol</i>	Sabbir: Today i have found my four hoobies ((hobbies)) ... Women, Girls, Chicks and Babes.....lol
2. Bonya: mohila, meye, murgi r bachcha... :-/	Bonya: Women, girls, young chickens, and babies ... :-/
3. Sabbir: bah ((sounds of appreciation, here used as sarcasm))....tui to valo bangla janos..... Bonya	Sabbir: bah ((sounds of appreciation, here used as sarcasm)) ...you know such good Bangla Bonya
4. Bonya: hehe... :D	Bonya: hehe... :D
5. SA: <i>You really think you're Johnny Bravo? Come on Sabbir! ;)</i>	SA: You really think you're Johnny Bravo? Come on Sabbir! ;)
6. FH: <i>Thank you SA ;)</i>	FH: Thank you SA ;)
7. SA: ^ <i>LAWL</i> .	SA: ^ <i>LAWL</i> .
8. SM: Sabbir, tui to r <i>jhony bravo</i> hoite parbi na, tui khub beshi hole <u>Jhony Gaddar</u> hoite parbi: P	SM: Sabbir, you can never be jhony bravo, you can be Jhony Gaddar if you really try hard: P

Bonya and her friends play with words through manipulation of translation from English to Bangla and vice versa—a common phenomenon of their everyday linguistic creativity. In line 1, Sabbir suggests his interest in women ('women, girls, chicks and babes')—as a pleasurable hobby. Why is he using these specific words in English in order to express his hobby? What intertextual echoes do these words carry? These words, specifically chicks and babes, are popular amongst men for sexually objectifying women and expressing their masculine hegemony over women. These words are also popular in the media for relegating women to a subservient position compared to men. Thus, the intertextual echoes indicate that Sabbir, with his use of masculine specific words, enacts what we might (perhaps generously) call a laddish masculinity. He is also aware of global online signs such as 'lol' (North 2007) which shows that his linguistic repertoire has been enriched by his mobility in the virtual space.

Sabbir's intentions are foiled, however, by Bonya in line 2. The intratextual forms, that is the use of these words within the conversation, indicate that Bonya uses the literal translation here and manipulates the differences in meaning caused by translation from English to Bangla.

She suggests that Sabbir is interested in ‘murgir bachha’ (young chicken) and ‘bachcha’ (young children). With the literal translations of ‘chicks’ and ‘babies’, Bonya subverts Sabbir’s attempt to perform his male identity attributes. By contrast, he is identified as a pervert, interested in ‘chicks’ and ‘babies’. The language play through translation brings to the fore various character attributes obviously not intended by Sabbir in line 1 (cf. Broner and Tarone 2001; Bell 2016, for features of language play). Thus, using her awareness of the cultural significance and meaning of the words (line 1) in popular culture and manipulating the strategy of literal translation from English to Bangla, Bonya challenges Sabbir’s attempts in performing authoritative masculine womanizer identity attributes.

Why are Jhony Bravo and Jhony (Johnny) Gaddar set in juxtaposition in lines 6 and 9? What purposes do they serve in this conversation? The answer may be unravelled by exploring the subtextual meanings associated with the titles of these English and Hindi films. Johnny Bravo refers to the main character of an American animated television series: a hunk who impersonates Elvis Presley in his pompadour hairstyle and voice and spends time in his futile endeavours to make women fall in love with him. Johnny Gaddar (Johnny the Traitor), by contrast, refers to the main character of the 2007 Hindi film in which an underworld criminal betrays and kills his friends in a drug deal, only to be killed himself at the end of the film. In line 8, SM, with an implicit reference to the plots of these films, compares Sabbir to an underworld criminal, drug dealer and traitor who meets an untimely death in a feud.

The preference furthermore for an Indian film in comparison with an America animated cartoon for hassling Sabbir here subtextually raises the issues of perceived hierarchies in popular culture based on the countries of origin. For example, Indian entertainment has a lower acceptance and status compared to Western entertainment in Bangladesh. The perceived lower status of Indian popular culture allows SA and SM to accomplish their interactional goal in this extract, that is foiling Sabbir’s performance of masculine identity attributes. With intertextual references to the traits of these characters and shared subtextual knowledge about these films, Bonya and her friends playfully mock and tease Sabbir (lines 5–8). In addition, the use of online emoticons and signs, such as :-/, :D, ^LAWL,); and, :P allow Bonya and others to support the verbal sarcasm towards

Sabbir in non-verbal ways (Walther and D'Addario 2001). Thus, a range of linguistic and cultural resources from popular culture, awareness of ideologies associated with these resources and a variety of emoticons make it possible for these young adults to collectively engage in language play and tease each other.

Overall, the transtextual analysis of this extract enables us to have a better understanding of how popular culture is used in the ludic language play of young adults and how language play serves broader purposes. As many studies have shown, playing around with language may have many implications beyond its immediate humorous effects, from drawing attention to aspects of language to enhancing language learning, from smoothing out work relations to constructing others in particular ways (Bell 2012; Forman 2011; Otsuji and Pennycook 2016). We can also explore the intratextual use of various resources from English and Bangla and common online signs, symbols and slang, and intertextual references to various forms of popular culture, with specific attention to the subtextual reference to the sociohistorical and ideological role of Indian and American entertainment in the context of Bangladesh. While we appreciate the linguistic creativity of young adults in ludic language play, we also unpack the sociocultural significance and preconceived ideologies associated with linguistic and cultural resources drawn from popular culture and the contextual relations between friends that altogether allow the group improvisation of sarcasm, parody and humor over the theme presented by Sabbir in line 1.

Researching Transglossic Language Practices

As can be seen from the examples above, and as discussed in the previous chapter, a focus of this book is on both online and offline (face-to-face) interactions and their relationship to each other. In order to research such contexts and in order to take up transglossic analysis, we need therefore much more than forms of textual analysis. One of the dangers of researching digital contexts such as online environments, or researching

through digital means (digital capture), is that too much of the all-important environment may be lost: pretextual histories, contextual factors and posttextual interpretations may be sacrificed for the more readily available intratextual, intertextual and subtextual forms of analysis. The same point has been made about the growth of linguistic landscape research: a digital camera seems to be all that is needed to gather data. And yet this clearly reduces a complex social environment to a series of images. Who put up the signs? Why? How do passers-by read them? As Blommaert (2013) argues with respect to linguistic landscape research, the introduction of an 'ethnographic approach heralds the end of the dominance of a synchronic (or achronic) perspective in linguistics and sociolinguistics' (p. 3). If we really want to understand the sociolinguistics of contemporary interaction, we need 'microscopic and detailed investigation of cases—ethnography, in other words' (p. 13).

Likewise, the research discussed in this book relies on ethnographic understandings of the contexts of interaction. It is not enough just to show language mixing, references to popular culture and the wider worlds they index. We need to know who is interacting and what their histories are, the physical or virtual contexts that surround them and the ways they engage with their own texts. This research develops further the linguistic ethnographic approach adopted by Creese and Blackledge (2011), Maybin and Tusting (2011) and Rampton (2007), drawing on the insights of ethnography but starting above all with language as its focus. From a linguistic ethnographic point of view, 'contexts of communication should be investigated rather than assumed' since meaning 'takes shape within specific social relations that have to be grasped ethnographically' (Rampton et al. 2015, p. 18). Yet 'analysis of the internal organization of verbal (and other kinds of semiotic) data is essential' if we are to understand how it comes to have meaning for the participants (Rampton et al. 2015, p. 18). In other words, unpacking the intricate relationship of meanings requires intratextual and intertextual analysis to understand the close workings of language and its indexical significance, and contextual, pretextual, posttextual and subtextual analysis to understand the discourses it takes up, the history behind it, the importance of everything around it and the meanings the participants see in their own language use.

Following Li Wei's (2011, p. 1224) 'Moment Analysis', with its shift away from a search for patterns and regularities and its orientation instead towards 'spontaneous, impromptu, and momentary actions and performances', we are interested in understanding *practices in place*, arguing that to understand the local language practices of participants we need both ethnography and linguistic analysis. Our understanding of 'context' therefore is far more than a mere contextual backdrop (people and place), but instead draws on more dynamic analyses of space as a social category (Pennycook 2010; Pennycook and Otsuji 2015). The linguistic ethnography that enabled us to follow these young adults in their daily lives also included 'linguistic netnography' based on 'netnography' (Kozinets 2002, 2015), and 'Internet/online ethnography' (Androutsopoulos 2011; Stæhr 2015) to look at the digital literacy practices of Facebook (FB) users (Copland and Creese 2015). The online linguistic and cultural resources they draw on also further enabled us to learn about the students' offline practices. It provided a convenient space for self-reflection and self-identification for many students, which can be expressed through an array of textual and linguistic resources (Barton and Lee 2013). We also hung out with students as participant-observers on multiple occasions during the students' leisurely get-togethers to learn more about the students' offline (and online) linguistic behaviours. Finally, the research participants were invited for interviews and casual discussions in terms of their own metalinguistic or postlinguistic interpretations. They also provided in-depth insights about their sociolinguistic biographies, social and cultural backgrounds, issues and tensions about their language use and self-identifications.

Research Context and Participating Young Adults

The data that we have used in this book are derived from two larger ethnographic research projects that looked into the linguistic practices of young adults in Dhaka and Ulaanbaatar (Sultana 2014a, 2015, 2016a, b; Dovchin 2015, 2017a, b, c). Sixty-five students from various social

backgrounds aged between 17 and 29 from the National University of Mongolia (NUM) and the University of Excellence (UOE—pseudonym), Bangladesh, volunteered to participate in the research.³ These young adults kept a digital recorder provided to them and recorded their own conversations in their own terms whenever they spent time with their friends during their class breaks. The interviews had semistructured questions about the academic, individual and social functions and significance of different languages and popular culture in their life. These questions which were addressed to the young adults in two/three consecutive sessions, each one hour long, brought out their experiences, stories, opinions and feelings about languages, genres of popular culture, and their demographic locations, educational backgrounds, socio-economic conditions, and affiliation with specific groups on campus and in the virtual space. Thus, the close observation of these young adults, informal discussions with them and in-depth interviews allowed a holistic understanding of their language practices and performances of identity.

The young adults' socio-economic and regional backgrounds were diverse, varying from affluent to poor and from rural to urban, before they gained admission to the universities and came to live in Dhaka and Ulaanbaatar. A majority of these participants allowed us access to their Facebook (FB) accounts and later provided their own posttextual FB analysis via interviews. We looked into their use of English, Bangla, Mongolian and other additional languages and manipulation of signs, symbols and multimodal materials in the virtual space. The multimodal resources of popular culture, such as photographs, links to music, music player, links to blog entry, embedded videos and so on add to the meaning-making of transglossia (Androutsopoulos 2011). In this book, we explore how these non-linguistic resources allow participants to create their own space and perform different facets of their identity. As Thurlow and Mroczek (2011) suggest, new media and new technologies are given social meanings by the users. This is one reason why FB seemed to be a suitable space for exploration, as a new way of presenting identity, expressing views, affinities, and affirming and rejecting moral stances.

Our acquaintance with the young adults in offline environments, our knowledge about their life trajectories and linguistic and educational backgrounds allowed us a better understanding of their patterns of language practices and performances of identities in the virtual space too. Interestingly, the virtual space, because of its flexibility and fluidity, provided more opportunities to understand how different resources were used to enact gendered or classed identity, how young adults went beyond these prescribed markers using resources available to them and how they recrafted their selves in the virtual space.

Nevertheless, as we found that these young adults mainly had their offline friends as their FB friends, their friendships were usually anchored in offline relationships, and their presence in FB was not anonymous like many other virtual sites where people may hide their identity. We therefore considered their language practices and negotiation of identity in the virtual space as an extension of the ones in 'real' space (Zhao et al. 2008). However, we observed that the flexibility and fluidity of the virtual space sometimes allowed them to be resistant to their offline identity attributes imposed on them by their demographic or linguistic backgrounds and they performed starkly different identity attributes, using linguistic and cultural resources drawn from popular culture. This observation reflects what Androutsopoulos (2008) identifies: even though young adults are marked by prescribed identity attributes of the 'real' space, they discursively negotiate various other identity attributes in online discussions.

Because of our specific interest in *transglossia*, we were interested in the voices of the participants in their dialogic interactions, and the resonance of the past and present in their voices. We needed to look beyond the dialogues. On the one hand, we had their dialogues, their immediate voices; on the other, we had to look for the multiple divergent voices underlying their voices (Pavlenko 2007), of which the participants themselves were not always aware. Their *habitus*, their symbolic capital, their overall life trajectories and the social dynamics of space and spatiality impacted on those embedded voices (Blommaert 2005). Hence, we used our disciplinary knowledge, theoretical framework and awareness of the sociocultural significance of English, Bangla, Hindi, Mongolian, Russian, Korean and so on developed through intensive

research, to bring out their voices. As ethnographers, during the analysis process, we also complemented their voice with our understanding of linguistic encounters that we had developed from our academic expertise in applied linguistics and ethnographic observations. The dialoguing voices of participants and ours ensured ‘a more complex understanding of the situation than either could do alone’ (Emerson et al. 2007, p. 366).

Participants were continually questioned about what they meant or intended to mean with their particular language practices, and *posttextual interpretations* of the data (the ways texts are read, interpreted, resisted and appropriated) enabled a much richer understanding of the practices and discourses at play (Pennycook 2007, p. 53). In other words, the participants themselves engaged in the process of contextualization of their conversations (cf. also Pavlenko 2007). Their responses as to why they produced their own utterances and how they interpreted the language of others allowed the researchers to reflect not only our interpretation, but also theirs. Consequently, the emergent interpretations through the analysis were ‘tuned into’ participants’ perspectives and voices (Maybin 2006, p. 12). Participants’ personal interpretations of their own voices and intentions were accommodated in the research and their opinions were fused into the data analysis sections. Therefore, the research itself was *polyphonic*; that is, it contained multiple independent voices working together in a text (Bakhtin 1981).

Conclusion

The transglossic framework that we have developed over the course of this research allows us to investigate language practices at multiple levels: We are interested in the complex mix of voices (the positions, desires and meanings the participants strive for), popular culture (the particular cultural forms the participants engage in) and language practices (the mixing up of languages and the types of linguistic interaction) in the online and offline environments (Facebook, YouTube, casual conversations) that our young adults engage in. This analysis, with its focus on transmodal and transtextual elements, allows us both to look closely at texts—pronunciation, morphemes, spellings and so on, intertextual

references, subtextual meanings, use of emoticons and other expressive features, diverse language resources—and also to look much more broadly at class and gender backgrounds, at different ideological and discursive positionings. In the next chapter, we will focus particularly on young adults' engagement with music genres, while also exploring the question of their sense of authenticity with reference to various musical performances and identities.

Notes

1. During her candid interview with Diane Sawyer on Primetime, Whitney Houston was denying her drug addiction by citing the simple fact that she can afford to do BETTER drugs: 'First of all, let's get one thing straight. Crack is cheap. I make too much money to ever smoke crack. Let's get that straight. Okay? We don't do crack. We don't do that. Crack is whack'. (<http://www.urbandictionary.com/define.php?term=crack%20is%20whack>).
2. All accounts provided by the research participants in the interviews/group discussions/online correspondences were conducted in Mongolian or Bangla, and translated into English by the researchers.
3. All the names used for the research participants are pseudonyms. The interlocutors who engaged in the conversations with the research participants but were not directly involved in the research, gave consent, so that their conversations may be used in the research. Their names are put in capital letters, such as AA, KK and so on.

References

- Androutsopoulos, J. (2008). Potentials and limitations of discourse-centred online ethnography. *Language at Internet*, 5. <http://www.languageatinternet.org/articles/2008/1610>.
- Androutsopoulos, J. (2010). Localizing the global in the participatory web. In N. Coupland (Ed.), *The handbook of language and globalization* (pp. 203–231). West Sussex: Wiley.

- Androutsopoulos, J. (2011). From variation to heteroglossia in the study of computer-mediated discourse. In C. Thurlow & K. Mroczek (Eds.), *Digital discourse: Language in the New Media* (pp. 277–298). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bailey, B. (2007). Heteroglossia and boundaries. In M. Heller (Ed.), *Bilingualism: A social approach* (pp. 257–274). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Bakhtin, M. (1981). *The dialogic imagination: Four essays* (C. Emerson & M. Holquist, Trans.). Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Bakhtin, M. (1986). *Speech genres and other late essays*. (V. McGee, C. Emerson & M. Holquist Eds., Trans.). Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Barton, D., & Lee, C. (2013). *Language online: Investigating digital texts and practices*. London: Routledge.
- Bauman, R., & Briggs, L. C. (1990). Poetics and performance as critical perspectives on language and social life. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 19, 59–88.
- Bell, N. (2012). Formulaic language, creativity, and language play in a second language. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 32, 189–205.
- Bell, N. (2016). Introduction. In N. Bell (Ed.), *Multiple perspectives on language play* (pp. 1–10). Berlin: de Gruyter Mouton.
- Billé, F. (2010). Sounds and scripts of modernity: Language ideologies and practices in contemporary Mongolia. *Inner Asia*, 12(2), 231–252.
- Blackledge, A., & Creese, A. (2010). *Multilingualism: A critical perspective*. London: Continuum.
- Blackledge, A., & Creese, A. (2014). Heteroglossia as practice and pedagogy. In A. Blackledge & A. Creese (Eds.), *Heteroglossia as practice and pedagogy* (pp. 1–20). Dordrecht: Springer.
- Blommaert, J. (2005). Bourdieu the ethnographer. *The Translator*, 11(2), 219–236.
- Blommaert, J. (2013). Complexity, accent, and conviviality: Concluding comments. *Applied Linguistics*, 34(5), 613–622.
- Blommaert, J., & A. Backus. (2013). Super diverse repertoires and the individual. In I. de Saint-Georges & J. Weber (Eds.), *Multilingualism and multimodality: Current challenges for educational studies* (pp. 11–32). Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.
- Broner, M. A., & Tarone, E. (2001). Is it fun? Language play in a fifth-grade Spanish immersion classroom. *The Modern Language Journal*, 85(3), 363–379.

- Canagarajah, S. (2013). *Translingual practice: Global Englishes and cosmopolitan relations*. New York: Routledge.
- Clark, K., & Holquist, M. (1984). *Mikhail Bakhtin*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Copland, F., & Creese, A. (2015). *Linguistic ethnography: Collecting, analysing and presenting data*. London: Sage.
- Creese, A., & Blackledge, A. (2011). Separate and flexible bilingualism in complementary schools: Multiple language practices in interrelationship. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 43(5), 1196–1208.
- Darvin, R., & Norton, B. (2015). Identity and a model of investment in applied linguistics. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 35, 36–56.
- Dovchin, S. (2015). Language, multiple authenticities and social media: The online language practices of university students in Mongolia. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 19(4), 437–459.
- Dovchin, S. (2017a). The ordinarieness of youth linguascapes in Mongolia. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 14(2), 144–159.
- Dovchin, S. (2017b). Translocal english in the linguascope of mongolian popular music. *World Englishes*, 36(1), 2–19.
- Dovchin, S. (2017c). The role of English in the language practices of Mongolian Facebook users: English meets Mongolian on social media. *English Today*, 33(2), 16–24.
- Dovchin, S., Sultana, S., & Pennycook, A. (2015). Relocalizing the translingual practices of young adults in Mongolia and Bangladesh. *Translation and Translanguaging in Multilingual contexts*, 1(1), 4–26.
- Emerson, R. M., Fretz, R. I., & Shaw, L. L. (2007). Participant observation and fieldnote. In P. Atkinson, A. Coffey, S. Delmont, J. Lofland, & L. Lofland (Eds.), *Handbook of ethnography* (pp. 352–368). London: Sage.
- Forman, R. (2011). Humorous language play in a Thai EFL classroom. *Applied Linguistics*, 32(5), 541–565.
- García, O. (2009a). *Bilingual education in the 21st Century: A global perspective*. Oxford: Wiley.
- García, O. (2009b). Education, multiingualism and translanguaging in the 21st century. In T. Skutnabb-Kangas, R. Phillipson, A. Mohanty, & M. Panda (Eds.), *Social justice through multilingual education* (pp. 140–158). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- García, O. (2014). Countering the dual: Transglossia, dynamic bilingualism and translanguaging in education. In R. S. Rubdy & L. Alsagoff (Eds.), *The global-local interface and hybridity: Exploring language and identity* (pp. 100–118). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

- García, O., Flores, N., & Chu, A. (2011). Extending bilingualism in U.S. secondary education: New variations. *International Multilingual Research Journal*, 5(1), 1–18.
- García, O., & Leiva, C. (2014). Theorizing and enacting translanguaging for social justice. In A. Blackledge & A. Creese (Eds.), *Heteroglossia as practice and pedagogy* (pp. 199–216). Dordrecht: Springer.
- García, O., & Wei, L. (2014). *Translanguaging: language, bilingualism and education*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Hill, J. H. (1993). Hasta la vista, baby: Anglo Spanish in the American southwest. *Critique of Anthropology*, 13(2), 146–176.
- Holquist, M. (1990). *Dialogism: Bakhtin and his world*. London: Routledge.
- Hornberger, N., & Link, H. (2012). Translanguaging and transnational literacies in multilingual classrooms: A biliteracy lens. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 15(3), 261–278.
- Jørgensen, J. N. (2008a). Polylingual languaging around and among children and adolescents. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 5(3), 161–176.
- Jørgensen, J. N. (2008b). *Languaging: Nine years of poly-lingual development of young Turkish-Danish grade school students* (Vol. 2). Copenhagen: University of Copenhagen.
- Jørgensen, J. N., Karrebæk, M. S., Madsen, L. M., & Møller, J. S. (2011). Polylinguaging in superdiversity. *Diversities*, 13(2), 23–38.
- Kozinets, R. V. (2002). The field behind the screen: Using netnography for marketing research in online communities. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 39(1), 61–72.
- Kozinets, R. V. (2015). Netnography. *The International Encyclopedia of Digital Communication and Society*. 1–8.
- Lee, J. W. (2017). *The politics of translanguaging: After englishes*. New York: Routledge.
- Lin, A. (2014). Hip-hop heteroglossia as practice, pleasure, and public pedagogy: Translanguaging in the lyrical poetics of “24 Herbs” in Hong Kong. In A. Blackledge & A. Creese (Eds.), *Heteroglossia as practice and pedagogy* (pp. 119–136). Dordrecht: Springer.
- Malinowski, D., & Kramsch, C. (2014). The ambiguous world of heteroglossic computer-mediated language learning. In A. Blackledge & A. Creese (Eds.), *Heteroglossia as practice and pedagogy* (pp. 155–178). Dordrecht: Springer.
- Martin-Beltrán, M. (2014). “What do you want to say?” How adolescents use translanguaging to expand learning opportunities. *International Multilingual Research Journal*, 8(3), 208–230.

- Maybin, J. (2006). *Children's voices, talk, knowledge, and identity*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Maybin, J., & Swann, J. (2007). Everyday creativity in language: Textuality, contextuality, and critique. *Applied Linguistics*, 28(4), 497–517.
- Maybin, J., & Tusting, K. (2011). Linguistic ethnography. In J. Simpson (Ed.), *Routledge handbook of applied linguistics* (pp. 515–528). London: Routledge.
- Møller, J. S. (2008). Polylingual performance among turkish-danes in late-modern copenhagen. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 5(3), 217–236.
- Nikulin, D. (1998). Mikhail Bakhtin: A theory of dialogue. *Constellations*, 5(3), 381–402.
- North, S. (2007). 'The voices, the voices': Creativity in online conversation. *Applied Linguistics*, 28(4), 538–555.
- Otsuji, E., & Pennycook, A. (2010). Metrolingualism: Fixity, fluidity and language in flux. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 7(3), 240–254.
- Otsuji, E., & Pennycook, A. (2016). Cities, conviviality and double-edged language play. In N. Bell (Ed.), *Multiple perspectives on language play* (pp. 199–218). Berlin: de Gruyter Mouton.
- Pavlenko, A. (2007). Autobiographic narratives as data in applied linguistics. *Applied Linguistics*, 28(2), 163–188.
- Pennycook, A. (2007). *Global Englishes and transcultural flows*. London: Routledge.
- Pennycook, A. (2010). *Language as a local practice*. London: Routledge.
- Pennycook, A. (2016). Mobile times, mobile terms: The trans-super-poly-metro movement. In N. Coupland (Ed.), *Sociolinguistics: Theoretical debates* (pp. 201–206). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Pennycook, A., & Otsuji, E. (2014). Metrolingual multitasking and spatial repertoires: 'Pizza mo two minutes coming'. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 18(2), 161–184.
- Pennycook, A., & Otsuji, E. (2015). *Metrolingualism: Language in the City*. London: Routledge.
- Pietikäinen, S. (2013). Heteroglossic authenticity in Sámi heritage tourism. In S. Pietikäinen & H. Kelly-Holmes (Eds.), *Multilingualism and the periphery* (pp. 77–94). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Pietikäinen, S., & Dufva, H. (2014). Heteroglossia in action: Sámi children, textbooks and rap. In A. Blackledge & A. Creese (Eds.), *Heteroglossia as practice and pedagogy* (pp. 59–74). Dordrecht: Springer.

- Pujolar, J. C. (2001). *Gender, heteroglossia and power: A sociolinguistic study of youth culture*. New York: Walter de Gruyter.
- Rampton, B. (2006). *Language in late modernity: Interaction in an urban school*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rampton, B. (2007). Neo-hymesian linguistic ethnography in the United Kingdom. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 11(5), 584–607.
- Rampton, B., Maybin, J., & Roberts, C. (2015). Theory and method in linguistic ethnography. In J. Snell, S. Shaw & F. Copland (Eds.), *Linguistic ethnography: Interdisciplinary explorations* (pp. 14–50). Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Stæhr, A. (2015). Reflexivity in Facebook interaction—enregisterment across written and spoken language practices. *Discourse, Context and Media*, 8, 30–45.
- Sultana, S. (2013). *Transglossic language practices: Young adults transgressing language and identity in Bangladesh*. Ph.D. diss. University of Technology, Sydney (UTS).
- Sultana, S. (2014). Heteroglossia and identity of young adults in Bangladesh. *Linguistics and Education*, 26, 40–56.
- Sultana, S. (2015). Transglossic language practices: Young adults transgressing language and identity in Bangladesh. *Translation and Translanguaging in Multilingual Contexts*, 1(2), 68–98.
- Sultana, S. (2016a). Language and identity in virtual space: Reconceptualisation of ELF. *Journal of Asian Pacific Communication*, 26(2), 216–237.
- Sultana, S. (2016b). English as a local practices: Young adults in Bangladesh. *Journal of Institute of Modern Languages*, 2015–2016 (1–28).
- Sultana, S., Dovchin, S., & Pennycook, A. (2015). Transglossic language practices of young adults in Bangladesh and Mongolia. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 12(1), 93–108.
- Tagg, C. (2016). Heteroglossia in text-messaging: Performing identity and negotiating relationships in a digital space. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 20(1), 59–85.
- Thurlow, C., & Mroczek, K. (2011). *Digital discourse: Language in the New Media*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Varis, P., & Wang, X. (2011). Superdiversity on the Internet: A case from China. *Diversities*, 13(2), 71–83.
- Walther, J. B., & D'Addario, K. P. (2001). The impacts of emoticons on message interpretation in computer-mediated communication. *Social Science Computer Review*, 19(3), 324–347.

- Wei, L. (2011). Moment analysis and translanguaging space: Discursive construction of identities by multilingual Chinese youth in Britain. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 43, 1222–1235.
- Weiss, W. A. (1990). Challenge to authority: Bakhtin and ethnographic description. *Cultural Anthropology*, 5(4), 414–430.
- Wilce, J. M. J. (1998a). The kalimah in the kaleidophone: Ranges of multivocality in Bangladeshi muslim's discourses. *Ethos*, 26(2), 229–257.
- Wilce, J. M. J. (1998b). The pragmatics of “madness”: Performance analysis of a Bangladeshi woman's “aberrant” lament. *Culture, Medicine and Psychiatry*, 22(1), 1–54.
- Zhao, S., Grasmuck, S., & Martin, J. (2008). Identity construction on Facebook: Digital empowerment in anchored relationships. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 24(5), 1816–1836.

Popular Culture, Voice and Linguistic Diversity

Young Adults On- and Offline

Dovchin, S.; Pennycook, A.; Sultana, S.

2018, IX, 222 p. 1 illus., Hardcover

ISBN: 978-3-319-61954-5