RESEARCH ARTICLE

Redefining speakership: Implications for language program direction

Carl S. Blyth, University of Texas at Austin

Amanda Dalola, University of South Carolina

Abstract

This article reviews scholarship in sociolinguistics and applied linguistics to discern how the definitions of speakership and competence have changed in the last fifty years. It is shown that the redefined concepts reflect a new understanding of language that is no longer consonant with many current teaching practices anchored in structuralism and monolingualism. Next, the article outlines five tenets of language based on Blommaert's (2010) critical sociolinguistics of globalization and discusses the implications of these tenets for language program direction.

Keywords: *language pedagogy, sociolinguistics, speakership, language program direction*

APA Citation: Blyth, C. S., & Dalola, A. (2020). Redefining speakership: Implications for language program direction. *Second Language Research & Practice*, *1*(1), 99–123. http://hdl.handle.net/10125/69843

Introduction

The 2002 American Association of University Supervisors, Coordinators, and Directors of Language Programs (AAUSC) volume entitled *The Sociolinguistics of Foreign Language Classrooms: Contributions of the Native, the Near-Native and the Non-Native Speaker* explored the relevance of sociolinguistic research for language program direction. Blyth (2002) framed the volume by posing a series of questions about the appropriateness of the theoretical construct of the native speaker for language education: "If we get rid of the native speaker, where does that leave us? If we deconstruct the native speaker, what do we construct in its place?" (p. xiv). The goal of this article is to revisit the concept of speakership in the allied fields of sociolinguistics and applied linguistics to discover what has changed since the publication of the 2002 volume.

In this article, following Eckert (2012), we first describe the sociolinguistic research on speakership in terms of three distinct waves. Next, we describe the trajectory of speakership in applied linguistics in reference to the changing conceptualizations of linguistic competence. The article ends with a discussion of the implications of the redefinitions of L2 speakership for language program direction and for language teacher education.

Speakership in Sociolinguistics

Research in sociolinguistics has been characterized in terms of three successive waves (Eckert, 2012). Within the field, the notion of speakership has evolved in parallel with these waves and their associated methodologies. The first wave of sociolinguistic research during the 1960s and 1970s, commonly referred to as variationism, employed statistical analyses of large-scale urban surveys to establish the relationship between linguistic variants (e.g., different pronunciations of the same word) and broad demographic categories. The second wave during the 1980s and 1990s ushered in the use of ethnographic methods to enhance the earlier variationist approach via the use of locally relevant, participant-designed social

CC BY NC ND

categories, in lieu of general, predetermined ones. Beginning with the new millennium, the third wave refocused sociolinguistic inquiry on performative styles that made use of linguistic variables to construct and index various personae. Today, sociolinguists continue to develop their understanding of speakership by remixing earlier methods with computer-assisted approaches involving big data and predictive statistical modeling, which they use to carry out analyses on both traditional data and new media data.

Speakership in the First Wave

The first wave of quantitative variationist studies (Eckert, 2012) began in 1966 with Labov's publication of *The Social Stratification of English in New York City*, which surveyed a sample of New York's Lower East Side for the presence or absence of several linguistic variants found in the local vernacular, e.g., post-vocalic 'r', 'th/dh'-stopping, [æ]-height, etc. Carried out via large-scale surveys and recorded interviews, the goal of Labov's study was to use quantitative methods to correlate linguistic variants with different macrosocial categories (e.g., socioeconomic class, gender, age, ethnicity) and styles, defined in this model as level of attention paid to speech. To that end, countless first-wave studies found evidence of gender and style stratification that transcended race and ethnicity: Women's speech was observed to be consistently more standard across the socioeconomic hierarchy than men's (Macaulay, 1977; Trudgill & Trudgill, 1974; Wolfram, 1969), and patterns of stylistic variation were found nested within levels of socioeconomic variation (Labov, 1966). According to Eckert (2012), the first wave's view of meaning was rooted largely in the socioeconomic hierarchy: linguistic variables were seen as marking one's socioeconomic status, and gender and stylistic dynamics were viewed as the effects of these categories on speakers' orientation to their assigned place in that hierarchy. The use of generic, predetermined social categories and superficial contact with participants helped contribute to an understanding of social sound change in the urban center but ultimately motivated the use of more time-intensive ethnographic practices in the second wave, which assessed both the relevance of these general categories and the existence and composition of other more meaningful constructs unique to the local context.

Speakership in the Second Wave

The second-wave approach of sociolinguistic studies made use of ethnographic methods to study the vernacular (viewed as an expression of local or class identity) within specific communities and correlate its use with personalized, locally relevant social categories. Inaugurated in 1980 with Milroy's analysis of phonological variation in Belfast social networks, this wave of sociolinguistic inquiry was operationalized far and wide, in rural settings as well as urban (a peasant village in the Spanish Pyrenees [Holmquist, 1985] versus New York City [Labov, 1972]) and in varieties of World English as well as varieties of other languages (Guyanese English [Rickford, 1986] versus Spanish and Castilian [Holmquist, 1985]). Despite the uniqueness of each community and their vastly different repertoires of meaningful local categories, e.g., jocks and burnouts in a suburban Detroit high school (Eckert, 1989), sugar plantation field workers and managers in Guyana (Rickford, 1986), mountain herders, cattle farmers, and factory workers in Spain (Holmquist, 1985), several recurring themes emerged: women as leaders of linguistic change (Eckert, 2000; Gal, 1979; Holmquist, 1985; Milroy, 1980), a greater use of local variants indicative of a higher level of rootedness and engagement in the local community (Eckert 1989, 2000; Edwards, 1992; Edwards & Krakow, 1985; Knack, 1991; Milroy, 1980) and linguistic variation as part of a much larger cluster of stylistic practices, working in concert with other facets of self-representation, such as clothing, food and music. This last discovery is what spurred the shift to a third-wave conceptualization of speakership that viewed variation not as a reflection of one's social identity, but as an on-going performance in which speakers place themselves in the social landscape through stylistic practice (Bucholtz, 2010; Bucholtz & Hall, 2005; Irvine, 2001).

Speakership in the Third Wave

Speakership in the third wave has witnessed a veritable reversal in the conceptualized relationship between language and society established in the first wave and elaborated upon in the second (Eckert, 2012). Now conceived of as an essential element of speech, variation in this era has been reconceptualized as a social

semiotic system in which variables possess indexical mutability, a status attained via repeated stylistic practice, as speakers make social-semiotic moves, reinterpreting and recombining variables in a continual process labeled “bricolage” (Hebdige, 1979). Central to this axis are the concepts of indexical order (Silverstein, 2003), indexical field (Eckert, 2008), and enregisterment (Agha, 2006). Indexical order is the process by which a distinguishing feature from a population becomes typified and is subsequently used to mark membership in the population, e.g., the use of *yinz* “you (pl.)”, a distinguishing feature of Pittsburgh, which anyone—even non-Pittsburghers—can use to show affiliation to the city. The process that allows this generalization and repurposing of the linguistic variable to, and eventually by outsiders, is known as *enregisterment*. When a variable’s meaning becomes differentiated in various contexts to indicate not just a single meaning but a constellation of ideologically linked meanings, we talk about that variable’s indexical field. The use of a hyperarticulated /t/ (or /t/-release) in American English, for instance, has been found to index the styles of nerd girls (Bucholtz, 2001), Orthodox Jewish boys (Benor, 2001) and gay men (Podesva, et al., 2002) because it is associated with educated, articulate, elegant, and prissy qualities and polite, careful, and emphatic stances. In similar fashion, Zimman (2017)’s analysis of perceptions of trans men’s gender identity, demonstrated how gender operates like all other facets of identity—performatively, indexically and contextually—mediated by both measures of voice pitch and /s/-frequencies, but by neither one individually. The reconceptualization of style as on-going and ever-present has, therefore, broadened the meaning of the construct in this era from one involving regional and non-standard linguistic variables to one focused on the simultaneous utilization of linguistic and extralinguistic variables in the dynamic performance of various personae.

Current Approaches to Speakership in Sociolinguistics

If the last 50 years have witnessed the embedding of the personal computer in all aspects of our daily lives, then the last 20 have witnessed a sharp increase in its portability. Now equipped with laptops, tablets, smartphones and smartwatches, the 21st century speaker has many virtual or face-to-face communities available for performing their linguistic identities. In particular, social media platforms and other new media, such as SMS, Snapchat, TikTok (formerly known as Musical.ly), YouTube, Tumblr, Reddit, Twitter and Facebook, have all provided the loci for these interactions, and in some cases, inspired new speech genres by imposing medium-specific constraints on performance, e.g. Twitter’s 140-character limit from 2006-2017 and subsequent doubling and TikTok’s 15-second recording/60-second compilation limits. The millennial sociolinguist has learned to go in search of these personae and their definitive linguistic variants within these new digital environments, armed with a host of new digital tools. Making use of data-mining methodologies, several contemporary sociolinguistic analyses have tracked the rates of use of sociophonetic variables (via variant spellings) on francophone Twitter (Dalola, 2017; Law, 2017; McCulloch & Lamontagne, 2017), on White anglophone Twitter (Tatman, 2015, 2016) and on Black (i.e., African American Vernacular English-speaking) Twitter (Eisenstein, 2015; Ilbury, 2020; Jones, 2015). Researchers have also tapped into the microblogging environment to track lexical variation (Donoso & Sánchez, 2017; Gonçalves & Sánchez, 2016; Russ, 2012; Zsombok, 2019), and morphosyntactic variation (Claes, 2017; Willis, 2017), spawning a new breed of digitally-mediated dialectology. Present-day sociolinguistic inquiry has also moved into new digital contexts, as researchers continue to analyze forms of socially-conditioned variation as represented in the speech-like writings found in text messages (Blondeau et al., 2014; Ong’onda et al., 2011; Tremblay et al., 2020).

Not only has the locus of performance spaces changed following the development of computers, but so have the methodological approaches sociolinguists deploy in their analysis of them. The first and second waves of sociolinguistic study were the heyday of variable rules analysis (often referred to by the acronym VARBRUL), a proprietary version of the stepwise logistic regression which allowed linguists to assess the probability of one variant’s selection over another via the assignment of factor weights to a set of predictor variables (Cedergren & Sankoff, 1974). The reconceptualization in the third wave of language variation as styles instead of dialects, and personae instead of speaker categories, demanded a more multifaceted analysis which made use of both more sophisticated statistical modeling as well as more comprehensive qualitative approaches that add dimension to the interplay of relevant local characters and contexts.

Millennial sociolinguistics has added to these methodologies the use of linear regression to allow for an analysis of variables that are continuous instead of categorical (see Erker, 2010, for an impassioned call to arms), as well as developed statistical methods to allow samples to be less influenced by individual differences in participants and words (Drager & Hay, 2012; Johnson, 2009). Others still have begun calling on methods from corpus linguistics and natural language processing to train machine-learning models on corpora of informal speech and writing, to analyze variation more broadly to consider entire bouquets of linguistic variants in bi- and multilingual contexts (see Bullock et al., 2017). As samples of informal speech proliferate in digital environments, so too must the complexity and automaticity of the methods linguists use to examine them if they hope to observe and track them in real time.

Summary

The last 50 years have witnessed the birth of a more comprehensive conceptualization of what it means to be a speaker in an ever-changing social and technological landscape: Whereas the 20th-century native speaker was understood to use certain linguistic variants from a single language that correlated with large social categories in specific geographic centers, the 21st-century speaker is understood to use linguistic resources from multiple languages to perform styles in face-to-face and digital environments that construct personae when considered in concert with other extralinguistic details. It is already clear from the first three waves of sociolinguistic study that our understanding of socially-conditioned linguistic variation will continue to be amplified as we increase the dimensionality of our approaches.

Speakership in Applied Linguistics

In contrast to sociolinguists who have focused on the social meaning of linguistic variation, applied linguists have framed their research in terms of the development of linguistic proficiency. As a consequence, applied linguists have traditionally been more concerned with theorizing competence rather than speakership per se. In other words, applied linguists have employed the term "learner" more readily than the term "speaker." Despite this major difference, the concept of speakership in applied linguistics has changed in similar ways to its evolution in sociolinguistics.

Speakership in the Era of Grammatical Competence

Arising in opposition to the formal concerns of structural linguistics in the 1950s and 1960s, applied linguistics was established as a field that sought solutions to practical language issues (Grabe, 2012). Despite its practical orientation, the young field of applied linguistics was heavily influenced by the linguistic theories of the day. As such, many applied linguists understood speakership in purely grammatical terms following the work of linguists such as Chomsky who studied language as an autonomous, decontextualized system (Chomsky, 1965). In contrast to his predecessors, Chomsky steered linguistics away from its social roots by adopting a radically reductionist approach to speakership: "Linguistic theory is concerned primarily with an ideal speaker-listener, in a completely homogeneous speech-community, who knows its language perfectly" (p. 3). With this statement, Chomsky did not deny the reality of linguistic variation. Rather, his intention was to argue for a theory of competence based on speakers' grammatical intuitions rather than their variable linguistic performance. As such, he viewed linguistic variation as largely irrelevant to the enterprise of theoretical linguistics.

Even though Chomsky's research had little practical relevance for language education, his ideas greatly influenced how educators framed language as an object of study (van Lier, 2004). For example, many teachers came to emphasize language in terms of a context-free system of syntactic rules rather than the use of language in particular social contexts. In addition, the Chomskyan notion of competence reinforced educators' penchant for prescriptivism, the belief that there is a correct way to use the target language based on an idealized standard. According to socially-oriented linguists such as Romaine (1989), the trivialization of linguistic variation in Chomsky's approach belied an ethnocentric Western perspective that was based on the twin ideologies of monolingualism and nationalism:

> It is . . . no accident that linguistic theory has its origins in the cultural ideology of Western Europe and the major Anglophone countries, which attach some special significance to monolingualism and the ethos of 'one state/one language.' At various stages in their history most of these nations have felt that minority groups were threats to the cohesion of the state and have therefore tried to eradicate both the speakers and their language. (Romaine, 1989, p. 6)

In brief, language education in the 1950s and 1960s emphasized grammatical competence and largely ignored the early studies in sociolinguistics that sought to reframe speakership and linguistic competence in terms of real-world communication. Not surprisingly, such an asocial approach to language met with strong opposition from sociolinguists. Criticizing Chomsky for his reliance on speaker intuitions and fabricated examples, Labov coined the term "secular linguistics" to describe the empirical approach adopted by first wave sociolinguistic researchers (Coupland 2007, p. 4). As noted above, first-wave sociolinguistic studies conclusively proved that members of a speech community neither formed a "completely homogeneous speech-community," nor did they "know its language perfectly" (Chomsky, 1965, p. 3).

Speakership in the Era of Communicative Competence

In the early 1970s, the sociolinguist Hymes, who opposed the prevailing reductionist views of competence, proposed an alternative approach grounded in ethnography (Hymes, 1972, 1974). Hymes emphasized that language use during an interaction varied according to multiple factors such as the participants, the physical setting, and the topic of the interaction. Above all, Hymes was concerned with reframing linguistic performance in terms of appropriateness rather than grammaticality. Hymes stressed that a competent speaker not only knew grammatical rules, but also social rules governing the use of language within a speech community. He coined the phrase "communicative competence" to refer to a speaker's combined knowledge of language, that is, the knowledge of what is considered grammatical in a language combined with the knowledge of what is considered appropriate (Hymes, 1972, 1974). Several applied linguists such as Breen and Candlin (1980), Canale and Swain (1980), Savignon (1983), and Bachman (1990) further refined the concept of communicative competence by elaborating its constituent parts and by examining its pedagogical implications.

According to Kramsch (2006), the initial acceptance of communicative competence by applied linguists was meant to "facilitate access and inclusion of nonnative speakers into communities of native speakers" (p. 249). However, during the next 20 years, the term communicative competence diverged from its sociolinguistic origins. According to Swaffar (2006), the consensus view of communicative competence among language teachers was "grounded in generalized language contexts and hence relatively dissociated from cultural differences and learners' capacity to engage actively in exploring such differences despite their own cultural preconceptions" (p. 248). Furthermore, Swaffar claimed that communicative language teaching and the American Council of Teachers of Foreign Language (ACTFL) proficiency movement emphasized communication without fully grasping the implications of linguistic variation for cross-cultural meaning-making. Along similar lines, Kramsch (2006) noted that the term was principally "put to the service of instrumental goals" (p. 250) that served to downplay the importance of linguistic variation and cultural diversity. This meant commercial language textbooks of the time continued to represent native speakers in generic terms thereby reinforcing students' stereotypes of the cultural other (Swaffar, 2006, p. 248). Despite the fact that first-wave sociolinguistic studies had proven the existence of diversity within target-language speech communities, second language educators continued to frame the native speaker as essentially monolingual and homogenous.

Things began to change in the 1980s with the publication of *The Native Speaker is Dead!*, a provocative volume written by Paikeday (1980), a Canadian lexicographer. The book was composed of a series of interviews of forty well-known linguists, including Chomsky, Crystal, Halliday, and Labov, who discussed their views on the theoretical construct of the native speaker. Rejected by academic publishers as too controversial and unorthodox, the volume was finally published by Paikeday himself. Despite the lack of an academic publisher, the book was widely circulated in the field of applied linguistics and served to galvanize the debate surrounding speakership. In his interview, Chomsky maintained that the scientific

construct of the ideal native speaker was never intended to be applied to real people. Paikeday countered that the construct had resulted in discrimination against real speakers who did not conform to the linguistic norm despite the intentions of the scientific community. In addition, Paikeday criticized the construct because it was difficult to define and failed to account for multilingual speakers whose language dominance changed during their lifetime.

During the 1980s, many second language acquisition (SLA) scholars followed Krashen's influential Monitor Model of L2 performance that portrayed a learner's attention to linguistic form as categorical, and not variably related to nuances of social context (Krashen, 1981, 1982). But by the mid 1980s, prominent SLA scholars such as Ellis and Tarone began applying Labov's variationist framework to examine the effects of style shifting on interlanguage development (Ellis, 1985; 1987; Tarone, 1985, 1988). Tarone (1985) found that the accuracy with which English articles and other grammatical forms were used by native speakers of Arabic and Japanese varied depending on the tasks the speakers were asked to perform (e.g., a grammar test, an oral interview, and a narrative task). Quantitative measures showed that the variability of L2 speaker performance was conditioned by the task and the degree of focus on form. In brief, tasks such as the grammar test that required a greater attention to form resulted in greater variability than did the oral communication tasks that exhibited less variability in grammatical usage. Put differently, the less L2 speakers paid attention to their usage, the more homogenous and stable their linguistic production. Along similar lines, Ellis (1985) examined how attention to form affected learners' use of English past tense marking in narrative discourse. Many of these early SLA variationist studies are summarized in Tarone's 1988 book entitled *Variation in Interlanguage*. In general, the findings from these early SLA variationist studies mirrored the findings from Labovian sociolinguistics, for example, L2 speakers were found to have a range of speaking styles that depended on the social context operationalized in terms of attention paid to linguistic form and that the vernacular was the L2 speaker's most systematic style.

Speakership in the Era of Multicompetence and Intercultural Communicative Competence

At the beginning of the 1990s, applied linguist Cook (1992) introduced the concept of multicompetence, which reframed the debate surrounding speakership and proficiency in terms of multilingualism. According to Cook, the commonsense view of the multilingual speaker as two separate monolinguals in the same body was seriously flawed. Cook maintained that the languages of a multilingual person form an integrated, mental system. Such a conceptualization of multilingualism allowed applied linguists to view second language learners as emergent multilinguals who progressively blend their L1s and L2s into a whole. In addition, studies in SLA such as Birdsong (1992) and Bialystok (1997) suggested that some adult learners were able to achieve nativelike mastery of a second language after the so-called critical period. These findings called into question the discreteness of the native/non-native dichotomy.

By the late 1990s, the social turn in applied linguistics (Block, 2003) had led applied linguists to reframe language learning and identity development in ways that began to align more closely with sociolinguistic research. For instance, Blyth (1995) questioned the longstanding prohibition of using the L1 in L2 classrooms and called for language program directors (LPDs) to reimagine their programs as multilingual speech communities. Two years later, Byram (1997) published a book that redefined the multilingual speaker in terms of interculturality. Coining the term "intercultural communicative competence" (ICC), Byram emphasized different forms of knowledge that a speaker needed to bridge cultural divides. These different forms of knowledge were referred to using the French verb *savoir* (to know): *savoir apprendre* (to know how to learn), *savoir comprendre* (to know how to understand), *savoir s'engager* (to know how to engage the cultural other) and *savoir être* (to know how to be). These four interrelated savoirs were a mixture of skills, knowledge and attitudes. Byram admitted that the theory of ICC was meant to problematize the complex relationship between language and culture in foreign language education and was not intended as a pedagogy for teachers, but rather as a catalyst for researchers.

Concurrent with the development of Byram's theory of ICC, Kramsch (1997) published an influential article that flipped the authority of the native speaker construct on its head by claiming that *non-native* speakership was a *privilege*. In her article, Kramsch challenged foreign and second language professionals

to reconceptualize their practices by viewing language as a social practice rather than the traditional standardized system. According to Kramsch, language learning was best understood as an expansion of one's semiotic potential that resulted from the blending of multiple languacultural perspectives. For the 2002 AAUSC annual volume, Kramsch's article was reprinted with permission from the PMLA (the journal of the Modern Language Association), and LPDs of the era were asked to respond to the claims made therein. While most agreed that it made sense to view language learning through the lens of multilingualism, a few respondents argued that the native speaker construct had professional utility despite lacking a basis in reality (Koike & Liskin-Gasparro, 2002; Siskin, 2002). Nevertheless, all the contributors agreed with Train (2002) that both learners and teachers needed to take a more critical look at speakership. In addition, contributors called for several specific innovations: the strategic use of English in L2 studies (Belz, 2002; Chavez, 2002), a greater recognition of the contributions of near-native and heritage speakers (Katz, 2002; Lacorte & Canabal, 2002), and the development of functional, pedagogical norms for language curricula (Auger, 2002; Valdman 2002).

Speakership in the Era of Symbolic and Translingual Competence

As the new millennium began, applied linguists were still refining the notion of multilingual competence. Inspired by Byram's theory of ICC, Kramsch developed the theory of symbolic competence (2006, 2008, 2009). Citing globalism as the post-modern condition, Kramsch (2006) argued that the national paradigm of modern language education had become untenable: "It is no longer appropriate to give students a tourist-like competence to exchange information with native speakers of national languages within well-defined national cultures. They need a much more sophisticated competence in the manipulation of symbolic systems" (p. 251). Kramsch emphasized the importance of nourishing the "literary imagination" so that learners could grasp the full meaning-making potential of the target language. In particular, she cited three major components of symbolic competence that were fostered by studying literary texts: production of complexity, tolerance of ambiguity, and form as meaning. In short, the ultimate goal of Kramsch's approach to symbolic competence was for learners to "understand the practice of meaning-making itself" (2006, p. 251). Kramsch continued to refine her ideas about symbolic competence in her 2009 book *The Multilingual Subject*. In the book, Kramsch defined the multilingual subject as "a symbolic entity that is constituted and maintained through symbolic systems such as language" (2009, p. 17). Following Bakhtin's (1981, 1986) insights about the dialogic nature of meaning, Kramsch claimed that a multilingual subjectivity results from dialogue with other multilinguals, a process that eventually gives rise to a learner's self-awareness as a multilingual speaker.

Closely related to symbolic competence was the concept of translingual/transcultural competence (TTC) that formed the centerpiece of the 2007 report issued by the Modern Language Association (MLA) Ad Hoc Committee on Foreign Languages (MLA Report, 2007). The MLA Report called for a "broader and more coherent curriculum in which language, culture, and literature were taught as a continuous whole (p. 3). In addition, the MLA Report advocated a new outcome for collegiate foreign language study:

> The language major should be structured to produce a specific outcome: educated speakers who have a deep translingual and transcultural competence. The idea of translingual and transcultural competence places value on the multilingual ability to operate between languages. (pp. 3–4)

The new goal of TTC implied a critical awareness of multilingualism that went far beyond functional communicative skills. Rather, TTC described the attributes of an educated multilingual speaker who knew how to navigate between different cultural frames of interpretation during interactions with speakers from other languacultures.

Summary

In sociolinguistics, speakership was originally conceptualized in terms of linguistic performance as correlated with predetermined social categories such as age, sex, and socioeconomic class within a speech community. In general, a speaker who conformed to the sociolinguistic norms of the speech community was considered to be an authentic native speaker. In applied linguistics, speakership was originally

conceptualized in terms of the grammatical competence of the native speaker. Gradually, speakership in both fields expanded to include a greater emphasis on the performative aspects of identity as negotiated through linguistic choices in interaction. In the most recent conceptualizations of symbolic and translingual competence in applied linguistics, the L2 speaker is no longer characterized as "a deficient communicator" (Belz, 2002, p. 211) but as "an authentic speaker" (van Compernolle, 2016, p. 62). However, today's definition of authenticity is not the same as previous definitions of the term. According to first-wave studies, a speaker who conformed to community norms was taken to be an authentic speaker. Today, however, following sociocultural linguists such as Bucholtz (2003) and Bucholtz and Hall (2005), speakers may be deemed authentic as long as they are able to appropriate new forms and meanings that are consonant with their self-perceptions and performed identities. In such a view, authenticity is equated with the personal transformation that occurs whenever speakers employ language in ways that feel true to their emergent sense of self. In keeping with these recent conceptualizations of authentic speakership, second language researchers view language as a dynamic, social practice rather than a static, grammatical code (van Compernolle & McGregor, 2016).

Implications for Language Program Direction

A historical review of scholarship in the allied fields of sociolinguistics and applied linguistics clearly shows that definitions of speakership and linguistic competence have radically changed in the last fifty years. In turn, these redefined concepts reflect a newer understanding of language that is no longer consonant with teaching practices anchored in outdated structuralism. For instance, intercultural educator Risager (2006, 2007) contended that a structuralist view of language has traditionally gone hand-in-hand with a nationalist stance that rejected the reality of multilingualism and multiculturalism and that equated speaker identity with proficiency in a single standardized language (e.g., the English speak English, the French speak French, the Germans speak German) (Dervin & Liddicoat, 2013). Applied linguists have argued that the traditional paradigm for language studies inevitably essentializes languages and cultures and perpetuates the very stereotypes that language study seeks to dispel. Unfortunately, the traditional paradigm remains prevalent in many language programs in higher education despite repeated calls for reform (Dervin & Liddicoat, 2013; Kearney, 2015; Lord & Lomicka, 2018).

Why should it be so difficult to change the pedagogical status quo? We contend that the acceptance of pedagogical innovation has been impeded by a complicity between many language educators and educational publishers. For instance, educational publishers continue to produce commercial textbooks in which language is operationalized in narrowly grammatical terms; language program directors continue to rely on the discrete point testing of prescriptive grammar items; and teacher educators continue to privilege the practical concerns of classroom teaching while avoiding critical discussions about language ideology and sociolinguistic variation. Given such professional inertia, we believe that paradigm change in modern language education (Dupuy & Michelson, 2019) will only be possible if language educators transform their conception of language itself. Furthermore, we contend that language professionals should base their conception of language on empirical evidence. In general, sociolinguistic research describes what people actually say and write rather than what they think they should say or write. In keeping with this empirical stance, we outline a manifesto for 21st century language education that includes five tenets about language based on accepted sociolinguistic facts:

- Language is variation.
- Language is interaction.
- Language is a remix.
- Language is a means of self-authentication.
- Language is a dynamic object of study.

After each tenet, we explain what we mean by the statement and discuss its pedagogical implications. Next, we give concrete examples of how to translate the tenet into a specific teaching practice. Some of the examples come from educators who have published materials and experimented with innovative practices. Other examples are taken from our own teaching experiences. In summary, we have two goals in this section. First, we seek to articulate in a concise manner the emerging conception of language based in "a critical sociolinguistics of globalization" (Blommaert, 2010). Second, we attempt to translate this conception of language into a set of coherent pedagogical practices.

Language is Variation

Sociolinguists view variation as an inherent design feature of language. In other words, variation is not peripheral but lies at the core of language. Furthermore, sociolinguists see variation as playing an important role in the evolution of language as a complex, adaptive system. Therefore, instead of removing, avoiding or relegating variation to secondary or advanced-level discussions, language teachers should acknowledge and name linguistic variables and engage learners at all levels of L2 education in identifying and decoding these variables. In this way, variation becomes a primary focus of instruction and understanding variation becomes a pedagogical goal for every level of language learning. At beginning levels, learners should be introduced to basic concepts of linguistic variation (e.g., register variation, genre variation, audience design, indexicality) to increase their sociolinguistic and metalinguistic awareness; intermediate learners should be taught specific language variants along with their associated indexical meanings; and advanced learners should continue their study of specific variants in addition to learning about prevalent language ideologies.

Although much work remains to be done to understand the development of sociolinguistic awareness and competence, it seems likely that some linguistic variables will prove more difficult to master than others. For example, the variable deletion of the negative particle *ne* in French negative constructions (e.g., *Je **ne** sais pas* > *Je __ sais pas* "I don't know") seems intuitively easier for learners to grasp and reproduce than the variable devoicing of French vowels in word-final positions (e.g., *mon ami_hhh*) for a host of reasons. First, francophones are highly aware of *ne*-deletion and will often cite it as a common feature of spoken (but not written) French. Second, as a morphosyntactic variable, the omission of *ne* is typically construed as a simple deletion rule. In other words, the variation can be summarized in terms of the presence or absence (deletion) of the negative morpheme. In contrast, native speakers of French may be completely unaware of phonetic variables such as final vowel devoicing because phonetic variables often require an advanced level of phonetic proficiency that includes perceptual and articulatory mastery of different phonation types (e.g., creaky voice, breathy voice) or different phonetic distinctions (e.g., released vs. unreleased consonant stops). We believe that the establishment of an order of acquisition of linguistic variables will constitute an important future research topic for applied linguists working in collaboration with sociolinguists.

Still in its infancy, the teaching of linguistic variation has captured the attention of applied linguists who have created innovative materials for the L2 classroom. For instance, Potowski & Shin (2019) propose a spectrum of consciousness-raising activities for all levels in their Spanish language textbook, *Gramática Española: Variación Social*. The textbook classifies prominent Spanish variables in terms of familiar grammatical categories, e.g., nouns, pronouns, prepositions, verbs, and culminates in a chapter on contact-induced variation in World Spanishes. Exercises range from guided internet searches to observed variation in the plural-marking of nouns (e.g., *el café* > *los cafés/caféses* 'the coffees') and the discussion of comments in wordreference.com forums describing the stigma attached to *dequeísmo*, the non-normative use of the preposition *de* before a subordinate complement introduced by the conjunction *que* "that" (e.g. *nos sorprende de que*..."we are surprised __ that…").

In a similar vein, Blattner et al. (2015, 2016) proposed a guided noticing activity on Twitter that drew beginning learners' attention to variation in the use of abbreviations and English borrowings in French by francophone celebrities and newsgroups. As part of the study, students were asked to select three well-known francophone personalities to follow on Twitter. The students analyzed two tweets per week from the celebrities' Twitter feed with the help of a guided survey that directed their attention to the use of

abbreviations and borrowings from English. Although reporting a significant number of communication breakdowns for beginning learners in these categories, the study also reported an improvement in students' ability to recognize and process variation in these categories and highlighted the advantages of using Twitter's micro-contexts of 280 characters (then 140) or less to facilitate the development of this skill.

Finally, Michelson (2019) reported on an intermediate collegiate French course designed as a global simulation, a multiliteracies-inspired approach that aims to teach language, culture, and discourse in a holistic manner. In a global simulation, students carry out communication tasks through a series of on-going character role plays. Crucially, the students were asked to reflect on how their different characters used language differently according to different communicative situations. Even though the course was not explicitly framed in terms of language variation, Michelson showed that many, though not all, students were able to grasp the concepts of genre and register variation through activities that obliged them to reflect on how linguistic choices indexed their characters' identities.

Language is Interaction

Viewing language in terms of interaction is not particularly new. In fact, Ferdinand de Saussure famously referred to the speech community's linguistic system as *langue* ('language') and the act of communication as *parole ('speech')* (Saussure, 1986). Modifying Saussure's ideas, Chomsky introduced the constructs of *competence*, the individual's underlying knowledge of the linguistic system, and *performance*, the use of the system in speech or writing (Chomsky, 1965). These two ways of viewing language, as either competence or performance, constitute a theoretical fault line that divides researchers in formal linguistics interested in the abstract system of rules from researchers in sociolinguistics interested in the concrete use of language by particular speakers in particular social settings. Van Lier (2004) argued that language teachers, despite their proclaimed interest in communicative competence, tend to think of language in terms of competence, that is, as the abstract and underlying system of grammatical rules, and, as a result, pay scant attention to the patterns of actual language use. However, usage-based linguists refute the concept of grammar as a discrete set of a priori rules that are detached from contexts of use. In place of this abstraction, usage-based linguists have posited emergent grammar, the notion that grammatical regularity emerges over time through communicative activity (Hopper 1987, 1988, 1998).

Along similar lines, Thorne & Ivkovic (2015) cited the semiotician Thibault (2011) who made an important ontological distinction between *languaging*, a first-order phenomenon, and *language,* a second-order phenomenon. Like Hopper, Thibault claimed that first-order languaging is ontologically primary and thus gives rise to the linguistic system, a secondary phenomenon. Nevertheless, Thibault pointed out that the second-order linguistic system is a reification and therefore more easily apprehended and understood by language users. Thorne and Ivkovic summarized this state of affairs stating, "It is second-order patterns, or perceptions of language as thing rather than process, that are normative, more readily visible to human agents, and that inform language ideology and evaluative judgment" (2015, p.171). In his 2014 book *Intercultural Pragmatics*, Kecskes made a similar distinction between opposing perspectives of language, what he called the micro perspective and the macro perspective: "the micro perspective includes the study of interactions between individuals" and "the macro perspective deals with establishing norms, patterns and expectations about language use in speech communities" (p. 2).

Despite the putative success of communicative language teaching (CLT), the pedagogical paradigm of modern language education continues to embrace the macro perspective while virtually ignoring the micro perspective. Swaffar (2006) explained this apparent paradox by noting that the concept of communication in most versions of CLT relied on generic scenarios and was therefore highly reductive in actual practice. According to Swaffar (2006), practitioners of CLT never really sought to engage their learners in the analysis of interactions between actual interactants in highly-situated contexts. And yet, a sociolinguistically-oriented pedagogy calls for a micro perspective on language-as-interaction in order to raise learners' awareness about how meaning is negotiated in a dynamic, co-constructed process.

A good example of such a micro perspective of language is van Compernolle's 2015 book *Interaction and*

Second Language Development: A Vygotskian Perspective. van Compernolle began the book by tracing the history of the interactionist tradition within SLA research. In his historical overview, he synthesized several major works of this tradition such as Hatch (1978), Long (1981, 1996), Varonis and Gass (1985), Gass and Varonis (1994) and Swain (1985). In brief, this line of research demonstrated that interaction was the necessary ingredient for the "negotiation of meaning," an activity that facilitated language learning via comprehensible input, intake and pushed output. Despite the impact these studies had on classroom discourse and instruction, van Compernolle argued that the interactionist tradition was cognitivist in orientation and therefore overlooked the impact of the social context on language development. Following Firth and Wagner (1997), whose paper questioned many of the cognitivist assumptions of SLA theories of the day, van Compernolle called for a social-interactionist approach to language learning that framed cognition as a joint enterprise distributed between social interactants, an approach consonant with Kecskes's micro perspective on language.

Even though van Compernolle's book was written primarily for SLA scholars and employed conversation analytic methods, there were many examples of pedagogical practices of interest to L2 teachers, especially the detailed transcriptions of student-teacher interactions. For instance, throughout the book, van Compernolle drew on the work of DiPietro (1987) who developed a type of pedagogical task called the "strategic interaction scenario." Similar to a role-play, a strategic interaction scenario is designed to produce a conflict that the participants must resolve through interaction. A particularly useful tool for instructional pragmatics, strategic interaction scenarios highlight the role of social relationships and personal identities during the negotiation of meaning. van Compernolle analyzed one particular scenario in which the teacher and the student assumed the roles of roommates who must find an apartment that they both agree is affordable. van Compernolle pointed out that such a scenario would typically elicit the use of informal variants since both interactants are friends with equal social status. However, van Compernolle (2015) noted that at one point during the interaction, the student chose to use the negative morpheme *ne* in a negative statement, a violation of sociolinguistic norms for conversational French (p. 36–38). Noting the anomalous usage, the teacher momentarily stepped out of his character role and asked his student why she chose to use the formal variant in an informal context. The student responded by noting that she decided not to omit the *ne* morpheme to indicate an emphatic negation, a conversational move that she had learned was permitted in informal contexts. In turn, the teacher acknowledged that emphatic negation can be felicitous in informal contexts, but added that the construction requires a different prosodic stress pattern. van Compernolle cited this example to show how L2 teachers can create pedagogical contexts that not only prompt students to employ different sociolinguistic variants, but also to reflect on the social significance of their linguistic choices in interaction. In summary, this example showed how a teacher used interaction with a student to assess the student's level of pragmatic knowledge, in this case, the sociopragmatics of pronominal choice in French. The teacher discovered that the student understood the pragmatics of pronominal choice but had not yet mastered how to indicate a marked negative construction in French using particular prosodic cues.

Language is a Means of Self-Authentication

The third wave of sociolinguistics highlights the role that an individual's identity plays in influencing the performative and stylistic aspects of language. Each new situation impels speakers to engage in a process known as *bricolage* (Hebdige, 1979; Lévi-Strauss, 1966), in which they appropriate and recombine available resources to construct a new personalized and context-specific style. Most language learning textbooks, however, tend to represent only dominant and/or stereotypical styles espoused by large and/or normative groups. This means that language learners lack the chance to not only observe authentic intersectionality in their second language, but also to become familiar with many of the resources they need when performing their own L2 identity. Therefore, the goal of language learning should not simply be to learn and adopt others' one-size-fits-all norms, but to mix and match all available means to perform one's own identity as authentically as possible.

Intuiting the various styles and personae in a second language, however, should not be left to chance or inductive reasoning. Instead, learners should first be given the space to observe varied performances on

their own and then be supported more explicitly in identifying and discussing the meaning and intent behind the cultural and linguistic choices therein. van Compernolle (2010, 2014) developed this point by arguing that language instruction should not only focus on pragmalinguistic forms, but also draw learners' attention to sociopragmatic information, such as the cultural values that inform linguistic choices in discourse, as this kind of information is often difficult to deduce from positive input alone. van Compernolle (2010, 2014) illustrated a sequence of pedagogical tasks for raising awareness around the nuances behind the T/V pronominal distinction in French (*tu/vous*, after the two French pronouns meaning "you familiar" and "you formal," respectively), in which he used conceptual instruction, guided identification and analysis of variables in film scenes, role-play via online chat, and the exploration and unstructured observation of existing online L2 communities to guide students in understanding the complex power dynamics that motivate the selection of one pronoun over the other.

In his approach to what he terms *instructional pragmatics*, van Compernolle (2014) made clear that the role of instruction was not to prescribe which language variants are appropriate for which social contexts, but rather to raise students' awareness of how pragmatic meaning is co-constructed in situated contexts. Invoking indexicality as the macro-level framework for understanding the meaning potential of pragmalinguistic forms in context, van Compernolle demonstrated how to operationalize three sociopragmatic concepts: power/relative status, social distance and self-presentation. The last concept—self-presentation—is key to understanding how language is a means for self-authentication. In brief, through the use of diagrams and strategic interaction scenarios, van Compernolle showed his students the consequences of their linguistic choices in French discourse. To make the concept of self-presentation more concrete, he gave his students an image of two couples, one couple dressed in tee-shirts and blue jeans and the other couple dressed in more formal attire. The informally clad couple was captioned with the informal pronoun *tu* and the formally attired couple was captioned with the formal pronoun *vous*. The images were not only meant to capture normative French associations of pronominal choice with particular social settings, but also to prompt learners to reflect on how they saw themselves: Did they see themselves as a tee-shirt-and-jeans person or a suit-and-tie person? Furthermore, van Compernolle showed how to use the image to start a discussion about the indexical field of the different pronouns: "The tee-shirt-and-jeans image was meant to suggest such potential meanings as youthfulness, informality, coolness, and so on, while the suit-and-tie image drew on associations of conservatism, professionalism, formality, and so forth" (van Compernolle, 2014, p. 59). van Compernolle made clear that the personae presented in the images did not represent a simple binary choice, as people often mix elements of these two general personality types depending on their moods and their social situations. For example, a speaker may wish to project professionalism on one occasion and youthfulness on another. Furthermore, van Compernolle pointed out that these images invariably suggested multiple interpretations to learners who had different lived experiences. He related this point to Vygotsky's concept of internalization, "the process of appropriating culturally constructed artifacts and transforming them as one's own" (van Compernolle, 2014, p. 59). In brief, van Compernolle's study of instructional pragmatics modeled how teachers raise awareness of L2 norms while still encouraging learners to use their linguistic repertoires in ways that honor their sense of personal authenticity.

Language is a Remix

Following recent trends in demographics that characterize metropolitan centers such as London and New York in terms of superdiversity (Vertovec, 2007), Blommeart (2010) argued for a paradigm shift in sociolinguistic theorizing. According to Blommeart (2010), the taken-for-granted notion of a language such as English, French or Spanish as a stable and homogeneous entity is increasingly problematic in the era of globalization. Today, populations are highly mobile and, as a result, communication patterns are increasingly fluid and variable. This prompted sociolinguists such as Blommaert to shift their attention away from the study of languages as a discrete, group-level phenomenon towards the study of multicultural individuals who employ a heterogeneous repertoire of linguistic and extra-linguistic resources to communicate. The point is that speakers from globalized metropolitan centers often possess communicative

repertoires that are more appropriately labeled "plurilingual" and "multimodal" (Thorne & Ivkovic, 2015). The new sociolinguistic paradigm as advocated by Blommaert emphasized a dizzying array of new forms of linguistic hybridity, variously referred to as transglossia, polylingualism, and plurilingualism (Thorne & Ivkovic, 2015).

In keeping with this shift in sociolinguistic focus, we argue that language educators must recognize language as complex and multifaceted. This means that language should be approached as an inherently *multi*lingual and *multi*modal cultural tool performed via *trans*lingual practices within a *pluri*lingual context. We refer to language as a remix, a term popularized by recent internet culture, as a means of capturing the related meanings of these prefixes (e.g., multi-, trans-, pluri-). In general, the term remix refers to an original piece of media such as a video or a song that has been altered in some way (Ferguson, 2012). Thus, the point of a remix is to appropriate an existing design and make changes to create a derivative. Today, remix is often used in internet circles as a cover term for the creative process itself (Ferguson, 2012).

The tenet *Language is a remix* is meant to echo the concept of *Designs of Meaning* taken from multiliteracies pedagogy (New London Group, 1996). In brief, the New London Group advocated that literacy instruction move beyond traditional logocentric, print-based literacies by embracing a more capacious view of the focal concept of *text*. Such a conceptual move made room for the inclusion of multimodal genres such as mashups and remixes in literacy studies. In addition, the New London Group created a new metalanguage grounded in the concept of media design to describe the on-going process of textual meaning-making:

> We propose to treat any semiotic activity, including using language to produce or consume texts, as a matter of Design involving three elements: Available Designs, Designing, and The Redesigned. Together, these three elements emphasize the fact that meaning making is an active and dynamic process, and not something governed by static rules. (New London Group, 1996, p. 74)

The multiliteracies-inspired concept of Designs of Meaning went beyond traditional grammatical categories and includes a wide array of signs such as images, colors and music. Importantly, such an approach explicitly allows language-users-as-designers the freedom to mix Available Designs from multiple languages and cultures.

The rise of remix culture calls into question many pedagogical and curricular practices associated with the traditional paradigm in second language education. For instance, Risager (2007) pointed out that the traditional paradigm relied on convergent scenarios in which monolingual speakers of a target language discuss stereotypical topics associated with the target culture. In other words, pedagogical materials have traditionally been based on generic scenes in which language, topic, and place converge, for example, German speakers discussing national reunification in Berlin. As a remedy to the nationalist paradigm and its essentialist textbooks, Risager (2007) advocated for a transnational paradigm in which meanings and practices commonly associated with cultural forms such as music, food, and language were conceptualized as flowing through international social networks that cross national and political boundaries. Such a transnational perspective highlights the importance of divergent scenarios for pedagogical materials, for example, a YouTube video of a German couple on vacation in Thailand discussing their favorite Asian foods. A transnational paradigm serves to frame the L2 classroom as a "language contact zone" (Thorne & Ivkovic, 2015, p. 168) that promoted translingual patterns of language use.

An innovative curriculum project that embraced the tenet of language as a remix is described in Hilchey (in press). As an LPD in charge of the selection and development of pedagogical materials for his program, Hilchey decided to create a Czech curriculum based on what he called reality-style content. Hilchey set off for Prague where he shot unscripted videos of Czech speakers in a wide variety of settings. However, he soon realized that his carefully planned scope and sequence led him to replicate convergent Czech scenarios similar to those described by Risager. Shortly thereafter, he stopped designing content based on his own preconceived ideas of "Czech reality" and searched online for digital media created by Czech speakers who represented their modern reality by including remixed elements from several languages and cultures. The

result was an expanded curriculum that made room for many unexpected vocabulary and grammar items. Today, Hilchey's new online curriculum entitled *Reality Czech* (https://realityczech.org/) relies heavily on found content of all kinds. In summary, as a curriculum developer, Hilchey came to realize that user-generated digital content that drew heavily from today's remix culture was the key to avoiding the cultural and linguistic stereotypes so prevalent in commercial textbooks.

Examples of user-generated content include many different forms of amateur cultural production: photographs, drawings, songs, conversations, videos and everyday digital genres such as Tiktok videos, Instagram posts and Twitter feeds. We argue that the inclusion of user-generated content would also likely lead to a more inclusive pedagogy by showcasing voices that are often marginalized or completely missing from commercial language materials, such as dialectal and sociolectal speakers, non-native and near-native speakers, people with disabilities, sexual minorities, non-binary genders, indigenous populations, refugees, and immigrants. Inclusion of a wider array of target language varieties in the L2 curriculum has been shown to have a beneficial impact upon the development of critical language awareness (Blyth, 2009). And finally, as mentioned above, the pedagogical use of user-generated, multimodal content is consonant with recent trends in modern language education, such as the *multiliteracies framework* for collegiate foreign language teaching (Paesani et al., 2015), as well as approaches that emphasize better integration of language and content (Katz Bourns et al., 2020).

Language-as-a-remix does not only refer to products such as video mashups or online courses created from user-generated content. Rather, the tenet also refers to the process of remixing Available Designs from multiple sources. The various practices of language contact—borrowing, codeswitching, codemixing, codemeshing, and translanguaging—are the focus of applied sociolinguistics (Piller, 2016). We follow Canagarajah (2013) who uses the umbrella term translingual practices to refer to the many ways that speakers remix languages and semiotic resources in these various contact situations. Canagarajah distinguishes translingualism from the common uses of the term multilingualism:

> The term "multilingual" typically conceives of the relationship between languages in an additive manner. This gives the picture of whole languages added one on top of the other to form multilingual competence. This orientation may lead to the misleading notion that we have separate cognitive compartments for separate languages with different types of competence for each (an assumption which has been critiqued by Cook, 1999, among others). Similarly, in society, multilingual often connotes different language groups occupying their niches in separation from others. What should be clear is that the term "multilingual" doesn't accommodate the dynamic interactions between languages and communities envisioned by "translingual." (Canagarajah, 2013, p. 7)

In general, codeswitching and translanguaging refer to related phenomena that are associated with different theoretical positions and different research agendas. For instance, the concept of codeswitching implies the accepted reification of two or more languages as separate entities. In contrast, translanguaging is defined as the use of one's integrated multilingual repertoire. Therefore, translanguaging is often associated with forms of transgressive language play and the conscious performance of a multilingual identity, and for this reason, has been central to the study of multilingual literacies and subjectivities.

As a pedagogical practice, translanguaging has been accepted by many elementary and secondary bilingual educators (Garcia et al., 2017). More recently, Back and Wagner (2019), collegiate directors of a Spanish and a German language program, have called for the use of translanguaging at the college level as a way to bring "plurilingual, pluricultural identities more fully into the language classroom, while still supporting the goal of acquisition" (p. 177). As a concrete example of translanguaging, the authors described the work of Wagner and Tracksdorf (2017) who created an extended classroom activity based on the Eurovision Song Contest, a cultural event watched by millions on television and debated by speakers from different European languacultures in online chatrooms (Thorne & Ivkovic, 2015). The activity focused on Conchita Wurst, an Austrian drag performer who won the contest in 2014 dressed in an evening gown and sporting a full-grown beard. As part of the activity, students examined photos of Wurst and discussed their

understanding of gender ideology and performance in German-speaking countries. American students posted their thoughts online as part of a telecollaborative project with German students about the ensuing controversy surrounding the winning performance. Wagner and Tracksdorf (2017) argue that the use of the students' plurilingual repertoires was crucial in helping students to engage with the subject matter more deeply and to recognize themselves as emergent bilinguals.

Along similar lines, Trentman (2019), the director of a collegiate Arabic language program, described the plurilingual ideology that supports the use of translanguaging in the contexts of telecollaboration and study abroad. According to Trentman (2019), a plurilingual ideology distinguishes translanguaging from earlier approaches to codeswitching:

> Describing practices as translanguaging, rather than codeswitching, indicates a key theoretical difference. A codeswitching perspective normalizes the existence of separate linguistic codes onto which linguistic elements in an utterance can be mapped (e.g., this word is Spanish, this word is English). In contrast, a translanguaging perspective emphasizes the unity of an individual's linguistic repertoire and how they draw linguistic elements from this repertoire to communicate in specific contexts. Thus, the emphasis is on the unity of the individual's repertoire rather than linguistic codes as distinct objects. (p. 110)

What is clear from Trentman's analysis of her students' linguistic behavior in the contexts of study abroad and telecollaboration is that the pedagogical implementation of translanguaging must be carefully considered and planned out. In other words, as other applied linguists have previously argued (Levine, 2011), the use of semiotic resources from different languages should be intentional and strategic in the language classroom. Finally, Trentman envisioned the plurilingual classroom as a transformative space in which students were not only free to use their multifarious linguistic repertoires but also challenged to reflect on the consequences of translingual/plurilingual practices in terms of the larger questions of identity development and social justice.

Language is a Dynamic Object of Study

The final tenet refers to the fact that language is constantly evolving in at least two important ways. First, as a semiotic system, language is constantly being redesigned by its users who employ the system's Available Designs in creative ways (this is a corollary of the tenet language is a remix). Second, our understanding of language as an object of study inevitably changes as researchers make discoveries about its nature, function and acquisition. Given that language is a dynamic object in these two ways, language specialists must keep their professional knowledge from fossilizing. For example, language teachers must stay abreast of the latest changes in the languages they teach—the most recent neologisms, the newest sociolinguistic variables, and the changing sociopragmatic values that inform linguistic behavior. In addition, professional language educators must be encouraged to read the research literature on language teaching and to integrate new theories and ideas into their praxis.

In order for language educators to stay current, teacher education programs must stress the importance of maintaining one's professional knowledge base and provide the tools for teachers to do so. In practical terms, this means that language teachers should be obliged to read scholarly journals and should be encouraged to participate in professional development activities such as conferences and scholarly talks. In Menke and Paesani (2019), a study that analyzed teachers' conceptual appropriation of the multiliteracies framework, a pedagogical approach in keeping with the plurilingual classroom that we advocate, the authors synthesized several decades of research on language teacher education. In general, they found that teachers have great difficulty altering their teaching practices once established. It appeared that language teachers who are exposed to new ideas and innovative pedagogies during teacher education coursework often revert to what they had previously experienced as language learners (Allen, 2011; Dupuy & Allen, 2012). In light of these findings, Menke and Paesani maintain that "understanding how teachers develop a disciplinary vernacular and assign meanings to concepts and experiences is central to research in teacher cognition" (2019, p. 86). While more research is needed, it is abundantly clear that paradigm change will not be realized

without a more sustained effort to educate the new professoriate in ways that go well beyond the usual language methods class.

Applied linguist Kearney (2019) recently pointed out that there remained an enormous gap between the current, expanded theories of communicative competence (intercultural, symbolic and translingual) on the one hand, and the actual pedagogies that realize these newly defined competencies on the other. According to Kearney, Byram's influential model of ICC "is not a theory of a pedagogy supportive of developing such competence" (p. 258). Moreover, Kearney claimed Kramsch's theory of symbolic competence had not gained widespread support from language educators because it had not been operationalized in ways that supported classroom practices. Kearney's critiques must be met by second language teacher educators who are willing to explore the pedagogical implications of recent theorizing.

To help with this mission, we suggest that teacher educators explore the relevance of instructional pragmatics (Blyth & Sykes, 2020; Ishihara, 2010; McConachy, 2017; Taguchi 2015; van Compernolle, 2014) and intercultural pragmatics (Kecskes, 2014). Instructional pragmatics refers to the teachability and learnability of language-use patterns described in terms of the relationship between sociopragmatic values and the use and interpretation of pragmalinguistic forms. In particular, we believe that the outcomes of translanguaging in the plurilingual classroom should be taught in teacher education programs, not only in terms of learner oral production but also in terms of the culturally-informed perceptions of social and pragmatic indexes. There has already been some attention paid to the overt development of L2 sociolinguistic competence in 21st century language classrooms (see Dewaele, 2007 for a comprehensive overview), but much of it has focused on morphosyntax, in particular the familiar versus formal pronoun usage in languages that make a T/V distinction (van Compernolle, 2010, 2014).

Furthermore, we contend that teacher education programs should also expose new language teachers to authentic L2 social variation beyond pronouns of address, to include other types of sociolinguistic variables well-rooted in the minds and mouths of bi- and translinguals but variably perceived, produced and conceptualized across different groups of speakers, for example, code switching patterns (Bullock & Toribio, 2009), negation placement (Donaldson, 2017), tense and aspect marking (Howard, 2004), lexical preferences (Mougeon & Rehner, 2001; Rehner, 2005), and sociophonetic behaviors (Amengual, 2012; Dalola & Bullock, 2017), to name just a few areas.

Finally, we advocate that teacher education programs include readings from intercultural pragmatics (Kecskes, 2014). In a nutshell, intercultural pragmatics refers to the study of interaction between speakers from different languacultures who communicate via a lingua franca. Kecskes pointed out that standard theories of pragmatics based on homogeneous, monolingual speech communities assume common ground, i.e., the commonalities, conventions and common beliefs that traditionally form the basis of a community (p. 1). We contend that a sociolinguistically-oriented paradigm for language education that includes plurilingualism as its logical outcome must be grounded in empirical studies of intercultural pragmatics. Understanding how speakers from different languacultures negotiate meaning together would help language program directors reconcile their traditional focus on the target language with a more expansive agenda of negotiating multiple norms, patterns and expectations of language use in transnational and/or plurilingual communities. In brief, we believe that a knowledge of intercultural pragmatics would help language educators to foster a greater awareness of languacultures as dynamic, co-constructed, and subjective phenomena.

Conclusion

Early conceptions of speakership were framed in terms of monolingualism and the binary opposition of the native versus the non-native (Davies, 2001; Piller, 2002). However, social theories of identity evolved in keeping with the analysis of language variation in sociolinguistics (Eckert, 2012). By the end of the 20th century, both sociolinguists and applied linguists had adopted a multilingual frame for theorizing speakership (Davies 2001; Eckert, 2012; Kramsch 2009). The 21st century ushered in a recognition of

translingual practices that were the result of global forces such as the internet and the demographics of superdiversity (Blommaert, 2010; Canagarajah 2013). In this article, we have shown that the concept of the monolingual/monocultural native speaker based on a static view of language-as-code has gradually been replaced with a post-modern conception of the plurilingual speaker that construes language learning and language use as a dynamic process of self-authentication (van Compernolle & McGregor, 2016). In keeping with this emergent conception of speakership, we call for a paradigm shift in modern language education that embraces sociolinguistically-oriented teaching practices in an effort to respect our learners' multiple social identities, cultural practices and communicative intents.

References

Agha, A. (2006). *Language and social relations* (Vol. 24). Cambridge University Press.

Allen, H.W. (2011). Embracing literacy-based teaching: A longitudinal study of the conceptual development of novice foreign language teachers. In K. E. Johnson & P. E. Glombek (Eds.), *Sociocultural research on second language teacher education: Exploring the complexities of professional development* (pp. 86–101). Routledge.

Amengual, M. (2012). Interlingual influence in bilingual speech: Cognate status effect in a continuum of bilingualism. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*, *15*(3), 517–530.

Auger, J. (2002). Linguistic norm vs. functional competence: Introducing Québec French to American students. In C. Blyth (Ed.), *The sociolinguistics of foreign language classrooms: Contributions of the native, the near-native and the non-native speaker. AAUSC issues in language program direction* (pp. 79–106). Heinle Cengage.

Bachman, L. (1990). *Fundamental considerations in language testing*. Oxford University Press.

Back, M., & Wagner, M. (2019). Languages for all: World languages for meaning-making and intercultural citizenship. In B. Dupuy & K. Michelson (Eds), *Pathways to paradigm change: Critical examinations of prevailing discourses and ideologies in second language education* (pp. 176–189). Heinle Cengage.

Bakhtin, M. (1981). *The dialogic imagination*. University of Texas Press.

Bakhtin, M. (1986). *Speech genres and other late essays*. University of Texas Press.

Belz, J. (2002). Identity, deficiency, and first language use in foreign language education. In C. Blyth (Ed.), *The sociolinguistics of foreign language classrooms: Contributions of the native, the near-native and the non-native speaker. AAUSC issues in language program direction* (pp. 209–249). Heinle Cengage.

Benor, S. (2001). The learnèd /t/: Phonological variation in Orthodox Jewish English. *University of Pennsylvania Working Papers in Linguistics*, *7*(3), 1–16.

Bialystok, E. (1997). The structure of age: In search of barriers to second language acquisition. *Second Language Research, 13*(2), 116–137.

Birdsong, D. (1992). Ultimate attainment in second language acquisition. *Language* 68(4), 706–755.

Blattner, G., Dalola, A., & Lomicka, L. (2015). Tweetsmarts: A pragmatic analysis of well-known native French speaker tweeters. In E. Dixon & M. Thomas (Eds.), *Researching language learner interaction online: From social media to MOOCs* (pp. 213–236). Computer Assisted Language Instruction Consortium.

Blattner, G., Dalola, A., & Lomicka, L. (2016). Twitter in foreign language classes: Initiating learners into contemporary language variation. In V. Wang (Ed.), *Handbook of research on learning outcomes and opportunities in the digital age* (pp. 769–797). IGI Global.

Block, D. (2003). *The social turn in second language acquisition*. Edinburgh University Press.

Blommaert, J. (2010). *The sociolinguistics of globalization*. Cambridge University Press.

Blondeau, H., Tremblay, M., & Drouin, P. (2014). Hybridité et variation dans les SMS: Le corpus Texto4Science et l'oralité en français montréalais [Hybridity and variation in SMS: The Texto4Science corpus and orality in Montreal French]. *Canadian Journal of Linguistics/Revue Canadienne De Linguistique*, *59*(1), 137–165.

Blyth, C. (1995). Redefining the boundaries of language use: The foreign language classroom as a multilingual speech community. In C. Kramsch (Ed.), *Redefining the boundaries of language study* (pp. 145–183). Heinle & Heinle.

Blyth, C. (Ed.) (2002). Introduction. In C. Blyth (Ed.), *The sociolinguistics of foreign language classrooms: Contributions of the native, the near-native and the non-native speaker. AAUSC issues in language program direction* (pp. ix–xiv). Heinle Cengage.

Blyth, C. (2009). The impact of pedagogical materials on critical language awareness: Assessing student attention to patterns of language use. In M. Turnbull & J. Dailey-O'Cain (Eds.), *First language use in second and foreign language learning* (pp. 156–178). Multilingual Matters.

Blyth, C., & Sykes, J. (2020). Technology-enhanced L2 instructional pragmatics. *Language Learning & Technology*, *24*(2), 1–7.

Breen, M. P., & Candlin, C. N. (1980). The essentials of a communicative curriculum in language teaching. *Applied Linguistics, 1*(2), 89–112.

Bucholtz, M. (2001). The whiteness of nerds: Superstandard English and racial markedness. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology, 11*(1), 84–100.

Bucholtz, M. (2003). Sociolinguistic nostalgia and the authentication of identity. *Journal of Sociolinguistics, 7*(3), 398–416.

Bucholtz, M. (2010). *White kids: Language, race, and styles of youth identity*. Cambridge University Press.

Bucholtz, M., & Hall, K. (2005). Identity and interaction: A sociocultural linguistic approach. *Discourse Studies*, *7*(4–5), 585–614.

Bullock, B. E., & Toribio, A. J. (2009). Trying to hit a moving target. In L. Isurin, D. Winford, & K. de Bot (Eds.), *Multidisciplinary approaches to code switching* (pp. 189–206). John Benjamins.

Bullock, B.E., Toribio, A.J., Guzmán, G., Ricard, J., & Serigos, J. (2017, November 3). *Quantifying the complexity of code-switching for cross-corpus comparison.* [Poster presentation]. New Ways of Analyzing Variation 46, Madison, WI, United States.

Byram, M. (1997). *Teaching and assessing intercultural communicative competence*. Multilingual Matters.

Canagarajah, A. S. (2013). *Translingual practice: Global Englishes and cosmopolitan relations*. Routledge.

Canale, M., & Swain, M. (1980). Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing. *Applied Linguistics, 1*(1), 1–47.

Cedergren, H., & Sankoff, D. (1974). Variable rules: Performance as a statistical reflection of competence. *Language*, *50*, 333–355.

Chavez, M. (2002). The diglossic foreign language classroom: Learners' views of L1 and L2 functions. In C. Blyth (Ed.), *The sociolinguistics of foreign language classrooms: Contributions of the native, the near-native and the non-native speaker. AAUSC issues in language program direction* (pp.

163–208). Heinle Cengage.

Chomsky, N. (1965). *Aspects of the theory of syntax*. MIT Press.

Claes, J. (2017). La pluralización de haber presentacional en el español peninsular: datos de Twitter [The pluralization of presentational haber in Peninsular Spanish: Data from Twitter]. *Sociolinguistic Studies*, *11*(1), 41–64.

Cook, V. J. (1992). Evidence for multicompetence. *Language Learning, 42*(4), 557–591.

Cook, V. J. (1999). Going beyond the native speaker in language teaching. *TESOL Quarterly 33*(2), 185–209.

Coupland, N. (2007). *Style: Language variation and identity*. Cambridge University Press.

Dalola, A. (2017, November 3). *#YouAreWhatYouTweet: Identity & vowel devoicing in French-language tweets.* [Poster presentation]. New Ways of Analyzing Variation 46. Madison, WI, United States.

Dalola, A., & Bullock, B. E. (2017). On sociophonetic competence: Phrase-final vowel devoicing in native and advanced L2 speakers of French. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, *39*(4), 769–799.

Davies, A. (2001). *The native speaker in applied linguistics*. Edinburgh University Press.

Derwin, F., & Liddicoat, A. (2013). *Linguistics for intercultural education*. John Benjamins.

De Saussure, F (1986). Course in general linguistics. [English translation by R. Harris of Cours de linguistique générale]. Chicago: Open Court Publishing.

Dewaele, J. M. (2007). Diachronic and/or synchronic variation? The acquisition of sociolinguistic competence in L2 French. In D. Ayoun (Ed.), *Handbook of French applied linguistics* (pp. 208–236). John Benjamins.

DiPietro, R. (1987). *Strategic interaction: Learning languages through scenarios*. Cambridge University Press.

Donaldson, B. (2017). Negation in near-native French: Variation and sociolinguistic competence. *Language Learning*, *67*(1), 141–170.

Donoso, G., & Sánchez, D. (2017). *Dialectometric analysis of language variation in Twitter.* Proceedings of the Fourth Workshop on NLP for Similar Languages, Varieties and Dialects (VarDial4), 16–25.

Drager, K., & Hay, J. (2012). Exploiting random intercepts: Two case studies in sociophonetics. *Language Variation and Change*, *24*(01), 59–78.

Dupuy, B., & Allen, H. (2012). Appropriating conceptual and pedagogical tools of literacy: A qualitative study of two novice foreign language teaching assistants. In G. Gorsuch (Ed.), *Working theories of teaching assistant and international teaching assistant development* (pp. 275–315). New Forums Press.

Dupuy, B., & Michelson, K. (Eds.). (2019). *Pathways to paradigm change: Critical examinations of prevailing discourses and ideologies in second language education. AAUSC issues in language program direction.* Heinle Cengage.

Eckert, P. (1989). *Jocks and burnouts: Social categories and identity in the high school*. Teachers College Press.

Eckert, P. (2000). *Language variation as social practice: The linguistic construction of identity in Belten High*. Wiley-Blackwell.

Eckert, P. (2008). Variation and the indexical field. *Journal of sociolinguistics*, *12*(4), 453–476.

Eckert, P. (2012). Three waves of variation study: The emergence of meaning in the study of variation. *Annual Review of Anthropology, 41*, 87–100.

Edwards, W. F. (1992). Sociolinguistic behavior in a Detroit inner-city black neighborhood. *Language in Society*, *21*(1), 93–115.

Edwards, W., & Krakow, C. (1985). *Polish-American English in Hamtramck: A sociolinguistic study.* [Paper presentation]. Conference on New Ways of Analyzing Variation in English*.* Washington, D.C., United States.

Ellis, R. (1985). Sources of variability in interlanguage. *Applied Linguistics*, 6, 118–131.

Ellis, R. (1987). Interlanguage variability in narrative discourse: Style-shifting in the use of the past tense. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 9, 1–20.

Eisenstein, J. (2015). Systematic patterning in phonologically-motivated orthographic variation. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, *19*(2), 161–188.

Erker, D. G. (2010). A subsegmental approach to coda/s/weakening in Dominican Spanish. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, *2010*(203), 9–26

Ferguson, K. (2012). *Creativity is a remix.* TED Talk. [Video]. YouTube. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=zd-dqUuvLk4

Firth, A. & Wagner, J.. (1997). Fundamental concepts in SLA research. *Modern Language Journal* 81(3), 285-300.

Gal, S. (1979). *Language shift: Social determinants of linguistic change in bilingual Austria*. Academic Press.

Garcia, O., Ibarra Johnson, S. I., & Seltzer, K. (2017). *The translanguaging classroom: Leveraging student bilingualism for learning.* Caslon.

Gass, S., & Varonis, E. (1994). Input, interaction, and second language production. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, *16*, 283–302.

Gonçalves, B., & Sánchez, D. (2016). Learning about Spanish dialects through Twitter. *Revista Internacional de Lingüística Iberoamericana*, 65–75.

Grabe, W. (2012). Applied Linguistics: A twenty-first century discipline. In *The Oxford handbook of applied linguistics*, (2nd ed.). Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780195384253.013.0002

Hatch, E. (1978). *Second language acquisition: A book of readings.* Newbury House Publishers.

Hebdige, D. (1979). *Subculture: The meaning of style*. Routledge.

Hilchey, C. (in press). Finding and using the good stuff: Open educational practices for developing open educational resources. In C. Blyth and J. Thoms (Eds.), *Open education and second language learning and teaching: The rise of a new knowledge ecology.* Multilingual Matters.

Holmquist, J. C. (1985). Social correlates of a linguistic variable: A study in a Spanish village. *Language in Society*, *14*(2), 191–203.

Hopper, P. (1987). Emergent grammar. *Proceedings of the Berkeley Linguistics Society, 13,* 139-157.

Hopper, P. (1988). Emergent grammar and the a priori grammar postulate. In D. Tannen (Ed.), *Linguistics in context* (pp. 117–134). Ablex.

Hopper, P. (1998). Emergent grammar. In M. Tomasello (Ed.). *The new psychology of language* (pp. 155–175). Erlbaum.

Howard, M. (2004). On the interactional effect of linguistic constraints on L2 variation. The case of past time marking. *International Review of Applied Linguistics, 42*, 321–336.

Hymes, D. (1972). On communicative competence. In J. Pride & J. Holmes (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics* (pp. 269-283). Penguin Press.

Hymes, D. (1974). *Foundations in sociolinguistics: An ethnographic approach*. University of Pennsylvania Press.

Ilbury, C. (2020). “Sassy Queens”: Stylistic orthographic variation in Twitter and the enregisterment of AAVE. *Journal of Sociolinguistics, 24*, 245–264. https://doi.org/10.1111/josl.12366

Irvine, J. (2001). “Style” as distinctiveness: The culture and ideology of linguistic differentiation. In J. R. Rickford & P. Eckert (Eds.), *Style and Sociolinguistic Variation* (pp. 21–43). Cambridge University Press.

Ishihara, N. (2010). Instructional pragmatics: Bridging teaching, research and teacher education. *Language and Linguistics Compass, 4*(10), 938–953.

Johnson, D. E. (2009). Getting off the GoldVarb standard: Introducing Rbrul for mixed-effects variable rule analysis. *Language and linguistics compass*, *3*(1), 359–383.

Jones, T. (2015). Toward a description of African American Vernacular English dialect regions using “Black Twitter”. *American Speech*, *90*(4), 403–440.

Katz, S. (2002). Near-native speakers in the foreign language classroom: The case of Haitian immigrant students. In C. Blyth (Ed.), *The sociolinguistics of foreign language classrooms: Contributions of the native, the near-native and the non-native speaker. AAUSC issues in language program direction* (pp. 131–161). Heinle Cengage.

Katz Bourns, S., Krueger, C., & Mills, N. (2020). *Perspectives on teaching language and content*. Yale University Press.

Kearney, E. (2015). *Intercultural learning in modern language education: Expanding meaning-making potentials*. Multilingual Matters.

Kearney, E. (2019). Professional (re)visions of language teaching for interculturality. In B. Dupuy & K. Michelson. (Eds.), *Pathways to paradigm change: Critical examinations of prevailing discourses and ideologies in second language education. AAUSC issues in language program direction* (pp. 248–281). Heinle Cengage.

Kecskes, I. (2014). *Intercultural pragmatics*. Oxford University Press.

Knack, R. (1991). Ethnic boundaries in linguistic variation. In P. Eckert (Ed.), *New ways of analyzing sound change* (pp. 251–272). Academic Press.

Koike, D., & Liskin-Gasparro, J. (2002). The privilege of the nonnative speaker meets the practical needs of the language teacher. In C. Blyth (Ed.), *The sociolinguistics of foreign language classrooms: Contributions of the native, the near-native and the non-native speaker. AAUSC issues in language program direction* (pp. 263–266). Heinle Cengage.

Kramsch, C. (1997). The privilege of the non-native speaker. *Publications of the Modern Language Association (PMLA), 112*(3), 359–369.

Kramsch, C. (2006). From communicative competence to symbolic competence. *The Modern Language Journal, 90*(2), 249–252.

Kramsch, C. (2008). Ecological perspectives on foreign language education. *Language Teaching, 41*, 389–408.

Kramsch, C. (2009). *The multilingual subject.* Oxford University Press.

Krashen, S. (1981). *Second language acquisition and learning*. Pergamon Press.

Krashen, S. (1982). *Principles and practice in second language acquisition*. Pergamon Press.

Labov, W. (1966). *The social stratification of English in New York City.* Cambridge University Press.

Labov, W. (1972). *Language in the inner city: Studies in the Black English vernacular* (Vol. 3). University of Pennsylvania Press.

Lacorte, M., & Canabal, E. (2002). Interaction with heritage language learners in foreign language classrooms. In C. Blyth (Ed.), *The sociolinguistics of foreign language classrooms: Contributions of the native, the near-native and the non-native speaker. AAUSC issues in language program direction* (pp. 107–129). Heinle Cengage.

Law, J. (2017, November 3). *"Les jons fon skil veulent": Reflections of the French nasal vowel shift in variant orthography.* [Poster presentation]. New Ways of Analyzing Variation 46. Madison, WI, United States.

Lévi-Strauss, C. (1966). *The savage mind*. University of Chicago Press.

Levine, G. (2011). *Code choice in the language classroom*. Multilingual Matters.

Long, M. (1981). Input, interaction, and second language acquisition. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, *379*(1), 259–278.

Long, M. (1996). The role of the linguistic environment on second language acquisition. In W. C. Ritchie & T. K. Bhatia (Eds.), *Handbook of second language acquisition* (pp. 413–468). Academic Press.

Lord, G. and Lomicka, L. (2018). Ten years after the MLA Report: What has changed in foreign language departments? *ADFL Bulletin, 44*(2): 116–120.

Macaulay, R.K.S. (1977). *Language, social class and education: A Glasgow study*. Edinburgh University Press.

McConachy, T. (2017). *Developing intercultural perspectives on language use: Exploring pragmatics and culture in foreign language learning*. Multilingual Matters.

McCulloch, G. & Lamontagne, J. (2017, November 3). Troppppp loooongueuuhhhh: Orthographic lengthening across French dialects. [Poster presentation]. *New Ways of Analyzing Variation 46*. Madison, WI, United States.

Menke, M., & Paesani, K. (2019). Understanding teacher discourse around multiliteracies pedagogy. In B. Dupuy & K. Michelson (Eds.), *Pathways to paradigm change: Critical examinations of prevailing discourses and ideologies in second language education. AAUSC issues in language program direction* (pp. 83–106). Heinle Cengage.

Michelson, K. (2019). Global simulation as a mediating tool for teaching and learning language and culture as discourse. *Foreign Language Annals 52*, 284–313.

Milroy, L. (1980). *Language and Social Networks*. Blackwell.

MLA Ad Hoc Committee on Foreign Languages. (2007). Foreign languages and higher education: New structures for a changed world. http://www.mla.org/pdf /forlang_news_pdf.pdf

Mougeon, R., & Rehner, K. (2001). Variation in the spoken French of Ontario French immersion students: The case of *juste* vs *seulement* vs *rien que*. *Modern Language Journal 85*, 398–415.

New London Group. (1996). A pedagogy of multiliteracies: Designing social futures. *Harvard Educational Review*, 66(1), 60-92.

Ong'onda, N. A., Matu, P. M., & Oloo, P. A. (2011). Syntactic aspects in text messaging. *World Journal of English, 1*(1), 2–8.

Paesani, K., Allen, H., & Dupuy, B. (2015). *A multiliteracies framework for collegiate foreign language teaching*. Pearson Education.

Paikeday, T. (1980). *The native speaker is dead!* Paikeday Publishing.

Piller, I. (2002). Passing for a native speaker: Identity and success in second language learning. *Journal of Sociolinguistics, 6*(2), 179–208.

Piller, I. (2016). *Language diversity and social justice: An introduction to Applied Sociolinguistics*. Oxford University Press.

Podesva, R. J., S. J. Roberts & K. Campbell-Kibler. (2002). Sharing resources and indexing meanings in the production of gay styles. In K. Campbell-Kibler, R.J. Podesva, S.J. Roberts & A. Wong (Eds.), *Language and Sexuality: Contesting Meaning in Theory and Practice* (pp. 175–190). CSLI Press.

Potowski, K., & Shin, N. (2019). *Gramática española: Variación social*. New York: Routledge.

Rehner, K. (2005). *Developing aspects of second language discourse competence*. Lincom Europa.

Rickford, J. R. (1986). The need for new approaches to social class analysis in sociolinguistics. *Language and Communication*, *6*(3), 215–221.

Risager, K. (2006). *Language and culture: Global flows and local complexity*. Multilingual Matters.

Risager, K. (2007). *Language and culture pedagogy: From a national to a transnational paradigm.* Multilingual Matters.

Romaine, S. (1989). *Bilingualism*. Blackwell.

Russ, B. (2012, January 6). *Examining large-scale regional variation through online geotagged corpora*. [Paper presentation]. Annual Meeting of the American Dialect Society. Portland, OR, United States.

Savignon, S. (1983). *Communicative competence: Theory and classroom practice*. Addison-Wesley.

Silverstein, M. (2003). Indexical order and the dialectics of sociolinguistic life. *Language & Communication*, *23*(3–4), 193–229.

Siskin, J. (2002). The native speaker: Membership has its privileges. In C. Blyth (Ed.). *The sociolinguistics of foreign language classrooms: Contributions of the native, the near-native and the non-native speaker. AAUSC issues in language program direction* (pp. 277–280). Heinle Cengage.

Swaffar, J. (2006). Terminology and its discontents: Some caveats about communicative competence. *The Modern Language Journal 90*(2), 146–149.

Swain, M. (1985). Communicative competence: Some roles of comprehensible input and comprehensible output in its development. In S. Gass & C. Madden (Eds.), *Input in second language acquisition* (pp. 235–253). Newbury House.

Taguchi, N. (2015). Instructed pragmatics at a glance: Where instructional studies were, are, and should be going. *Language Teaching*, *48*, 1–50.

Tarone, E. (1985). Variability in interlanguage use: A study of style-shifting in morphology and syntax. *Language Learning*, *35*, 373–404.

Tarone, E. (1988). *Variation in interlanguage*. Edward Arnold.

Tatman, R. (2015). #go awn: Sociophonetic variation in variant spellings on Twitter. *Working Papers of the Linguistics Circle*, *25*(2), 97–108

Tatman, R. (2016). "I'm a spawts guay": Comparing the Use of Sociophonetic Variables in Speech and Twitter. *University of Pennsylvania Working Papers in Linguistics*, *22*(2), 18.

Thibault, P. (2011). First-order languaging dynamics and second-order language: The distributed language view. *Ecological Psychology, 23*(3), 210–245.

Thorne, S., & Ivkovic, D. (2015). Multilingual Eurovision meets plurilingual YouTube: Linguascaping discursive ontologies. In D. Koike & C. Blyth (Eds.), *Dialogue in multilingual and multimodal communities* (pp. 167–192). John Benjamins.

Train, R. (2002). The (non)native standard language in foreign language education: A critical perspective. In C. Blyth (Ed.), *The sociolinguistics of foreign language classrooms: Contributions of the native, the near-native and the non-native speaker. AAUSC issues in language program direction* (pp. 3–39). Heinle Cengage.

Tremblay, M., Blondeau, H., & Labeau, E. (2020). Texting the future in Belgium and Québec: Present matters. *Journal of French Language Studies, 30*(1), 73–98.

Trentman, E. (2019). Reframing monolingual ideologies in the language classroom: Evidence from Arabic study abroad and telecollaboration. In B. Dupuy & K. Michelson (Eds.), *Pathways to paradigm change: Critical examinations of prevailing discourses and ideologies in second language education. AAUSC issues in language program direction* (pp. 108–131). Heinle Cengage.

Trudgill, P., & Trudgill, S. (1974). *The social differentiation of English in Norwich* (Vol. 13). Cambridge University Press Archive.

Valdman, A. (2002). The acquisition of sociostylistic and sociopragmatic variation by instructed second language learners: The elaboration of pedagogical norms. In C. Blyth (Ed.), *The sociolinguistics of foreign language classrooms: Contributions of the native, the near-native and the non-native speaker. AAUSC issues in language program direction* (pp. 57–77). Heinle Cengage.

van Compernolle, R. A. (2010). Towards a sociolinguistically responsive pedagogy: Teaching second-person address forms in French. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, *66*(3), 445–463.

van Compernolle, R. A. (2014). *Sociocultural theory and L2 instructional pragmatics*. Multilingual Matters.

van Compernolle, R. A. (2015). *Interaction and second language development*. John Benjamins.

van Compernolle, R., & McGregor, J. (2016). *Authenticity, language and interaction in second language contexts*. Multilingual Matters.

van Lier, L. (2004). *The ecology and semiotics of language learning*. Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Varonis, E., & Gass, S. (1985). Non-native/non-native conversation: A model for negotiation of meaning. *Applied Linguistics*, *6*, 71–90.

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

Wagner, M., & Tracksdorf, N. (2017). IC online: Fostering the development of intercultural competence in virtual language classrooms. In M. Wagner, D. Perugini, & M. Byram (Eds.), *Teaching intercultural competence across the age range: Theory and practice* (pp. 135–155). Multilingual Matters.

Willis, D. (2017, September 10-13). *Using social-media data to investigate morphosyntactic variation and change*. [Conference presentation]. Societas Linguistica Europaea. Zurich, Switzerland.

Wolfram, W. A. (1969). *Linguistic correlates of social differences in the Negro community*. [Paper presentation]. Washington Linguistics Club Meeting. Seattle, WA, United States.

Zimman, L. (2017). Gender as stylistic bricolage: Transmasculine voices and the relationship between fundamental frequency and /s/. *Language in Society*, *46*(3), 339–370.

Zsombok, G. (2019, October 10-12). *Sharp/click words: Regional variation of prescribed variants on Twitter in France and Quebec.* [Paper presentation]. New Ways of Analyzing Variation 48. Eugene, OR, United States.

About the Authors

Carl S. Blyth is Associate Professor of French Linguistics and the Director of the Center for Open Educational Resources and Language Learning (COERLL) at the University of Texas at Austin. His research interests include intercultural and instructional pragmatics, discourse analysis, and language technology.

E-mail: cblyth@austin.utexas.edu

Amanda Dalola is Associate Professor of French and Linguistics at the University of South Carolina. Her research interests include sociophonetics, lab phonology and the use of social media in the L2 classroom.

E-mail: dalola@mailbox.sc.edu