



Working Papers in
**Urban Language &
Literacies**

Paper 78

**A neo-Hymesian trajectory in
applied linguistics**

Ben Rampton (*King's College London*)

2011

A neo-Hymesian trajectory in applied linguistics

Ben Rampton ¹

King's College London
Centre for Language Discourse & Communication
ben.rampton@kcl.ac.uk www.kcl.ac.uk/lcd

August 2011

Abstract

Rather than attempting a panoramic overview, this paper looks at knowledge construction in applied linguistics through the prism of a piece of data. It follows the analysis of this data into an academic argument, into a research training programme, and into professional development materials for teachers, and it argues that this empirically driven trajectory finds coherence in Hymes' writing on linguistics and ethnography.

Invited to describe the state of the art in applied linguistics, I find myself in rather a dilemma. On the one hand, applied linguistics really matters, and periodic reflection on what is happening in AL is enormously worthwhile. But on the other, I don't see AL as a unified field (Rampton 1997), and I lack the space, time and encyclopaedic breadth to write a state-of-the-art review that does justice to the huge range of work that the term 'applied linguistic' might be used to characterise. So in what follows I shall try to escape this dilemma by taking a piece of interactional data as my starting point, and seeing where it leads.

This data can, I think, speak both to contemporary social relations and the dynamics of knowledge production, central concerns in this special issue. But in addition, I will argue that there is more than just chaotic serendipity in this data exploration, and that there is a precedent for the path I follow in the kind of trajectory that Dell Hymes mapped out in his account of 'topic-oriented ethnography' (1996:5). According to Hymes, there are three basic processes in topic-oriented ethnography:

- first, a contrastive insight – the apprehension of a gap between prevailing accounts and what you can actually see and experience happening around you;
- second, the search – the quest - for a systematic view, a view that you have to produce yourself;
- third, an interpretation, locating what you've documented in longer or broader social processes.

The influential representations that a contrastive insight leads one to see as misleading can come from anywhere – linguistic theory, educational orthodoxy, political debates – and the social processes where one eventually locates one's description will also vary. But there is academic discipline in the second element - the search for a better view - and if this comes from research on language and communication, then the emerging work can be seen applied linguistics.

But applied linguistics of the kind I sketched some time ago:

“If in the past in applied linguistics there has been a tendency to attribute special privileges to the generalist, casting him or her as either the central character, sage, or master of ceremonies, this

¹ I would like to record my thanks to the colleagues with whom I have worked on the projects reported in this paper, to the ESRC for supporting us with funding, and to Suresh Canagarajah for the invitation to contribute both to the 2011 AAAL Invited Panel on Knowledge construction in applied linguistics and to this issue of the Applied Linguistics Review.

now seems less relevant. Understood as an open field of interest in language, in which those inhabiting or passing through simply show a common commitment to the potential value of dialogue with people who are different, there is no knowing where, between whom, or on what the most productive discussions will emerge.” (Rampton 1997:14; for a counter-argument, see Widdowson 1998a,b)

The field of applied linguistics is conceived here as, one might say, a cafeteria rather than a salon, an interdisciplinary space that is too noisy and diffuse to be ‘orchestrated’ or ‘rethought’ by any single individual. Noisy and diffuse, but not dizzying, for two vital and connected reasons. First, because the researcher is head-down pursuing the line that began with his/her contrastive insight, even though s/he knows that “problems lead where they will, and relevance commonly leads across disciplinary boundaries” (Hymes 1969:44-5; Rampton et al 2002:388-9). And second, because it is hard to forget a warning attributed to Hymes by Blommaert: no social cause is served by poor analysis, and only the best work stands a chance of making a difference (Blommaert 2011).² Of course, that isn’t really true – it is quite easy to think of marvelous practical interventions that aren’t particularly cogent theoretically, and in any practical work, it is also very important to know when to ‘let go’ analytically.³ Even so, there is a call here for work that travels beyond its reception by end-users into disciplinary heartlands, and there is a license for time-out from user-engagement, for periods when curiosity takes over, when rigour outstrips relevance, discovery outweighs usefulness. Blommaert is not proposing that one should never seek to connect with real-world problems – far from it – but he makes room for a dogged, non-distractable obsessiveness. Indeed in an era where there is so much pressure on research to dance to the tunes of policy and business, maybe it is also a right or responsibility that needs to be defended.

So with this set of commitments – to AL as a field of heteroglot (and sometimes cacophonous) plurality, to the acceptability and value of periods of ‘lost-to-the-world’ absorption in research, and to the warrant for this way of working offered by Hymes – I would now like to turn to the data.

1. Some data from a science lesson

The data that I shall discuss involved adolescents producing exaggerated posh and Cockney accents, and in terms of Hymes’ contrastive insight, it drew my attention because it jarred with what many people were saying about social class losing its traditional significance in late modernity, particularly among urban youth in globalised environments. In the particular episode that follows, 14 year old Hanif has been away from his table looking around for a book that he needs for the writing work that they’ve been set, but now he has arrived back, bringing a copy with him:

Extract 1

Hanif (wearing the radio-mic), Arun (14, male, Malaysian descent), Simon (14, male, Anglo-descent) are sharing the same table in science. Underlining in bold represents exaggerated Cockney pronunciation.

- 1 Hanif: ((whistles six notes))
 2 what you doing Arun (.) what you doin Arn (.)
 3 (>shup<) leave it Dimbo (2)
 4 look what you ma- look what you made me do
 5 (4)
 6 “Stars and Galaxies”
 [stā:z n gæləksōī::z]
 7 (1)
 8 ((quietly reciting page numbers:))
 9 one three seven (3)

² Also: “solving [real world problems] requires the best possible work, because there is no room for errors, failures, or half-baked work – people’s fate may depend on it.” (Blommaert 2008:200), or equally, “relevance without rigour is no better than rigour without relevance” (Guba 1981, cited in Lather 1986:65).

³ As Hammersley notes, “[t]here is little justification for the...presuppositions... that successful practice must be based on correct theoretical assumptions, and that incorrect assumptions much always lead to failure.” (1992:116)

So there is some data, which I would now like to follow it in three directions (to three different café tables). First, an academic argument; second, a research training programme; and third, a professional development programme for teachers.

2. First direction: An academic argument

As already mentioned, I was drawn to this kind of data because it seemed to contradict the widespread sociological view that young “are especially responsive to... the cultural changes discerned by postmodernists” and as a result, are most likely to be affected by “the decline of class awareness” (Bradley 1996:77; also e.g. Reay 1998). In fact, it turned out that:

- youngsters in the multi-ethnic school where I was doing fieldwork often did exaggerated posh and Cockney, even though at home a lot of them talked to their parents in languages other than English;
- much of this seemed to be linked to stratification and division at school – they would stylize posh and Cockney in the transitions between work and play, as in Extract 1, and they would do ultra-posh when they felt patronized by teachers; but
- there was also a lot of humour and mockery in hyper-posh and Cockney unconnected to schooling. Cockney conjured vigour, passion and bodily laxity; posh evoked physical weakness, social distance, constraint and sexual inhibition; and it was easy to make out the over-arching imprint of high-low, mind-body, reason-&-emotion binaries that reach back to the emergence of bourgeois society in the 18th and 19th centuries.

Stated baldly like this, these findings are interesting, but there is little to suggest much more than ordinary social science qualitative methods behind claims like these – a radio-mic, some reading, lots of patience, an ability to spot accents, and a bit of luck. So far, there is little to suggest any Hymesian orientation to probing systematically at the detail with the best tools available, but once these are introduced – once sociolinguistics enters the frame – the account of social class shifts gear.

Starting with the tools that can deepen our understanding of what’s happening in an episode like Extract 1, first there is phonetics and the notion of indexicality, focusing on the social connotations of specific speech forms. These help to pin down Hanif’s pronunciation of ‘ies’ in ‘galaxies’, to differentiate it from his normal accent, to align it with broad London and its associations with informality (I also double-checked some of this by playing it back to Hanif himself). Next, it is worth trying to understand what is going on interactionally in line 11, and here Goffman is useful. Hanif seems to be talking to himself when he reads the ‘Stars and Galaxies’ worksheet title, dedicating himself to the solitary task ahead. But as Goffman says, individuals are still very alert to the people around them when they talk to themselves in public, and so in Hanif’s self-talk, we are entitled to see an orientation to the over-hearers nearby (1981:97-98). In fact, in reading out the worksheet title, Hanif is also consolidating a shift of footing, displaying his upcoming involvement in the curriculum task, disengaging from the business with his friends, and if we link this back to broad Cockney’s indexical association with informal sociability, we can start to talk of interactional strategy: Hanif may be starting up on schoolwork, but in rounding off the title with hyper-Cockney, he’s toning down the signs of his school commitment, showing that that he’s not a nerd, that he’s still in tune. If we then bring in the notions of genre and interdiscursivity and turn to Extract 2, we can actually go further and say that at moments like these, Hanif is not just engaged in apologetic self-mitigation – he’s vernacularising school knowledge, bringing the science worksheet to life with non-standard accents and a popular TV genre.

Once we bring in the sociolinguistic detail like this, the claim that ‘class still matters’ moves to a different level. Hanif and his peers didn’t talk explicitly about social class, but we can glimpse the motile and differentiated class imagery they had at their fingertips in the fluency with which he navigates his positioning at school, first slipping hyper-Cockney into a footing shift and then turning it up in the orchestration of a mixed genre. With evidence like this, we can start to talk about a practical consciousness impregnated with class sensibility (Williams 1977), and when this is combined with the analysis of a significant number of other episodes, it seems like a reasonably solid

contribution to academic sociolinguistics and linguistic anthropology, a linguistic engagement with quite influential claims about class and late modernity.

Indeed, there are grounds for asserting the wider academic value of this kind of analysis,⁵ and for claiming, for example, that this kind of sociolinguistic detail takes us well beyond public and social scientific talk of ‘multiple, fluid, intersecting and ambiguous identities’. When one sees how closely anchored these posh and Cockney voicings are in the constraints and affordances of the institutionally situated interactional moment – when we see how they’re worked into the lived structures disclosed by socio-linguistics – then accounts of identity that trumpet multiplicity and fluidism look rather clumsy and half-baked. And if they go on from there to use words like ‘troubled’, ‘fractured’ or ‘fragmented’ without any sociolinguistic grasp of the communicative practices with which people bring quite a high levels of intelligible order to their circumstances, then there is a case for saying that they may even be potentially pernicious.

Admittedly, my argument is now running quite far beyond the boundaries of sociolinguistics and linguistic anthropology, maybe raising the suspicion that this is a bad case of expansionist fantasy, interactional sociolinguistics with delusional dreams of universal cross-disciplinary uptake. So it is worth now moving in the second direction, to the interdisciplinary training programme in Ethnography, Language & Communication.

3. Second direction: An interdisciplinary research methods training programme

In 2007, a group of colleagues and I were awarded funding from the UK Economic & Social Research Council to run an advanced methods training programme in linguistic ethnography for social scientists UK-wide. We advertised very widely with the headlines “*Is ‘qualitative data analysis’ too vague for you? Are you wondering how to do justice to your data?*”, and there was a good response – two or three applicants for every place from a range of backgrounds (inter alia health, education, management, psychology, anthropology, and linguistics). We selected very good doctoral and post-doctoral researchers who had reached the data analysis stage in their projects, and over three years, we ran a methods training programme that lasted the equivalent of about 20 days. The details are displayed in Table 1:

Table 1: The Ethnography, Language & Communication Research Training Programme

Targeted at social science PhD students facing the challenge of analysing the data they had collected, the programme consisted of:

- 2 five-day courses delivered by the programme team of six (Jeff Bezemer, Jan Blommaert, Carey Jewitt, Adam Lefstein, Ben Rampton & Celia Roberts)
- 4 one-day thematic/application workshops (‘Linguistic ethnography and sociocultural psychology in conversation’), immigration (‘Asylum & the analysis of language’), health communication (‘New methods for old problems’) and new media (‘Analyzing representations and communication in digital environments’).
- 2 one-day master-classes (Ray McDermott on ‘Interaction, culture & inequality: Seeing the universe in a grain of sand’; Elinor Ochs on ‘The everyday life of families: A view from linguistic anthropology’)
- 6 half-day follow-up and/or data workshops, led by the programme team
- 1 one-day seminar on ‘Teaching and learning linguistic ethnography’

In the period 2007-10, we had 650-700 participants in the programme, coming from, *inter alia*, health, education, management, psychology, anthropology, linguistics

See www.rdi-elc.org.uk for more detail.

How did we go about this, and how successful was it?

⁵ According to Blommaert & Rampton 2011, “[i]ntense scrutiny of textual and discursive detail discloses the ways in which widely distributed societal ideologies penetrate the microscopic world of talk and text, how ideologies have palpable mundane reality. Indeed, this layered, multi-scalar and empirically grounded understanding of ideology is perhaps one of the most sophisticated ones in current social science.” (2011:13)

Instead of presenting different analytical frameworks in their own sub-disciplinary histories, our training curriculum drew on a range of perspectives, which we presented as sensitising ‘tools to think with’. So we combined the analytic rhythms of conversation analysis with the linguistic anthropology of genre, with Goffman, multi-modal social semiotics, intertextuality and natural histories of discourse, calling our distillations ‘genre-’, ‘micro-’, ‘multi-modal’ and ‘trans-contextual’ analysis. We told participants that yes, sub-disciplinary disputes between, say, critical discourse and conversation analysis mattered, but that these were for later, once they had decided that our analytic perspectives were really worth pursuing, and in regular stock-taking discussions, we encouraged the participants to be realistic and reflexive in their appropriation of what we were offering, asking them e.g. ‘What are the limitations of Linguistic Ethnography?’, ‘Could I successfully defend this approach in my viva examination or a job talk?’. Throughout the programme, we used empirical data to work through the analytical frameworks, immersing the participants in recordings and transcripts. We ran with their interests and interpretations, but at the same time we also pointed to the insights afforded by the new perspectives and pushed people to make their claims accountable to evidence.

For many of the participants, the process of slow, intensive micro-analysis was itself a revelation, disclosing vivid empirical details in the processes of social construction that they had hitherto had no conception of, and as this ontological re-gearing took effect, they became clearer about the ways in which our programme offered an apparatus for advancing their own projects. Our workshops on the participants’ own data bore some similarities to traditional data-sessions in conversation analysis, but instead of prioritising a drilling down into the sequential machinery of interaction, we also worked outwards to larger scale processes, reflecting for example on the data’s implications for further rounds of ethnographic fieldwork.

Overall, the response to this training programme was very positive – ex-participants set up a more or less annual conference, with a 100+ attending, and we have subsequently run the course in a range of different locations. Stepping back, there are at least two external conditions that are likely to have enhanced the participants’ receptivity. First, as already intimated, most of the course participants were familiar and sympathetic to social constructionist theory, so that instead of facing the kind of epistemological crisis sometimes experienced by newcomers to discursive psychology (where the clash between positivist and interpretive philosophies is often quite intense), they really welcomed the purchase on reality production provided by linguistic, semiotic and discourse analysis. Second, they generally knew about ethnography, and that was how we staged it – as ethnography enriched with some highly developed heuristic frameworks and procedures for discovering otherwise unanalysed intricacies in social relations (cf Sapir 1929/1949:166; Hymes 1996:8).

My own sense is that a sensitive ethnographer with a non-linguistics background is unlikely to take very long to start using these tools to generate new insights, but it is also important to acknowledge that as a programme team based outside the disciplines and institutions where individual participants were doing their research, we have had very little control over what our graduates eventually did or do with the training we provided. Our training could be informally characterized as encompassing three stages: ‘coming together’, ‘getting down to basics’, and then ‘anything goes’. But rather than being a particular source of personal worry, this open-endedness is probably unavoidable in interdisciplinarity oriented to real-world problems (what is sometimes called ‘Mode B’ interdisciplinarity).⁶ Instead, my hope is that whether or not our graduates eventually do any micro-ethnography themselves, our programme provided them with an intensive exposure to the tangible, on-line moment-to-moment co-production of reality which puts them in a different position

⁶ In the UK, two types of interdisciplinarity are often distinguished: ‘Mode 1’ (or ‘A’) and ‘Mode 2’ (‘B’). In ‘Mode 1 interdisciplinarity’, focal problems are identified within a particular (sub-)discipline, and there is cross-reference to another paradigm/line of research in order to get past a ‘bottle-neck’ that researchers have reached using only the concepts and methods available within their own disciplinary heartland. In the rationales for cross-reference that are offered, the parameters of what to include and what to leave out are set fairly clearly, and there is quite a well-defined sense of exactly what kinds of methodological borrowing/combination are now in order. The starting point for particular cross-disciplinary projects are clearly defined, and it is possible to anticipate the outcome at least in its broad contours. In contrast in ‘Mode 2 interdisciplinarity’, ‘real-world’ issues of social, technical and/or policy relevance provide the starting point; there may be non-academic ‘stake-holders’ involved throughout; and it is the multi-dimensional complexity of the problem that motivates the mixing. Quite a high tolerance for ambiguity is required, and it is important not to commit too quickly to the specification of the key methods and dimensions of analysis.

ontologically, so that even if they revert to the content analysis of interview transcripts or field-notes as their main analytic strategy, then at least they have a sense of what they are glossing over.

Admittedly, my description of this training course hasn't actually referred to the Hanif data in Extracts 1 and 2, even though I have actually used it on occasion, it represents the kind of data we often focused on, and analytic concepts of the kind sketched in Section 2 were clearly central.⁷ But I shall now return to Hanif directly in order to introduce the third line of work.

4. Third direction: A professional development project with teachers

I suggested earlier on that Hanif was vernacularising school knowledge when he did different voices and introduced a quiz format – traditionally, a person's pronunciation is supposed to get posher when they read aloud or when they turn to school business, but Hanif did the opposite. This idea gains momentum when we situate the Stars & Galaxies episode in longer ethnographic observation of Hanif, his friends and classmates. First, yes, the challenge to traditional equations of book learning with poshness fits a much more general pattern – Hanif often mixed a commitment to learning with flagrant disregard for the decorums that learning is traditionally surrounded by. But second, Hanif's teachers were often very receptive to his transgressive enthusiasms, and he was widely recognized as a star pupil. So there are grounds for seeing the vernacularisation of schoolwork in the extracts as the product of his position at the top of the hierarchy in Class 9A, supported by the dominant local order rather than opposed to it.

Putting these patterns together, Roxy Harris and I started to refer to a 'new classroom settlement' (Harris & Rampton 2010; Rampton 2006:Chs.2&3). Classroom authority seemed much more decentred than it was supposed to be, pupil-teacher relations were often more informal, and commitment to learning wasn't necessarily tied to deference to the teacher. But how general was this new discursive order? We had seen it at Hanif's school, but there were no signs of it in another London secondary school we studied at roughly the same time (cf Rampton 2006:Chs.2 & 3).

To assess this, Harris selected four 2-4 minute recordings of fairly routine but definitely 'non-model' classroom interaction, played them to 39 London school teachers (with a combined 514 years of mainly urban classroom experience), and asked them to indicate how recognisable the extracts were:

Table 2: Summary of teachers assessments of the recognisability of the 4 interactional episodes

"In my experience I find the scenario in Extract __ (A/B/C/D)				
very recognisable"	fairly recognisable"	not sure if I recognise it"	fairly unrecognisable"	very unrecognisable"
65 responses (42%)	69 (44%)	2 (1%)	9 (6%)	4 (3%)

⁷ Links to the kind of analysis illustrated in Section 2 are clear in the four major sets of resources that I suggested linguistic ethnography draws on in the opening sessions of the training programme:

- a) linguistics & discourse analysis, which give a provisional view of the expressive affordances of the linguistic resources that participants draw on;
- b) Goffman and conversation analysis, which provide frameworks and procedures for investigating situated encounters, helping us to see
 - the ongoing, sequential construction of 'local architectures of intersubjectivity'
 - the rituals and moral accountabilities permeating the use of semiotic forms and strategies
 - the shifting spatio-temporal distribution of attention and involvement in situations of physical co-presence
- c) ethnography which provides
 - a sense of the stability, status and resonance that forms, strategies and materials have in different social networks beyond the encounter-on-hand, as well as
 - an idea of how and where an encounter fits into longer and broader biographies, institutions and histories.
- d) other public and academic discourses which provide the purpose and relevance for analysis, as well as a broader picture of the environment where any given study is sited.

86% described the recordings as either very or fairly recognisable. In open discussion, these teachers' first response was to criticise the teachers in the extracts, which points to the power of the traditional teaching ideal. But this soon gave way to the admission that although traditional order could still be found in some schools, classroom relations had changed.

"[the relationship between] staff and students is so different... I remember when I started teaching ... seventeen years ago and you got in [a] kid's face, that was accepted as the norm. You couldn't do that here and I'm so glad - they'd be quite entitled to go and complain about you. You would lose respect" (40-50 yr old Asst Head (m). 17 years experience)

"Children are bright now. You know, we have got a whole different climate now. Children know what they are entitled to. Children will tell you 'that was a crap lesson, it was boring, you read that story with no feeling'. But they are right to do that if we are crap, you know, whereas I wouldn't have dreamed of saying anything. I would have sat and be bored" (50-60 yr old R.E./Humanities teacher (f). 20 yrs experience)

Nowadays, communication with pupils tended to rely on negotiation rather than authority, pupils knew their rights, lessons needed to be entertaining, and you always had to reckon with digital culture.

Overall, it looked as though in a great many of classrooms, teachers were experiencing major cultural change, and this was raising a host of pressing practical issues: How important is classroom silence for intellectually demanding work? How far do pupils have a right to opt out of participation in whole class dialogue? Is it okay if they listen to mp3 players on headphones as they work? How should you treat your pupils – as learners, or as young adult consumers? Unfortunately, however, there has been no space for questions like these in contemporary education policy, and both in public and in educational policy discourse, classrooms like the ones we described are treated as the chaotic product of incompetent teaching, as a lamentable reflection of pupil disadvantage, and/or as an index of inadequate school management systems (Ofsted 2005, Curtis 2009). These hegemonic representations leave the professionals who work in these schools and classrooms with very little room for anything but feelings of failure and shame, and so funded again by the ESRC, we have just completed a materials development project which tries to create space where teachers have more opportunity to articulate their own principles and practical responses to the problems, dilemmas and pleasures of everyday urban classroom life.

There is not an exact match between the training resource that we have produced and what Hymes' describes as 'cooperative ethnographic monitoring' (1980/1996; Blommaert 2010; Van de Aa & Blommaert 2011). But there is a similar concern about teachers being positioned as bystanders, "confronted by... outside evaluators' charts and tables, and told a rating..., with nothing to say, or nothing, at least, that... evaluators feel required to heed" (1980:115),⁸ and we draw on roughly the same methods and frameworks of analysis. Harris, Lefstein et al's (2011) *Urban Classroom Culture: Realities, Dilemmas, Responses* centres on four audio-recorded episodes of classroom interaction, and it contains a set of activities which encourage teachers to attend very closely to each of the episodes, to reflect on their implications, and to consider their links to illustrations and analyses of public culture, drawn from the media and from sociolinguistics, sociology and cultural studies. And underpinning all this, there is a crucial recognition of the unexceptional ordinariness of the new classroom settlement, as well as its sensitivity to cultural changes beyond the control of individual schools, teachers and pupils (Hymes 1996:14-15,19).

So those are three directions in which data like Extracts 1 and 2 have led. It is now worth moving to conclusions.

⁸ "The greatest value of cooperative ethnographic monitoring is that the participants in [a] programme will have the firmest grasp possible of the working of the programme, of its successes and failures, strengths and weaknesses, in relation to their hopes for it. They will not be in the position of being confronted by an outside evaluator's charts and tables, and told a rating for their programme, with nothing to say, or nothing, at least, that such an evaluator feels required to heed. The participants will not have been bystanders. They will... be able to address the processes that have produced whatever statistics and graphs a formal evaluation process may yield" (1980:115)

5. Conclusion

One of the guiding assumptions in this special issue is that wider changes in patterns of communication in late modernity call for a review of the scope and possibilities for applied linguistics. But of course one can only say what these changes in communication are if one takes a close empirical look, and when one does, contrastive insights emerge which may then themselves propel one into an intensive search for the more systematic view. So in the data addressed in this paper, there was evidence of both change and continuity in the contemporary communicative economy – new patterns of classroom interaction but continued currency for posh and Cockney – and since both ran counter to influential contemporary discourses, the call for closer scrutiny proved irresistible, initiating quite sustained periods of nose-down, relatively tunnel-visioned analysis. Perhaps somewhat ironically, this inevitably reduces the time required to produce the panoramic state of the art appraisal one might otherwise aspire to, and it becomes easier to inhabit the identity of a craft practitioner committed to the investigation of specific empirical processes than to adopt the role of AL meta-theorist, invaluable though the latter may be.

But the position of craft practitioner need not limit the wider interdisciplinary relevance of this work, since the analytic frameworks and procedures developed in sociolinguistics and linguistic anthropology are not only powerful but also often quite appealing to others (cf Rampton et al 2002:387-9). In late modernity, disciplinary boundaries are much more porous than they used to be, and judging from our experience of the methods training programme outlined in Section 3, there is a substantial array of qualitative social scientists interested in applying linguistic ethnographic analysis to their own research problems.

Indeed, the empirical trajectory I have outlined need not preclude practical intervention. If you have a contrastive insight, if you have interrogated it with the kind of apparatus sociolinguistics provides and if you have found that it still holds up, then academic work provides a set of important resources in the kind of counter-hegemonic project described in Section 4.

Of course, it takes quite a great deal of time pursuing the different directions I have described, targeting three different audiences, and it is probably only manageable if one is working in a team. Even so, data of the kind presented in Extracts 1 and 2 provides a common anchor for all three of these trajectories, and even though it is elaborated to different degrees with different audiences, ethnographic sociolinguistics acts as the shared methodological underpinning. In fact, Hymes' vision of ethnography as a democratic science, widely disseminated throughout society, has some relevance here. At one pole, Hymes suggests, there would be people who have been professionally trained in ethnography and at the other pole, there would be the general population, respected for their intricate and subtle knowledge of the worlds they lived in. In between, there would be people who could "combine some disciplined understanding of ethnographic inquiry with the pursuit of their vocation" (1980: 99). The match between Hymes' vision and the directions I travelled with the Hanif data certainly isn't perfect, but there is a family resemblance, and although I think that 'cafeteria' is still the right metaphor for applied linguistics as a whole, I would claim that there is a neo-Hymesian coherence in the different articulations of linguistic ethnography that I have outlined.

Finally, what of the case for time away from application, trying to crack problems that professionals and policy-makers show no signs of any interest in? First and most obviously, they might come round later, but second and more immediately, it is essential to keep aiming at the university curriculum canon, which always needs interrogation and refreshing. At present, discussion of undergraduates tends to focus only on either consumer or remedial issues, but Hymes had a much broader view, and here is what he said about anthropology:

"within the academy, a redistribution of attention and prestige from graduate to undergraduate training of anthropology is important... [M]uch graduate time is spent on activities required... for induction into the hegemony of a particular department and a prospective profession.... [But u]ndergraduates would be freer to acquire relevant training and do good work, having in mind long-range plans not under the control of their teachers. The greatest contribution of anthropology departments might be to send into the world many lawyers, historians, activists,

workers for various institutions and agencies, well-trained in anthropological work” (Hymes 1969:56-7)

The same could be said about applied and sociolinguistics, and of course this requires much more than just teaching and textbooks: it also needs orthodox research outputs, the best accounts of problems, methods and findings that we can manage.

REFERENCES

- Blommaert, J. 2008. *Grassroots Literacy*. London: Routledge.
- Blommaert, J. 2011 'Policy, policing & the ecology of social norms: Ethnographic monitoring revisited' Working Papers in Urban Language & Literacies # 63. At www.kcl.ac.uk/ldc
- Blommaert, J. & B. Rampton 2011. Language and superdiversity: A position paper. Working Papers in Urban Language & Literacies # 70. At www.kcl.ac.uk/ldc
- Bradley, H. 1996. *Fractured Identities: Changing Patterns of Inequality*. Oxford: Polity.
- Curtis, P. 2009. 'Ofsted's new mission – to get rid of boring teachers'. *Guardian* 5/1/09: p. 1
- Goffman, E. 1981. *Forms of Talk*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Guba, E. 1981. Criteria for assessing the trustworthiness of naturalistic inquiries. *Educational Communications and Technology*. 29: 75-81.
- Hammersley, M. 1992. *What's Wrong with Ethnography?* London: Routledge.
- Harris, R., A. Lefstein with C. Leung & B. Rampton 2011. *Urban Classroom Culture: Realities, Dilemmas, Responses*. London: King's College London Centre for Language Discourse & Communication.
- Harris, R., A. Lefstein, B. Rampton & C. Leung. 2010-11. *Urban Classroom Culture & Interaction 2: From Research to Professional Practice*. ESRC Knowledge Transfer project. <http://www.kcl.ac.uk/projects/ldc/proj/identities.html?m=print>
- Hymes, D. 1969/1999. The use of anthropology: Critical, political, personal. In D. Hymes (ed) *Reinventing Anthropology*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press 3-79
- Hymes, D. 1980. *Language in Education: Ethnolinguistic Essays*. Washington DC: Center for Applied Linguistics.
- Hymes, D. 1996. *Ethnography, Linguistics, Narrative Inequality*. London: Taylor Francis
- Hymes, D. 1999. Introduction to the Ann Arbor Paperbacks edition. In D. Hymes (ed) *Reinventing Anthropology*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press. v-xlix
- Lather, P. 1986. Issues of validity in openly ideological research. *Interchange*. 17/4: 63-84.
- Ofsted. 2005. *Managing Challenging Behaviour*. At <http://www.ofsted.gov.uk/Ofsted-home/Publications-and-research/Browse-all-by/Care/Childcare/Managing-challenging-behaviour>
- Rampton, B. 1997. Retuning in applied linguistics. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*. 7/1: 3-25
- Rampton, B. 1998. Problems with an orchestral view of applied linguistics: A reply to Widdowson. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics* 8/1:141-6
- Rampton, B. 2006. *Language in Late Modernity: Interaction in an Urban School*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Rampton, B. 2007. Neo-Hymesian linguistic ethnography in the UK. In Rampton, B., J. Maybin and K. Tusting (eds) 2007. *Linguistic Ethnography: Links, Problems and Possibilities*. Special issue of *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 11 (5): 584-608.
- Rampton, B., J. Blommaert, J. Bezemer, A. Lefstein, C. Roberts and C. Jewitt 2007-2010. 'Ethnography, Language & Communication'. ESRC research training programme. www.rdi-elc.org.uk
- Rampton, B. & R. Harris. 2010. Change in urban classroom culture and interaction. In K. Littleton & C. Howe (eds) *Educational Dialogues*. London: Routledge. 240-264
- Rampton, B., C. Roberts, C. Leung & R. Harris 2002. Methodology in the analysis of classroom discourse. *Applied Linguistics*. 23/3: 373-392.
- Reay, D. (1998). "Rethinking social class: Qualitative perspectives on class and gender." *Sociology* 32(2): 259-75.
- Sapir, E. 1929. The status of linguistics as a science. *Language* 5: 207-14. Reproduced in D. Mandelbaum (ed) 1949 *Edward Sapir: Selected Writings in Language, Culture and Personality*. Berkeley: University of California Press. 160-6.
- van Aa, J & J. Blommaert 2011. Ethnographic monitoring: Hymes' unfinished business in educational research. Working Papers in Urban Language & Literacies # 69. At www.kcl.ac.uk/ldc
- Wells, J. 1982. *Accents of English 2: The British Isles*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Widdowson, H. 1998a. Retuning, calling the tune and paying the piper: A reaction to Rampton. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics* 8/1:131-140
- Widdowson, H. 1998b. Positions and oppositions: Hedgehogs and foxes. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics* 8/1:147-51
- Williams, R. 1977. *Marxism and Literature*. Oxford: Clarendon.