Community Languages in Late Modernity

Li Wei

This chapter aims to reconceptualise the notions of 'community' and 'community languages' in late modernity and to recontextualize the discussion of language policy and planning (LPP) with reference to diaspora. Given the heterogeneity or superdiversity of the world today, the chapter raises questions about the meaning of 'community' and its value in researching language. By extension, is the concept of 'community language' still relevant? If it is not, can it be replaced by something else? In addition, scholars working with migrant groups are revisiting the notion of 'diaspora', emphasizing its historical-cultural rootedness, global connections, and contemporary political, religious and economic relevance. The chapter suggests how LPP in migrant communities and regarding migrant community languages could benefit from applying the new usages of 'diaspora'. A particular focus will be on grassroots initiatives in LPP from within global diasporas.

The chapter consists of six sections. The first section presents a critique of the notion of 'community' in late modernity. It argues that i) community boundaries are fuzzy and multiple, ii) communities are mobile, intersecting and connected, and iii) communities are locations and generators of grassroots responsibilities and power. The challenges such features of the community in the 21st century present to the notion of 'community language' will also be discussed. The second section looks at the renewed interest in the notion of 'diaspora'. The third section examines the role of language and multilingualism. The fourth section discusses the possibilities and constraints of language policies and planning with regards to mobile and minority communities. The fifth section focuses on grassroots language planning actions, especially those that are carried out beyond institutionalised settings. The

chapter concludes with a discussion of the new challenges facing community languages in late modernity, highlighting the dilemmas of post-multilingualism and suggesting translanguaging as a possible solution.

The Notion of 'Community' in Late Modernity

Derived from the Latin *communitas*, the word 'community' was originally used to refer to a settlement of people who interacted closely with each other. This sense of the term is still used in archaeology and other fields where physical proximity and material exchange are the defining criteria of a community. In his 1887 work, *Gemeinschaft und Gesellschaft* (translated as *Community and Society*), the German sociologist Ferdinand Tönnies emphasized communal networks and shared social understanding, or 'unity of will' as he called it, as key to a community. McMillan and Chavis (1986) identified four elements of 'sense of community', namely: 1) membership, 2) influence, 3) integration and fulfillment of needs, and 4) shared emotional connection. They further developed a Sense of Community Index (SCI) which has subsequently been adapted for use in schools, the workplace, and a variety of types of communities. The shift of emphasis from physical closeness to 'unity of will' is in part of a recognition of the superdiversity of societies in the late-modern era.

As Vertovec (2007), who popularised the notion, recognises himself, 'superdiversity' is by no means a new social phenomenon. But the emergence of the scale in recent decades, plus the multilayered experience of different groups within unequal power structures and social locations, call for a reassessment of the traditional place- or ethnicity-based definitions of communities (Tollefson, 1991). More people move from more places to more places across the globe, rather than being tied to one location. Social formations become ever more complex, often marked by dynamic interplays of traditional variables such as ethnicity,

language, country of origin, age and gender, and by factors such as migration history, legal status, and access to social capital. In the meantime, a community can be virtual (Rheingold, 2000), with individuals interacting through specific social media crossing geographical and cultural boundaries, or imagined (Anderson, 1991), with members holding in their minds a mental image of their affinity without ever knowing, meeting or hearing of each other.

As technological modernization continues into the contemporary era, late modernity places the burden of responsibility on the individual, giving rise to the emergence of liquidity and reflexivity as key features of social life (Bauman, 2000). In turn, late modernity has given rise to a plethora of new terms with regards to community – online community, virtual community, LGBT community, learning community, knowledge community, brand community, community of practice, and so on – illustrating the fact that, under the cultural conditions of late modernity, individuals shift from one social position to another in a fluid manner. They change places, jobs, spouses, sexual orientations, political values, and more, as they take on the responsibilities for their own lives as opposed to replying on traditional, localized support structures. There is a general trend to move from location-based communities or communities of places, e.g. neighbourhood, suburb, village, town or city, region, nation or even the planet as a whole, to identity-based communities, ranging from the local clique, sub-culture, ethnic group, age, gender and sexuality, physical and mental capacity, religious, multicultural or pluralistic civilisation, or the global community cultures of today (Castells, 2010).

In the meantime, organizationally based communities continue to exist but expand from family or network-based associations to more formal incorporated associations, political decision making structures, economic enterprises, or professional associations at a small, national or international scale. Consequently, we can no longer talk about community as a geographical-physical entity. Instead, social scientists treat community as a sociological

construct - a set of social interactions between people whose everyday behaviours have meanings and expectations (see discussions in Christensen & Levinson, 2003; Delanty, 2010). These meanings and expectations are understood and shared by members of the community, forming interests, beliefs and values that are at the core of the construct. Paul James and his colleagues, for example, describe three kinds of relations that characterise different types of communities (James *et al*, 2012):

i) Grounded community relations, involving enduring attachment to particular places and particular people.

ii) Life-style community relations which give primacy to communities coming together around particular chosen ways of life, such as morally charged or interest-based relations or just living or working in the same location.

iii) Projected community relations, where a community is self-consciously treated as an entity to be projected and re-created. It can be projected as through advertising slogans, for example 'gated community', or it can take the form of ongoing associations of people who seek political integration, communities of practice based on professional projects, or associative communities which seek to enhance and support individual creativity, autonomy and mutuality. A nation is one of the largest forms of projected or "imagined" (Anderson, 1991) community.

Communities come in different shapes and sizes, with different interests and values, no two of which are alike. Here, I want to highlight three characteristics of the community in the 21st century that have important implications when we consider the relationship between language and community and with regard to language policy and planning in communities. These are concerned with their fuzzy boundaries, their mobile nature, and their grassroots responsibilities. I will detail each of them below.

Community Boundaries are Fuzzy and Multiple

Unlike geography-bounded communities that are physically separated from other communities and where human interaction may consist primarily of relations between the residents living inside that location, communities in late modernity, whatever they may be, typically have interactions with other communities way beyond any geographical area. Individuals also typically have simultaneous memberships in several communities; for instance, a scientist in a knowledge community could be a member of a learning community and a virtual community when she uses an online platform to learn a new language, whilst simultaneously being a member of an LGBT community in Australia as well as a member of the Asian community there.

The same individual may have relatives and friends in different parts of the world. Memberships of the different communities are maintained through contacts that serve specific purposes and may be activated to different levels at different times. The increasingly easy accessibility of information and communication technologies and new media means that even the once traditional, place-bound communities can establish and maintain contacts and relationships far beyond their physical locations. That is to say, the boundaries of communities are not precise and singular.

Communities are Mobile, Intersecting and Connected

Mobility is not a new feature or product of late modernity. There have been communities of nomadic herders who walked long distances with their cattle, fishing groups who moved from time to time as the fish were available, and hunters who followed game. Large-scale migrations of people have resulted in diasporic communities of various kinds across the globe.

This is continuing to be the case due to new developments of transportation, on the one hand, and humanitarian crisis created by war, on the other.

At the same time, mobile technologies and new communication media have increased and enhanced the mobility and mobilization of knowledge, ideas, resources, and values. People can be in contact with one another without physically moving places. In these terms, communities are both intersecting and connected: intersecting in the sense that there may be communities within larger communities in a cross-cutting matrix in relation to each other, and connected as they maintain multiple historical, spatial and cultural contacts through various means. The latter is particularly important to diasporic communities that I will discuss later.

Communities are Locations/Generators of Grassroots Responsibilities and Power

Communities play a crucial role in shaping opinions, influencing behaviours, and ultimately changing social structures. This works in both directions: community can provide a normative mindset that impacts on individuals' everyday practices – if one wishes to remain a member of a community, they need to behave in certain ways like others in the community; in the meantime, individuals can determine whether or not change is needed and how it might happen through their everyday practices and ultimately the collective mindset and practices of the community. Communities are where power relations are built, cultivated and mobilised. Anyone, either from inside or outside a community, wishing to influence opinion and to introduce change, will need to work through the relationships that already exist in the community, or what may be called 'empowerment' of the community. Top-down decision-making would have limited effect without the buy-in of the communities concerned.

Individuals are expected to take responsibilities for their actions in the interest of the community; their reward would be that their opinions are heard and accepted by others and social change could happen in a bottom-up way. The interconnectedness of communities that I talked about above also has important implications for social change itself: it means that change in any dimension of the intersections of a community has repercussions in the other dimensions and sections.

These three characteristics of the community in the 21st century present challenges to the notion of 'community language'. Often believed to have been coined in Australia in the 1970s to denote languages other than English and Aboriginal languages (Clyne, 1991), the term has come to refer to languages used by members of minority groups or communities as their first languages within a majority language context. Some of these are languages that have been used for hundreds of years in the community concerned; others may be of more recent origin. The adoption of the term 'community language' in preference to other terms such as 'minority', 'ethnic', or 'immigrant' languages is in itself a reflection of the complexities and concerns of everyday life in late modernity. For example, the term 'minority languages' suggests languages spoken by only a small number of people (manifestly not the case in relation to languages of world significance such as Arabic, Chinese, and Urdu) or languages which are somehow intrinsically of less value than 'majority' languages. And terms such as 'ethnic' or 'immigrant' languages indicate that other characteristics, not necessarily relevant or easy to define, have to be taken into consideration. In comparison, 'community language' would avoid many of the negative connotations that these other terms have attracted, and draws attention to the fact that languages are used in a range of shared social and cultural contexts. It also legitimises their continuing existence as part of a large society, and highlights the nested nature of contemporary communities: a 'minority' language in one community could be a 'majority' language in another community

and individuals can simultaneously have several different community languages as they belong to several different communities. It needs to be pointed out that those who use 'community language' tend to emphasise the shared heritage and socio-cultural practices amongst the language users, rather than any shared value that the term may imply, and acknowledge the issues arising from contested varieties and language standardisation.

A concept that is closely connected with that of 'community' and that has been transformed significantly under conditions of late modernity is 'diaspora'. I will turn to this below.

Diaspora: Old Concept, New Potentialities

The concept of 'diaspora' is a very old one, originally meaning the scattering of people between, through, and across different geographic locations. Its main reference was, for many centuries, the historical mass dispersions of the Jews, African slaves and the Chinese labourers. The emphasis on the involuntary nature of the displacement and dispersal in the historical references was easy to see. Studies of transnational human migration in the 20th century tended to use terms such as immigrants, guest workers, asylum seekers, ethnic minorities, or displaced populations to refer to the different groups of migrants in contemporary society. As the world moved into the 21st century, though, there has been a renewed interest in the notion of 'diaspora'.

Researchers increasingly find terms such as 'immigrants', and 'minorities' unsatisfactory. As Clifford (1997) suggests, "diasporic language seems to be replacing, or at least supplementing, minority discourse. Transnational connections break the binary relation of 'minority' communities within 'majority' societies" (p. 255). Scholars see a close link between the contemporary diasporic conditions and globalization (Cohen & Vertovec, 1999).

Diaspora in the 21st century is, to use a popular phrase, a 'superdiverse' phenomenon (Vertovec, 2007). Individuals with different migration motivations and experiences, and different educational and socio-economic backgrounds and statuses, come together; recent migrants are intermingled with long-term settlers; speakers of different languages, dialects and accents are interacting with each other, often in a mixed mode. Yet they find sufficient common ground to identify themselves with each other as part of a diaspora, creating an imagined community (Anderson, 1991). This diasporic imagination often involves suppressing or neutralising past differences and establishing commonality and connectivity through which new identities can be negotiated (Sofos, 1996).

The rediscovered term of diaspora indicates a shift of interest from mobility to connectivity and of emphasis from the victimization, uprooting and displacement of the individuals and groups concerned, to their capacity for constructing new transnational spaces of experience that are complexly interfacing with the experiential frameworks that both places of settlement and purported places of origin represent (Morley, 2000). Tsagarousianou (2004), for example, talks about the 'potentialities' of diasporas, i.e. "the various creative possibilities opened by the activities of diasporas in both local and transnational contexts" (p. 58). She further argues that it is important to focus on "the ability of diasporas to construct and negotiate their identities, everyday life and transnational activities in ways that often overcome the ethnic identity versus assimilation dilemma" (ibid), rather than the experiences of loss and displacement or the nostalgic fixation to a 'homeland'. For Tsagarousianou, the diasporic communities' readiness and willingness to engage themselves with the building of a transnational imagination and connections differentiate them from 'ethnic minorities'. In Brah's terms, "diasporas are ……the sites of hope and new beginnings" (1996, p. 193); rather than looking back in a nostalgic effort of recovering or maintaining their identity, they

discover or construct notions of who they are and what home is by essentially looking forward.

Such a shift in interest and emphasis in diaspora studies is echoed in applied linguistics research through the work of scholars such as David Block (2008), who challenges the appropriateness of the metaphor of 'loss' in studying multilingual, transnational individuals and communities and calls for a move away from the excessively emotive and romanticized stances towards language maintenance and language shift. For many such individuals and communities, it is not what they have lost that occupies their minds in their everyday lives, but what they seek to develop and construct for themselves. The estrangement of an individual or a community in diaspora, to use Mandaville's words (2001), "often leads to a particularly intense search for and negotiation of identity" (p. 172). It is therefore important to recognise the opportunity structures that the diasporic condition entails, which must include both the restrictive consequences of deterritorialization and reterritorialization and the creative potential of the multiplicity of connectivity. The multiplicity of connectivity creates an imagined rather than given community, continuously reinvented and reconstructed through the lengthy process of forging links amongst their members in both local and transnational contexts.

In an attempt to provide a theoretical framework for studying new communication media in diasporas, Tsagarousianou (2004) argues that migration movements in late modernity should not be framed in terms of isolation and solitude, but rather in terms of intense and constant interaction at a transnational level. Globalization, in her view, means not simply rapid mobility over long distances but also increased proximity and connectivity:

> Diasporas can be seen as situated at the centre of sets of intersecting transnational flows and linkages that bring together geographically remote locations. In turn, they contribute to the generation of transnational flows and, as a result, are considered to

> be in the vanguard of the forces that deepen and intensify globalization (Tsagarousianou, 2004, pp. 60-61).

The renewed interest in the notion of diaspora brings forth the role of language in the construction of community. In fact, many traditional communities were defined along language lines, i.e. individuals speaking the same language or language variety would be regarded as belonging to the same community and individuals speaking different languages would be members of different communities. We now look at this issue further.

The Role of Language and Multilingualism

The above-mentioned norm-enforcement effect of the community means that members of the same community would share a set of norms and expectations regarding their use of language too. This gave rise to the concept of 'speech community' (e.g. Labov, 1972) as a group of people with shared community membership as well as share linguistic communication:

> The speech community is not defined by any marked agreement in the use of language elements, so much as by participation in a set of shared norms: these norms may be observed in overt types of evaluative behavior, and by the uniformity of abstract patterns of variation which are invariant in respect to particular levels of usage (Labov, 1972. pp. 120–1).

The notion of the speech community was designed to see linguistic varieties as associated with social strata within a single community, and for this reason it assumed a structural integrity of the linguistic system of each social group. Operationally, it assumed each social group within the speech community to form a neatly bounded unit definable in terms of discrete and correlatable variables, such as ethnicity, race, class, gender, age, ideology, and specific formal variables of linguistic usage. This conceptualization worked well for Labov,

who wanted to show that African American Vernacular English could not be seen as a structurally degenerate form of English, but rather as a well-defined linguistic code with its own particular structure. Yet, human relations and human behaviours are much more complex and fluid in the 21st century than ever before.

Communities can no longer be identified on ethnic, race, or class terms alone, and, as Interactional Sociolinguistics research has demonstrated, there is much more intra-personal linguistic variation than was once understood. Choice of linguistic variant is often a situational choice made in relation to a specific speech context, rather than an expression of a permanent social identity, such as class, gender, or age. Furthermore, there is now much wider recognition that individuals of the same social group may not have exactly the same access to all linguistic forms, and the concept of the speech community as Labov defined it did not take account of power differentials within the community that sometimes work to restrict individual speakers' access to speech forms, or which impose certain linguistic varieties on certain groups and individuals.

It should be noted that Labov was by no means the only, nor the first, linguist to develop an analytic concept of the linguistic community. Gumperz (1968), for example, described how social dialectologies had taken issue with the dominant approach in historical linguistics that saw linguistic communities as homogeneous and localized entities in a way that allowed for drawing neat tree diagrams based on the principle of 'descent with modification' and shared innovations. Social dialectologists argued that dialect features spread through diffusion, and that social factors, often competing with each other, would determine how this happened in different communities. This insight prompted Gumperz (1968) to problematize the notion of the speech community as the community that carries a single speech variant, and instead to seek a definition that could encompass heterogeneity. He focused on the interactive aspect of language practice, because interaction is the path along

which diffused linguistic features would travel. Gumperz defined the speech community as "any human aggregate characterized by regular and frequent interaction by means of a shared body of verbal signs and set off from similar aggregates by significant differences in language usage" (Gumperz, 1968, p. 381). He further argued: "Regardless of the linguistic differences among them, the speech varieties employed within a speech community form a system because they are related to a shared set of social norms" (Gumperz, 1968, p. 382).

This definition does not aim to delineate either the community or the language system as discrete entities. In fact, Gumperz in his empirical work sought to compare the degree to which the linguistic systems of the community differed, so that speech communities could be multilingual, diglossic, multidialectal, or homogeneous, and the degree to which the use of different linguistic varieties were either set off from each other as discrete systems in interaction (e.g. diglossia where varieties correspond to specific social contexts) or habitually mixed in interaction (e.g. code-switching). Gumperz's work paved the way for later linguists to look at language from a Practice Theory (Bourdieu, 1977) perspective and speech community as Community of Practice (Lave & Wenger, 1991). Hanks (1996), for example, studied the ways in which shared practices relate to the production of linguistic meaning and how linguistic practices are connected to a variety of inhabitable positions within the different social fields. Eckert (2000), in the meantime, examined how speaker groups employ linguistic practices to demarcate themselves from other such groups. For her, linguistic variations are 'acts of identity' (Le Page & Tabouret-Keller, 1985) informed by ideologies. There are tensions between the goals and practices of subgroups coexisting within a macro-community, and these tensions interrelate and generate social change.

The replacement of the concept of 'speech community' with more empirically anchored and differentiating vocabulary such as 'community of practice' or 'network' better captures "the often mobile and flexible sites and links in which representations of group

emerge, move and circulate", as Blommaert and Rampton (2011, p. 4) suggest. But the more fundamental implication is for the conceptualization of language in superdiversity. Since the 1990s, there has been a noticeable shift of attention from structural configurations of linguistic diversity and language contact to indexicality and the connotational significance of signs. The "interaction of meaningful sign forms, contextualized to situations of interested human use and mediated by the fact of cultural ideology" (Silverstein, 1985, p. 220) forms the total linguistic fact which needs to be interpreted with reference to the specific activities and social relations in which it occurs as well as the symbolic values it carries beyond the denotational and propositional meanings of words and sentences. There is much wider acceptance that multilingual practices are far more flexible than they were once thought and do not map neatly onto ethnic, cultural, or the so-called language groups. Even the local naming of the practices, such as code-switching, crossing, translanguaging, heteroglossia, polylingualism, metrolingualism, and translingualism, may itself be indeterminate and contested both among their users and linguists (see further discussions in Garcia & Li, 2014; also Jørgensen *et al*, 2001; Rampton, 2001; Canagarajah, 2012; Pennycook & Otsuji, 2015).

The displacement and dispersal of people put speakers of different languages into direct contacts with each other. Multilingualism is a common, though not universal, outcome of such language contact. The need to build new connections with speakers of other languages in their new-found homes means that they need to learn and use new languages, whilst the need to maintain links with their former homelands and pass on their cultural heritage to their children means that they need to keep on using and teaching the young their existing languages. Many diasporic communities are already multilingual before migration; migration only further enhances their multilingualism. Thus, multilingualism becomes an integral part of contemporary diasporas across the globe. Advancements in information and communication technologies provide new affordances for multilingual development:

individuals and communities no longer have to migrate physically and geographically in order to get into direct contact with speakers of other languages. They also enable those who have migrated to maintain, even extend, their connections with others. Multilingualism adds an important dimension to the superdiversity of late modernity (Pérez-Milans, 2015).

Communities of whatever shape or form make decisions about their languages and language practices all the time, consciously and subconsciously. This will be explored in the following section.

Policies and Planning: Possibilities and Constraints

A central question is to what extent a community should try to maintain its traditional languages and language use patterns or to adopt new languages, i.e. language maintenance and language shift. Different communities have different responses to the question, due to a variety of historical, socio-political, economic, ideological and cultural reasons. On balance, most communities endeavour to preserve their traditional languages for some contexts and adopt new languages for others, often resulting in a dichotomy of we/in-group language and they/out-group language. Over time, the in-group and out-group languages may become primary languages of different generations, with the traditional community language being used primarily by older generations of speakers and the new languages by younger generations in the community. The former in-group language then becomes the heritage language, and the former out-group language becomes the ‘we’ language of the younger generations.

The language experience of diasporic communities often goes through the processes of being resisted or marginalised, mainstreamed or assimilated, and memorialised (Li Wei, 2016a). Whilst individuals may be welcomed into the hostland communities, immigrant

groups and their languages as a whole tend to be received negatively at the beginning. This may be largely due to ignorance and perceived threat to the cohesion of the local community. From the immigrants' point of view, if their number is small, they may feel isolated and their language use is restricted; and if the number is large, they might encounter segregation. Either way, they may experience marginalisation. The collective coping strategies for the immigrants often involve building the so-called "three pillars of the diaspora" (Li Wei, 2016a), namely, a community or townsfolk association, a school, and a communication network and media that usually begins with information newsletters and pamphlets, moving gradually to proper newspapers and magazines, and eventually to radio, television and, increasingly, digital and online media. These three pillars of the diaspora play crucial roles in community language policy and planning.

Paradoxically perhaps, the more successful an immigrant group is in building a community for themselves through establishing the three pillars of diaspora, the more pressure they may come under for mainstreaming and assimilation. Societies do not generally favour the idea of having too many different communities minding their own business and speaking their own languages. Under the discourse of community cohesion, immigrant communities, however successful and self-sufficient they may be, are pushed to assimilate with the so-called mainstream society. Of course, there are individuals and groups who do prefer to assimilate. And their efforts to do so often involve intermarriage, changing their names, and adopting a new language. Yet not everybody has the opportunity to assimilate even if they wanted to. The vast majority of immigrant groups are ignored and become invisible over time, leaving the most and the least socio-economically successful ones to stand out. In Britain, for example, different immigrant groups are perceived and treated very differently by the general public and the media. The majority of them rarely get any notice or mention. A small group is seen as forming problematic communities, such as the

Bangladeshis in terms of their children's educational achievement and the Romanians in terms of their economic and labour market status. Another small group, on the other hand, such as the Indian and the Chinese, is often held as examples of success especially in educational and economic terms.

Many diasporic communities get memorialised over time, by both their own descendants and the mainstream society. Tsuda (2013), for example, talks about what he calls 'double nostalgias', the deflation of the romantic notions of both the homeland and the place of sojourn. Older immigrants are often invited to relive their own and their families' experiences during the earlier phases of migration and settlement and construct stories of prolonged struggle and eventual success. Younger generations are taught to learn lessons from such experiences, which are constructed to be relevant to the challenges of contemporary society. All over the world, we see the setting up of museums of history of migration. The heritagization of community languages is another case in point. The processes of being resisted, mainstreamed and memorialised may not be a simple linear one; they could happen simultaneously in some communities, where different generations or sub-groups are being subjected to different pressures.

In addition to the three pillars of the diaspora, there are other community-based agencies for language reclamation, renewal, revitalisation, and revival, usually for communities that have already experienced language shift or loss. In the 1980s, Australia developed a language centre model, with the foundation of the Kimberley Language Resource Centre in the northwest of Western Australia. It is managed locally, and thus is more able to understand and meet the needs of local language communities. Some of the activities of the centre include coordinating local research projects, training staff in formal courses and through apprenticeship, hiring external linguists as necessary on short and longer-term contracts, acting as regional repositories and archives for data, and as a resource

production centre. Similar centres have been set up in other locations internationally, for example, the Yukon Native Language Center in Whitehorse, Yukon, and the Yinka Dené Language Institute in British Columbia, in Canada; the Centre for Endangered Languages Documentation (CELD) in Papua; the Academy for Kanak Languages, Agence de Développement de la Culture Kanak (ADCK) in New Caledonia; the Alaska Native Language Center, the Dena'ina Natuh and the Sealaska Heritage Institute in Alaska; the Three Rivers Language Center in Indiana, and the Navaho Language Academy in Window Rock, Arizona, in the USA. (More information about such community language centres can be found at the website of the Resource Network for Linguistic Diversity: http://www.rnld.org/.)

There are, of course, constraints on what communities can do in terms of policy and planning regarding their own languages, and these constraints are not simply a matter of resources; rather, higher order social policies often have a crucial impact. More and more countries require new migrants to pass citizenship tests that also require the knowledge of the national language (Extra et al., 2009). Pupils from linguistic minority backgrounds in schools do not have equal rights to their 'home' or 'heritage' languages and can only receive education in the majority language. Indeed the idea of 'home' or 'heritage' language can be seen as a result of compartmentalization and marginalization of community languages. In public discourses, not speaking the national or majority language is often constructed as a cause of social problems affecting community cohesion and the socio-cultural and economic welfare of the nation, even national security (Brecht & Rivers, 2000; Pérez-Milans, 2015).

The possibilities and constraints of language policy and planning facing mobile and minority communities highlight the need for grassroots actions beyond institutionalised contexts. We turn now to these.

Grassroots and the Everyday

The shift of sociological attention to the practice-based notion of community in late modernity points to the importance of grassroots actions and the everyday. For any policy and planning initiative to succeed, it needs the buy-in from ordinary members of the community in their daily social practices. For that reason, initiatives and actions from the grassroots are more powerful and can influence not only individuals' everyday behaviour but also their beliefs and values, which will have a longer term impact. The above mentioned three pillars of the diaspora - townsfolk associations, heritage language schools, and community media – are agencies of grassroots actions from within the community. They play a crucial part in the everyday lives of transnationals and impact directly on their linguistic and other social practices.

Understanding the everyday practices of individuals provides insights into how society works overall. And there is no better place to understand everyday language policy and planning than in the family. In Spolsky's (2009) language management model, the family is an important domain for language policy and planning. It represents the everyday practices of individuals with shared heritage. Families are not given but made. They are complex systems of relationships across time and space. They are the place where planning takes place on an everyday basis and where policies are developed, negotiated, accepted or rejected. They are the location of grassroots actions. There is an increasing body of literature on family language policy (King, Fogle & Logan-Terry, 2008), and indeed effective management of family language policy is seen to be crucial in the maintenance and shift of community languages in particular.

Studies of multilingual diasporic families reveal a common recurrent pattern of the first generation migrants struggling to learn the languages of the new resident country, whilst their local-born children face the challenge of maintaining the home/heritage language (e.g.

Li Wei, 1994; Schecter & Bayley, 1997; Shin, 2005; Lanza, 2007; Zhu Hua, 2008; Li & Zhu, 2011). If there are grandparents joining the family in their new setting, they often take up the responsibility of childcare and interact primarily with other family and community members, and have relatively little opportunity for learning new languages. Members of diasporic families have to face these different challenges together as a unit: the presence of monolingual grandparents is as much an issue to them as children not wanting or being able to speak the home language in their everyday family life. Diasporic families also face the challenges of constructing new identities and fighting against prejudices and stereotypes, sometimes caused by their members not speaking the languages of the resident country.

Two issues have been highlighted by existing research on the changing sociolinguistic configurations in transnational families: necessity and opportunity. In most cases, it is necessary to have a good knowledge of the languages of the new resident country, as it would enable members of the transnational family to access services, education and employment. Yet, opportunities for learning the languages are not always readily available. For instance, in the UK, funding for ESOL (English for Speakers of Other Languages) provision has been gradually removed, and the Ethnic Minority Achievement Grant, which was used to fund bilingual teaching assistants in schools for pupils whose English is an additional language, has been mainstreamed into the Direct Schools Grant covering everything from buildings to stationery (NALDIC, online; NASUWT, 2012).

Another example regarding home/heritage languages is that whilst transnational families often find it necessary to maintain them for domestic communication, especially where there are monolingual grandparents around, opportunities are not equally available across different home/heritage languages for the children to learn and maintain them. Again in the UK, some immigrant languages such as Bengali (150,000 speakers in the 2011 UK census) and Farsi (76,000 speakers) are taught in community schools and classes, while

others such as Kashmiri (115,000 speakers) and Tagalog (70,000 speakers) are not. Within the same ethnic community, there are better opportunities to learn and use some languages than others. In the Chinese community, for example, varieties of Chinese such as Mandarin and Cantonese are taught in heritage language schools, but no school teaches Hakka (approximately 10,000 speakers in the UK) or Hokkien (approximately 4,000 in the UK), which also have significant numbers of speakers in the Chinese diaspora worldwide.

Families' and individuals' motivations for learning, maintaining and using languages, however, often go beyond necessity and opportunity. They are tied to the families' and individuals' sense of belonging and imagination. As scholars in diaspora studies point out, transnationals construct and negotiate their identities, everyday life and activities in ways that overcome the ethnic identity versus assimilation dilemma, suppressing or neutralising past differences and establishing commonality and connectivity in building of a transnational imagination (e.g. Cohen, 1997). This imagination provides a site of hope and new beginnings (Brah, 1996, p. 193). Rather than looking back in a nostalgic effort of recovering or maintaining their identity, they discover or construct notions of who they are and where and what home is by essentially looking forward. The transnational imagination also motivates the families' decisions regarding their everyday language practices.

As well as the family, new, virtual communities are also important sources for aspiration and imagination and important sites for language policy and planning. The connectivities provided by the new media and information technologies also connect individuals, families and communities across geographical and time boundaries. The Internet is now widely used as an effective tool for language maintenance and learning, as well as for everyday communication with relatives and friends in far away places. Moreover, the netizens of the world exploit the affordances of the Internet and take control of the multilingual, multimodal and multisemiotic resources available to them in creating

communication spaces for the articulation of their experiences and subjectivities. These spaces present a challenge to language police and planning by the state and public institutions. They are spaces for grassroots actions. Studies have shown that netizens use their multilingual creativity to escape censorship, organise protests, and promote activism (Wozniak, 2015; Li Wei, 2016b).

So far we have been discussing what mobile and minority communities and individuals have done and can do in response to the constraints as well as possibilities afforded by the conditions of late modernity. The final section of this chapter will look at what new challenges such conditions pose to community languages and what the solutions may be.

New Challenges: Post-Multilingualism and Translanguaging

The connectivities and the flow of information and culture between individuals and communities across time and space that are characteristic of life of the 21st century present new challenges to multilingualism. Late modern societies are no longer content with simple recognition and acceptance of different languages, but are concerned with the process as well as consequence of language contact. There seems to be a dilemma between the desire to protect the identity and integrity of individual languages whilst recognizing and even promoting the fluidity of linguistic diversity and contact between languages. This is a particularly tough and sensitive question in the field of language endangerment, where tremendous efforts have been made to protect individual languages whilst the sociolinguistic environment may be such that there is no monolingual speaker in the community who has ever had a monolingual experience. This is what I have called a post-multilingualism challenge (Li Wei, 2016b).

Another example of the post-multilingualism challenge is that language users increasingly find themselves having to deal with the question of how to express one's cultural values through a language, or languages, that is/are traditionally associated with the Other or Others. For many transnationals, their personal family history of migration often involves learning 'foreign' languages that carry 'foreign' values. They need to learn to use the language without necessarily accepting the cultural values and ideologies that the language typically carries; on the contrary, they need to learn to understand the values, ideologies and practices through learning the language and to construct and articulate their own values, ideologies and subjectivities through their newly acquired languages.

One response to the post-multilingualism challenges of the kind outlined here is translanguaging – the dynamic process whereby multilingual language users mediate complex social and cognitive activities through strategic and creative employment of multiple semiotic resources to act, to know and to be (Garcia & Li Wei, 2014; Li Wei, 2011). Translanguaging represents a grassroots effort to push and break the boundaries between the old and the new, the conventional and original, and the acceptable and the challenging. Studies in both educational and other settings have shown that multilingual language users, especially those in less privileged positions in the social hierarchies, have a natural tendency to question and problematise received wisdom and to fight against any imposed order and ideologies (Li & Wu, 2009; Garcia & Li Wei, 2014). With regard to language, monolingual ideologies in the form of one language only or one language at a time still dominate many societies of today. Multilingual language users engage in translanguaging to challenge these ideologies. In doing so, they demonstrate their creativity and criticality.

As the contact and flow between people, cultures and languages intensify in the 21st century, notions of the community, community language, and multilingualism change. The foci and challenges of language policy and planning also change. The liquidity and reflexivity

that Bauman highlights of late modernity motivate hybridity and dynamic multilingualism, on the one hand, and protection and preservation of traditional, individual languages, on the other. Technological advances offer new affordances for communicating beyond the conventional linguistic boundaries, incorporating multimodal and multisensory semiotic resources. The translanguaging perspective aims to transcend not only the boundaries between languages, but also between language and other cognitive and semiotic systems, as well as to transcend the divides between disciplines and research paradigms.

References

Anderson, B. (1991). *Imagined communities: Reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism*. Revised edition. London: Verso

Bauman, Z. (2000). *Liquid modernity*. Cambridge: Polity

Block, D. (2008). On the appropriateness of the metaphor LOSS. In P. Tan & R. Rubdy (Eds.), *Language as commodity: Global structures, local marketplaces* (pp. 187–203). London: Continuum.

Blommaert, J. & Rampton, B. (2011). Language and superdiversity. *Diversities* 13(2), 1-22.

Bourdieu, P. (1977). *Outline of a theory of practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Brah, A. (1996). *Cartographies of diaspora: Contesting identities*. London: Routledge

Brecht, R. D., & Rivers, W. P. (2000). *Language and national security in the 21st century: The role of title VI/Fulbright-Hays in supporting national language capacity*. Dubuque, IA: Kendall/Hunt Publishing Company.

Canagarajah, S. (2012). *Translingual practice: Global Englishes and cosmopolitan relations*. Routledge.

Castells, M. (2010). *The information age: Economy, society and culture, Vol. 1: the rise of the network society* (2nd edition). Oxford: Wiley Blackwell.

Clifford, J. (1997). *Routes: Travel and translation in the late twentieth century*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Clyne, M. (1991). *Community languages: The Australian experience.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Christensen, K. & Levinson, D. (2003). *Encyclopedia of community: From the village to the virtual world*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE

Cohen, R. (1997). *Global diasporas: An introduction*. London: UCL Press

Cohen, R. & Vertovec, S. (Eds.) (1999). *Migration, diasporas and transnationalism*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.

Delanty, G. (2010). *Community* (2nd edition). New York: Routledge

Eckert, P. (2000). *Linguistic variation as social practice*. Oxford: Blackwell

Extra, G., Spotti, M., & Van Avermaet, P. (Eds.). (2009). *Language testing, migration and citizenship: Cross-national perspectives on integration regimes*. London: A&C Black.

García, O. & Li Wei, L. (2014). *Translanguaging: Language, bilingualism and education*. Houndsmill, Basingtoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Gumperz, J. (1968). The speech community. In D. Sills & R.K. Merton (Eds.), *International encyclopedia of the social sciences* (pp. 381–6). New York: Macmillan.

Hanks, W. (1996). *Language and communicative practices*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press

James, P., Nadarajah, Y., Haive, K., & Stead, V. (2012). *Sustainable communities, sustainable development: Other paths for Papua New Guinea.* Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.

Jørgensen, J. N., Karrebæk, M. S., Madsen, L. M., & Møller, J. S. (2011). Polylanguaging in superdiversity. *Diversities* 13, 23-37.

King, K. A., Fogle, L., & Logan-Terry, A. (2008). Family language policy. *Language and Linguistics Compass* 2(5), 907-922.

Labov, W. (1972). *Sociolinguistic patterns*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press

Lanza, E. (2007). Multilingualism and the family. In P. Auer & Li Wei (Eds.), *Handbook of multilingualism and multilingual communication* (pp. 45-67). Berlin: De Gruyter.

Lave, J. & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Le Page, R. & Tabouret-Keller, A. (1985). *Acts of identity: Creole-based approaches to language and ethnicity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Li Wei (1994). *Three generations two languages one family*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Li Wei (2011). Moment analysis and translanguaging space: Discursive construction of identities by multilingual Chinese youth in Britain. *Journal of Pragmatics* 43, 1222–1235.

Li Wei (2016a). Transnational connections and multilingual realities: The Chinese diasporic experience in a global context. In Li Wei (Ed.), *Multilingualism in the Chinese diaspora worldwide* (pp. 1-12). Oxford: Routledge

Li Wei (2016b). New Chinglish and the post-multilingualism challenge: Translanguaging ELF in China. *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca* 5(1), 1-25.

Li Wei, & Wu, C. J. (2009). Polite Chinese children revisited: Creativity and the use of codeswitching in the Chinese complementary school classroom. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* 12(2), 193-211.

Li Wei & Zhu Hua (2011). Voices from the diaspora: Changing hierarchies and dynamics of Chinese multilingualism. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 205, 155–171.

Mandaville, P. (2001). Reimagining Islam in diaspora: The politics of mediated community. *Gazette* 63(2–3), 169–186.

McMillan, D.W., & Chavis, D.M. (1986). Sense of community: A definition and theory. *Journal of Community Psychology* 14(1), 6-23.

Morley, D. (2000). *Home territories: Media, mobility, identity*. London: Routledge

NALDIC (online) http://www.naldic.org.uk/research-and-information/eal-funding.

NASUWT (2012). *Ethnic minority achievement*. Birmingham: NASUWT.

Pennycook, A., & Otsuji, E. (2015). *Metrolingualism: Language in the city*. New York: Routledge.

Pérez-Milans, M. (2015). Language education policy in late modernity: (Socio)linguistic ethnographies in the European Union. *Language Policy* 14(2), 99-107.

Rampton, B. (2011). From 'multi-ethnic adolescent heteroglossia' to 'contemporary urban vernaculars'. *Language & Communication* 31(4), 276-294.

Rheingold, H. (2000). *The virtual community: Homesteading on the electronic frontier*. Boston, MA: MIT Press.

Schecter, S. R. & R. Bayley. (1997). Language socialization practices and cultural identity: Case studies of Mexican-descent families in California and Texas. *TESOL Quarterly* 31, 513-541.

Silverstein, M. (1985). Language and the culture of gender. In E. Mertz & R. Parmentier (Eds.), *Semiotic mediation* (pp. 219-259). New York: Academic Press.

Shin, S. J. (2005). *Developing in two languages: Korean children in America*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Sofos, S. (1996). Interethnic violence and gendered constructions of ethnicity in former Yugoslavia. *Social Identities* 2(1), 73-91.

Spolsky, B. (2009). *Language management*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Tollefson, J. W. (1991). *Planning language, planning inequality: Language policy in the community*. London: Addison-Wesley Longman.

Tönnies, F. (1887). *Gemeinschaft und gesellschaft*. Leipzig: Fues's Verlag. (Translated, 1957 by C. P. Loomis as *Community and society*. East Lansing: Michigan State University Press.)

Tsagarousianou, R. (2004). Rethinking the concept of diaspora: Mobility, connectivity and communication in a globalized world. *Westminster Papers in Communication and Culture* 1(1), 52-65.

Tsuda, T. (2013). When the diaspora returns home: Ambivalent encounters with the ethnic homeland. In A. Quayson & G. Daswani (Eds), *A companion to diaspora and transnationalism* (pp. 172-198). Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.

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

Wozniak, A. M. (2015). River-crabbed shitizens and missing knives: A sociolinguistic analysis of trends in Chinese language use online as a result of censorship. *Applied Linguistics Review* 6(1), 97-120.

Zhu Hua (2008). Duelling languages, duelling values: Codeswitching in bilingual intergenerational conflict talk in diasporic families. *Journal of Pragmatics* 40, 1799-1816.