

The Social and Linguistic Turns in Literacy Theory A Retrospective and Prospective View*

David Bloome** · Min-Young Kim***

— < 次 例 > —

- I. Introduction
- II. Philosophical Discussions of the Linguistic Turn in the Social Sciences
- III. Philosophical Discussions of the Social Turn in the Study of Literacy
- IV. Reading Sterling Brown's "After Winter" in a Seventh Grade Language Arts Classroom
- V. From the Classroom to the Social Turn in the Study of Literacy and the Linguistic Turn in the Social Sciences

* Manuscript based on presentation at The 17th Seoul National University Korean Language Education Research Institute International Conference, 24 October, 2015. We gratefully acknowledge that the preparation of this manuscript was supported, in part, by the Center for Video Ethnography and Discourse Analysis at The Ohio State University, Department of Teaching and Learning. We also acknowledge the cooperation and contribution of the teacher highlighted in this manuscript, Ms. Wilson (pseudonym). Some of the concepts in this manuscript were based on Bloome and Green (2015).

** EHE Distinguished Professor, The Ohio State University

*** Doctoral Student, The Ohio State University

I. Introduction

There are few topics in educational research that evoke as much passion and debate as the study of literacy.¹⁾ Perhaps this is understandable as contested claims for the effects of the teaching and learning of reading and writing have included the historical evolution of society, the provision of democracy and government by law, the accumulation of knowledge beyond that which an individual mind can hold, the holding of a linear historical perspective, and the development of abstract ways of thinking otherwise unavailable (see Goody & Watt, 1963; Olson, 1977; Ong, 1982). In the U.S. and elsewhere, reading has been viewed by some as foundational to religion, to knowing G_d, and to being saved (from eternal damnation); and as such laws were passed promoting the teaching of reading. For example, in 1642 the Massachusetts Bay Colony passed what is known as the Ole Deluder Satan Law and the General School Law to provide for the teaching of reading to all so that they could learn the biblical scriptures (illiteracy was viewed as a tactic Satan used to deny people knowledge of G_d and what G-D required) (Willis, 1997). Similar views of reading and religion were used to justify missionary schools sponsored by various Christian organizations and the military campaigns that subjugated people (and in some

1) Literacy has been defined in widely different ways (see Bloome, Averill, Hill, & Ryu, 2014); here we use literacy as referring to the use of written language (reading and writing).

cases annihilated them) (Spring, 1994). The passion behind the teaching of literacy has also been driven by economics and politics (Hicks, 2002; Purcell-Gates, 1995; Rose, 1989). Scholars, politicians, educators, and pundits of various kinds have argued that the failure to acquire a particular level of acumen with reading and writing precludes participation in a complex, modern society; and economic organizations take the literacy level of a country into consideration when assessing its economic potential and future and imposing economic and social policies (Archer & Costello, 2013; Bhola, 1985). Political movements and revolutions, such as those in Cuba and Nicaragua, have led to massive literacy campaigns casting illiteracy as a way that ruling classes maintained their control over the lives of the workers and ordinary people (Archer & Costello, 2013). The 'moral' and 'economic' agenda of literacy education has been appropriated by many governments who prescribe both that reading and writing should be taught and how it should be taught. To be against the teaching of reading and writing would position someone to be against history, democracy, G_d, economic advancement, justice and equity, and education itself.

Yet, there have been a growing number of scholars who have questioned the claims made above. For example, Graff (1979, 1987) shows that the empirical evidence just does not support the claims for the economic effects of literacy development. Scribner and Cole (1981) showed that communities and people viewed as illiterate are often very capable of complex abstract thinking, and

that people easily learn to read and write when it follows functions embedded in their daily lives. Street (1995) similarly showed that literacy education is often a way to continue the subjugation of one group by another and to maintain a cultural hegemony. What these scholars, and others (see Gutiérrez, 2008; Heath, 1983; Luke, 1988), are suggesting is not that people should not be taught to read and write; but rather that, first, many people who are often viewed as illiterate often have sophisticated and complex ways of using written language that are consistent with their daily, cultural lives and thus are only 'illiterate' because they do not use written language in ways that more powerful others approve; and second, that *how* people are taught to read and write and *what* they are taught that reading and writing to be are keys to understanding whether the teaching of reading and writing is cultural and political subjugation or whether the teaching of reading and writing supports and respects people's cultural lives and provides economic, political, and social capital giving them and their families and communities more control over their lives (see also Freire, 2000; Freire & Macedo, 1987). From this perspective, literacy does not exist as a thing in and of itself separable from the social, cultural, economic, and political contexts of its use and of its teaching. As Robinson (1987) notes:

It will no longer do, I think, to consider literacy as some abstract, absolute quality attainable through tutelage and the accumulation of knowledge and experience. It will no longer do to think of reading

as a solitary act in which a mainly passive reader responds to cues in a text to find meaning. It will no longer do to think of writing as a mechanical manipulation of grammatical codes and formal structures leading to the production of perfect or perfectible texts. Reading and writing are not unitary skills nor are they reducible to sets of component skills falling neatly under discrete categories (linguistic, cognitive); rather, they are complex human activities taking place in complex human relationships. (p.329).

In order to understand this shift in framing literacy education as “complex human activities taking place in complex human relationships”, it is necessary to understand both the linguistic turn in the social sciences and the social turn in the study of literacy. These turns while primarily articulated in philosophical writings about the nature of knowledge and knowing (e.g. Rorty, 1992) are played out daily in the interactions of teachers and students in classrooms across grade levels, subject areas, and globally. We take the stance that close analysis (cf., thick description, Geertz, 1973) of what happens in the interactions between teachers and students, juxtaposed with the history of philosophy of language and knowledge, reflects and refracts the evolution of the linguistic turn in the social sciences and the social turn in the study of literacy.

We begin by briefly reviewing the philosophical discussions of the linguistic turn in the social sciences and the social turn in the study of literacy. However, as there are numerous discussions of

these turns elsewhere (see Bloome & Green, 2015; Gee, 1999), we focus on the analysis of a seventh grade classroom language arts lesson and what can be learned about the nature of language, literacy, and education from that lesson. In brief, the argument we are making here is that one is never only teaching or researching literacy *per se*; as a teacher or researcher the way one does one's work - the way one teaches literacy and the way one studies literacy and literacy education - is always promulgating definitions of spoken and written language, philosophies of knowledge and knowing, and what it means to be a person in the world.

II. Philosophical Discussions of the Linguistic Turn in the Social Sciences

The linguistic turn in the study of social science is grounded in the acknowledgement that language is the agent through which the social world and social phenomena are represented, organized, and constructed (e.g. Habermas, 2001; Rorty, 1992). As Volosinov (1929/1973) notes, "What is important about the word is not so much its sign purity as its *social ubiquity*. The word is implicated in literally each and every act or contact between people - in collaboration on the job, in ideological exchanges, in the chance contacts of ordinary life, in political relationships, and so on."

(p.19)

Recognition of the centrality of language in fashioning knowledge and in the representation of social phenomena has taken place in various fields including anthropology (e.g., Clifford & Marcus, 1986; Collins, 1995; Gumperz, 1986; Hymes, 1974), sociology (e.g., Fishman, 1987), linguistics (e.g. Silverstein, 1985; Volosinov, 1929/1973), the natural sciences (e.g., Latour, 1987; Lemke, 1990) as well as literacy studies (e.g. Cook-Gumperz, 1986; Heath, 1982; Street, 1984). Briefly stated, whether we are researchers, educators, or otherwise, in our daily lives we use language to explore and understand the world, to craft our social relationships, to share emotions and imagination, to understand ourselves and others, to build social institutions, to create and exchange cultural and economic capital, and to construct bodies and fields of knowledge. Yet, the language we use is neither neutral nor transparent; it asserts itself, in part, by creating conceptual categories and then filling those categories with attributes; it asserts itself through its grammatical, textual, and rhetorical structures fashioning relationships among concepts (constituting cultural ideologies); and language asserts itself through how it is used (and the cultural norms for its use) within specific situations in connecting texts, events, and contexts over time (Bloome et al., 2009; Bloome & Egan-Robertson, 1993).

Inherent to any use of language or any word, is that it simultaneously looks backward and forward while connecting people with each other. As Volosinov (1929/1973: 10–11) writes:

“A sign does not simply exist as a part of reality - it reflects and refracts another reality ... Signs emerge, after all, only in the interaction between one individual consciousness and another.” Language is always retrospective and prospective; what is at issue is recognizing how it is so. It is in this sense that we can view language as inherently dialogic and social; and such a recognition also implicates education as ubiquitously defined by the use of language. Language is not simply a set of structures, concepts, and norms for usage; rather, it is a dynamic system for the constructed reflection of what has gone before intimately coupled with a reconstructed (refracted) future which is inseparable from ourselves as it constitutes (both as reflection and refraction), who we are, were, and are becoming, what we have done, are doing and will do. More simply stated, our individual and collective understanding of the world is mediating through our individual and collective uses of language.

The linguistic turn leads us to broaden our view in studying language and literacy. It will no longer do to ask ‘what is the meaning of a particular spoken or written text?’. Rather, to ask about meaning one needs to go beyond text and must ask about how the text reflects and refracts what has gone before, about how it is used within the specific social situation in which it is used, including by whom, when, and with what connections to what social and cultural contexts. There can be no separation of the text from the social event and the social practices in which it is embedded; it must be understood as part of how people act and

react to each other (cf., Bloome et al., 2005). It is to redefine meaning as what Silverstein (1985: 220) calls “the total linguistic fact” (see also Blommaert, 2015: 6, on the “total semiotic fact”).

III. Philosophical Discussions of the Social Turn in the Study of Literacy

The social turn in the study of literacy is embedded in the linguistic turn in the social sciences. Implicit in the linguistic turn was the intimate relationship of language and social life. No bit of language - no word, no text, no conversational exchange - can be viewed as a simple transmission of information from a speaker or writer to a listener or reader. Yet, for the most part, the linguistic turn in the social sciences has gone unacknowledged in researching and teaching literacy. It has long been the pervasive view that writing and reading are a mechanistic transmission of information between a speaker and a listener or between a reader and a writer. Within this view, the questions asked have concerned the skills and strategies of the writer and the the reader as they are engaged in encoding and decoding meaning, respectively, with and from texts (e.g. Pressley, 1998; RAND, 2002).

This view of literacy has been questioned by the social turn in the study of language and literacy. The social turn in the study of

literacy refers to the shift in the view of literacy from the literacy as an autonomous set of cognitive and psychological *skills and abilities* to the view of literacy as a socially and culturally situated practice. How people use written language varies depending upon the social situation, the configuration of people involved, the cultural and historical context, and the diverse institutional, political, economic, and social ideologies people collectively hold (see Barton & Hamilton, 1998; Gee, 1999; Street, 1984, 1995). The view of literacy as social practice. means that it is not a decontextualized or individualized intellectual endeavor, but a social, concerted activity in which people act and react to each other (cf., Bloome et al., 2005). As such, literacy is defined as those social events and social practices in which the use of written language is non-trivial (cf., Heath, 1980; Street, 1984).

Consider a classroom situation in which the teacher and students are reading Shakespeare's *Merchant of Venice*. The teacher asks the students, "What is the meaning of this play?" The teacher is following a curriculum guide produced by the State Department of Education which is following the federal government's guidelines endorsed by the local board of education. The guide informs the teacher about what questions to ask and what constitutes correct answers. The students, all seventh graders, want to do well and earn a grade of "A" so they can advance to the next grade and take classes oriented to preparing them for university. The students are all Christian except for one Jewish student. The Jewish student knows the answer that the

teacher wants to hear, but he is conflicted. The play builds on anti-Semitic stereotypes of Jews. The Jewish student has resented having to read the play and has resented the teacher for teaching it. But, given the social context - who the other students are, what he knows are the expected correct answers, the risk that would be taken to protest the play as anti-Semitic - he keeps quiet, effectively silenced. He is angry at himself for not protesting, believing that he has betrayed the Jewish community by being silent. There is no separation between the text of the play and the event in which it is read and discussed; part of the 'total linguistic fact' is that the meaning of this play is driven by the dominant cultural and state supported ideology (including the educational ideology) framing the event of its reading. The tensions that exist - and the fact that they are not noticed by the teacher and the other students (cf., a form of erasure, Derrida, 1978) - is the consequence of the presence of an alternative cultural ideology embodied by the presence of the Jewish student (whose Jewishness is made invisible). Having been silenced and made invisible during the teaching of *The Merchant of Venice* the Jewish student reframes all that has happened in the class before that "reading" while also reconsidering the nature of his participation in future "reading" events and how he might make and articulate 'meaning' during those events.

The tension that exists in this specific classroom implies that reading is not an autonomous or decontextualized cognitive

endeavor of an individual in isolation. Rather, it takes place in a particular context where social and cultural ideologies are at play (and, they are always at play whether acknowledged or not). Street (1984, 1995) has provided a way to characterize these two different views of literacy; the one represented by the teacher, the school, and the state and the one manifest in the tensions. Street contrasts an 'autonomous model of literacy' with an 'ideological model of literacy'. An autonomous model considers literacy as given and prescribed ways of reading and writing, a set of cognitive and linguistic skills that are relatively stable regardless of social context, and as such frames people who lack these cognitive and linguistic skills as 'deficit'. And those who remain deficit become labeled illiterate. Within this autonomous model, the Jewish student's conundrum is not considered a literacy issue. The ideological model of literacy assumes that there are multiple sets of literacy practices (ways of using written language) and that these sets of literacy practice are socially situated and derivative of the diverse cultural ideologies of diverse social institutions, cultures, and societies. Literacy does not reside in an individual mind as a neutral apparatus but in social events and practices deeply rooted in a specific culture, history, ideology, epistemology, and ontology.

What follows in next section is close look at how a teacher and students use written language within a classroom lesson. Using principles from microethnographic discourse analysis, we provide a thick description of who is doing what, when, where and how

with written language; that is, how people employ written language in how they act and react to each other. While in part our goal is to illustrate how the linguistic and social turns we described above are manifest in the actual events of a classroom, we also use this thick description to deepen and broaden our understanding of these two philosophical turns.

IV. Reading Sterling Brown's "After Winter" in a Seventh Grade Language Arts Classroom

Ms. Wilson's²⁾ seventh grade language arts classroom had 26 students (students approximately 13 years old); of them all but six were African-American. All of the students came from local working class and low-income neighborhoods. The school contained only grades seven and eight and the school had a reputation for poor academic achievement. Ms. Wilson was a young, African-American teacher with a Masters degree in literacy education with an emphasis on sociolinguistics, language variation, and ethnography.

The lesson on which we focus occurred toward the end of the academic year. At the beginning of the lesson the students read the poem, "After Winter" by Sterling Brown. Sterling Brown is a well-known and highly regarded African-American poet. Each

2) All names are pseudonyms.

student had a copy of the poem. The teacher read the poem aloud and then directed the students to form small peer groups and to read the poem aloud in the group twice and to discuss what the poem was about. She gave the students time to do so and then began a whole class discussion about the poem. She began by asking the students to share what they discussed (what the poem was about) and then she oriented the students to the historical period to which the poem is referring. (A transcript of this part of the discussion can be found in the Appendix).

Before analyzing the instructional conversation, it is important to note the default and dominant framework in U.S. education for teaching literacy. Emphasis is placed on the cognitive skills, processes, and strategies involved in decoding the meaning of a written text. What is at issue is providing students with those cognitive skills, processes, and strategies to accurately and efficiently decode the meaning of the text (what Street, 1984, calls an autonomous model of literacy). However, as the analysis that follows shows, Ms. Wilson provides a different model and definition of reading and literacy.

Ms. Wilson begins by orienting students to the historical period in U.S. history to which the poem refers (lines 01 to 21). This historical reference is not explicit; rather, one needs to take the stance that a text - indeed any use of language - is historical, located in time, and thus it is essential to ask what its historical context is (or might be). Given its historical context and the history of the U.S., Ms. Wilson frames their reading of the poem

in terms of race relations and the history and legacy of slavery. She then shifts the discussion to consider language variation and the social context of language variation. She connects language variation with assumptions about inherent intelligence versus levels of education (lines 16 to 21), language ideology (some dialects are more prestigious than others) (lines 115 to 167), language acquisition (lines 36 to 50), the relationship of varieties of English to race (lines 32 and 33), to registers of language (lines 64 to 107) and to ideologies of racial hierarchy (lines 54 to 60, 108).

What is at issue here, however, is not the specific concepts of language that she is offering (although the students continue to discuss those concepts even after class); but rather her engagement with students in reflecting on the nature of language and its relationship to the social context. That is, she is offering them an intellectual framework for using language as a way to understand and interrogate the world in which they live.

One of the reasons that Ms. Wilson's focus on language variation and social context is remarkable is the language ideology that the students themselves hold. Most of the students, and most of the people in their families and community as well as in U.S. society more generally assume that there is a proper way of speaking with other ways of speaking being wrong (slang). And that these ways of speaking are associated with the quality of the person. As Danielle says:

110. D: It all depends how you carry yourself because
111. I mean
112. there some black people that talk proper and slang and there
some white people who talk proper and slang
113. so it all depends if you wanna talk that way
114. you gonna talk that way

But Ms. Wilson will not leave such a language ideology unchallenged. She challenges this language ideology by problematizing the linguistic concept of taking proper and talking slang

115. Tw: OK
116. What is proper and what is slang ↑
117. *Help me out*

Although she does not use the sophisticated terminology of semiotics, she is engaging students in sophisticating process of deconstructing the relationship of sign, signified, and signifier. To help them learn the practice of deconstruction (a critical component of the linguistic turn in the social sciences), she tells her students a personal narrative (lines 118 to 129). Her doing so is not mere happenstance or simply providing an example for clarification. Ms. Wilson is incorporating fundamental principles from Critical Race Theory, especially the primacy of personal narratives of experience (cf., Crenshaw, 1995). What is at issue here is what counts as legitimate knowledge for building

language ideologies (if the teacher can use personal narratives for building a metadiscourse about language and knowledge, then it is validated for the students to do so similarly).

Ms. Wilson laminates and supplants the deconstruction of “proper” and “slang” with the concept of “sounding white.” As occurred earlier in their classroom discussion, language variation is framed as language hierarchy and associated with racial hierarchy. The language hierarchy is taken by some to validate racial hierarchy, and reciprocally racial hierarchy validates linguistic hierarchy. Ms. Wilson incorporates the students into problematizing these relationships of language and social structure; but she does so by positioning the students to do the deconstruction and problematizing rather than lecturing them on it. She asks them, “Who can explain this concept [sounding white] to me” (line 138) and “What is sounding white?” (lines 139, 144). She asks these questions of both the African-American students and the white students as these issues of language ideology are not just issues for the African-American students.

Perhaps because Ms. Wilson earlier used a personal narrative as a source of knowledge (and had done so throughout the academic year), Danielle offers a personal narrative to provide insight in response to the question, “Who can explain to the concept of sounding white?”³⁾ Danielle begins to offer a story about what happened to her at lunch but she gets interrupted by

3) We have transcribed the line as uttered; it is often the case that actual utterances include substitutions and restarts but are heard as seamless.

Andrew who mocks Danielle's use of "I be."

One way to interpret Andrew's interruption is the use of a language ideology to construct a hierarchical social relationship (the relationship of Andrew to Danielle) and to challenge the legitimacy of African-American Language as a legitimate language for use in the classroom and for providing knowledge and insight. The linguistic structure "I be" - which is the utterance that Andrew derides - is the habitual case of the verb "to be" within African-American Language.⁴⁾ Ms. Wilson retells Andrew's interruption and by exaggerating what Andrew said (lines 150 "when you said | when I be | Andrew said *when I be ha ha ha*") mocks his implied claim that "I be" is an improper linguistic structure and that it indexes a derogatory character. (Apparently during line 151 Andrew says "I am" as the more proper utterance that Danielle 'should' have said - see line 154 as the basis of this inference).

Although Ms. Wilson makes it clear that Andrew's interruption is misguided (both with regard to politeness and language ideology), she does not explain to the students the basis for characterizing it as misguided. Instead, she asks them, "What does I be mean?" (line 155). One student translates "I be" as "I am" (line 156), which is inaccurate in terms of meaning but it does reveal the ideological social preference for what is called Standard English over African-American Language. Ms. Wilson

4) African-American Language is also called African-American English, African-American Vernacular English, and Ebonics.

does a small bit of a dance in response. It is not clear how to interpret this dance. Given the students' reactions, it does not seem to be taken as sarcasm or mockery, it may have been an effort to reduce the tension (there seemed to be tension among the students over Andrew's interruption) and encourage dialogue. In line 159, a student clarifies the language ideology behind Andrew's interruption. This is taken by Tiffany as a criticism of Danielle and in so doing reframes the interruption as an issue of hypocrisy. Yet, to claim it is hypocrisy is to overlook the language ideology at issue and reinforces the hierarchy involved in the particular language ideology Andrew offers. Although it is true that Andrew does say, "I be" when he is in conversation with friends and thus his criticism of Danielle is hypocritical, that is not the issue Ms. Wilson is raising. She raises the issue again by asking the students if she, as the teacher and thus someone who can be assumed to use language in a "proper" manner, ever says "I be". A student confirms that, as teacher, Ms. Wilson doesn't make mistakes (line 164); but it is not clear whether the student is affirming that "I be" is a legitimate linguistic structure or whether she is denying that Ms. Wilson says "I be." However, another student says that "I be" is not a mistake (line 166) and connects the appropriateness of "I be" and of African-American Language by connecting it to pride in how African-Americans talk. It is both an assertion of a language ideology that assumes equality among varieties of English and a political statement of pride in and respect for African-American language and the

African-American community.

The classroom discussion continues in a similar manner until the end of the lesson. Just before the bell rings and the students move on to their next class, the teacher tells the students:

402. we're gonna save this part of the dialogue because
I'm gonna give you a second poem
403. S?: Ms. W
404. SS: *Students yell out comments, talk with each other*
405. Tw: OK
406. Hold on, hold on hold on
407. Whatever it is I want you to marinate on your
thoughts and then
408. think about yourself in relationship to your
comments
409. use
410. a lot of you are making excellent comments but they
are devoid of you as a person
411. It's very easy to make generalizations about people
or about other people when you're able to take
yourself out of it
412. But when you put yourself back into your
statements
413. put yourself in relationship to your comments you're
making
414. and then see if the comment still works

What happens at the end of the lesson is important for several

reasons. First, it reveals the teacher's framing of the lesson as the teaching of a particular practice of reading. That is, what they are learning is a way of reading (a way of reading that varies distinctly from the dominant and state sponsored model of reading and literacy). They will be reading another poem soon and using what they have learned on this day - a particular literacy practice with an accompanying cultural ideology - for how they will read this second poem. Part of this reading practice is revealed in lines 408 to 414; students need to think about what they are saying in terms of their own lives and experiences. This is consistent with the teacher's use of personal narratives in this lesson and previous lessons and her protection of students who use personal narratives to explore concepts and ideas (such as Danielle's personal narrative). The reading practice she is promulgating and offering to her students is the use of a text as a tool and a prop for examining, deconstructing and reconstructing the worlds in which they live including their own lives. As such, she is inviting them to juxtapose their personal stories - their narrativization of their experiences - with the literary text, constructing an intertextual space that provides opportunities for challenging extant and dominant language, social, and racial ideologies. Reading in this classroom is less about the construction of decontextualized representation of a text (which from the perspectives of the social turn in the study of literacy and the linguistic turn in the social sciences is a non sequitur) and more about acting on the world in which the

students live.

V. From the Classroom to the Social Turn in the Study of Literacy and the Linguistic Turn in the Social Sciences

We have briefly discussed two turns in the intellectual and philosophical contexts of teaching and researching literacy: the linguistic turn in the social sciences and the social turn in the study of literacy. These turns challenge the taken-for-granted dominant conception of literacy as a mechanistic transmission of information from an author to a reader in which writers and readers employ a relatively stable set of cognitive and linguistic skills and strategies. These turns place how people use language in specific events - in the ways in which they use written language in how they act and react to each other - as central in constituting what is happening and how written language means, the total semiotic fact (cf., Blommaert, 2015, 2016). Our analysis of a brief excerpt from a classroom events not only illustrated how the linguistic and social turns are manifest in classroom literacy events, how any literacy event reflects and refracts what has gone before, but also how these philosophical turns manifest themselves in language ideologies, curriculum, and instruction. Further, the analysis pushes our understanding of the linguistic and social turns further. These turns implicate how personhood is

situationally defined. Are the students merely educational objects to be defined in terms of how well they display acumen on a set of predetermined and decontextualized cognitive skills (that may or may not be pertinent to the ‘total semiotic fact’ of the set of classroom events)? Or, are they to be defined in as agentive in using written language to redefine and act upon the worlds in which they live in ways that validate and respect their cultural and linguistic heritage and future?*

References

- Archer, D., & Costello, P. (2013), *Literacy and power: The Latin American battleground*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Barton, D., & Hamilton, M. (1998), *Local literacies: Reading and writing in one community*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Bhola, H. S. (1985). “A policy analysis of adult literacy promotion in the Third World: An accounting of promises made and promises fulfilled”, *International Review of Education*, 30(3), pp.249-264.
- Blommaert, J. (2015), “Chronotopes, scales and complexity in the study of language in society”, *Annual Review of Anthropology 4 (Tilburg Papers in Culture Studies: No. 121)*, pp.1-24.
- Blommaert, J. (2016), “Meaning as a nonlinear effect: The birth of cool”, *AILA Review 28*, pp.7-27.
- Bloome, D., Averill, J., Hill, H., & Ryu, S. (2014), “Ideologies and their

* 이 논문은 2015. 11. 20. 투고되었으며, 2015. 11. 26. 심사가 시작되어 2015. 12. 4. 심사가 완료되었고, 2015. 12. 13. 편집위원회 심의를 거쳐 게재가 확정되었음.

- consequences in defining literacies - An essay”, In P. J. Dunston, S. K. Fullerton, C. C. Bates, P. M. Stecker, M. Cole, A. Hall, D. Herro, & K. Headley (Eds.), *63rd Yearbook of the Literacy Research Association*. (pp. 61-78). Altamonte Springs, FL: Literacy Research Association.
- Bloome, D., Beierle, M., Grigorenko, M. & Goldman, S. (2009), “Learning over time: uses of intertextuality, collective memories, and classroom chronotopes in the construction of learning opportunities in a ninth-grade language arts classroom.”, *Language and Education*, 23(4), pp.313-334.
- Bloome, D., Cater, S. P., Christian, B. M., Otto, S., & Shuart-Faris, N. (2005), *Discourse analysis and the study of classroom language and literacy events: A microethnographic perspective*. New York, NY: Taylor & Francis.
- Bloome, D., & Egan-Robertson, A. (1993), “The social construction of intertextuality in classroom reading and writing lessons”, *Reading Research Quarterly*, 28(4), pp.304-333.
- Bloome, D., & Green, J. (2015), “The social and linguistic turns in studying language and literacy”, In J. Rowsell, & K. Pahl (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of literacy studies* (pp.19-34). New York, NY: Taylor & Francis.
- Clifford, J. & Marcus, C. (1986), *Writing culture: The poetics and politics of ethnography*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Collins, J (1995), “Literacy and literacies”, *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 24, pp.75-93.
- Cook-Gumperz, J. (Ed.) (1986), *The social construction of literacy*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Crenshaw, K. (1995), *Critical race theory: The key writings that formed the movement*. New York, NY: The New Press.
- Derrida, J. (1978), *Writing and difference [Trans. Alan Bass]*. London & New York: Routledge.

- Fishman, S. (1987), *Ideology, society and language: The Odyssey of Nathan Birnbaum*. Ann Arbor: Karoma Publishers.
- Freire, P. (2000), *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York, NY: Continuum.
- Freire, P. & Macedo, D. (1987), *Literacy: Reading the word and the world*. South Hadley, MA: Bergin & Garvey Publishers.
- Gee, J. P. (1999), "The future of the social turn: Social minds and the New Capitalism", *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 32(1-2), pp.61-68.
- Geertz, C. (1973), *The interpretation of cultures*. New York, NY: Basic Books Inc.
- Goody, J., & Watt, I. (1963), "The consequences of literacy", *Comparative studies in society and history*, 5(3), pp.304-345.
- Graff, H. (1979), *The literacy myth: Literacy and social structure in the 19th century city*. New York, NY: Academic Press.
- Graff, H. (1987), *The legacies of literacy: Continuities and contradictions in western culture and society*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.
- Gumperz, J. (1986), *Discourse strategies*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Gutiérrez, K. D. (2008), "Developing a sociocritical literacy in the third space" *Reading Research Quarterly*, 43(2), pp.148-164.
- Habermas, J. (2001), *On the pragmatics of social interaction: Preliminary studies in the theory of communicative action*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Heath, S. B. (1980), "The function and uses of literacy", *Journal of Communication*, 30(1), pp.123-133.
- Heath, S. B. (1982), "What no bedtime story means: Narrative skills at home and school", *Language in Society*, 11(1), pp.49-67.
- Heath, S. B. (1983), *Ways with words: Language, life, and work in communities and classrooms*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Hicks, D. (2002), *Reading lives: Working-class children and literacy learning*.

- New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Hymes, D. (1974), *The foundations of sociolinguistics: Sociolinguistic ethnography*. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Latour, B (1987), *Science in action: How to follow scientists and engineers through society*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Lemke, J. L. (1990), *Talking sciences: Language, learning, and values*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Luke, A. (1988), "The non-neutrality of literacy instruction: A critical introduction", *Australian Journal of Reading* 11(2), pp.79-83.
- Olson, D. (1977), "From utterance to text: The bias of language in speech and writing", *Harvard Educational Review* 47, pp.257-281.
- Ong, W. (1982), *Orality and literacy: The technologizing of the word*. London & New York: Methuen.
- Pressley, M. (1998), "Comprehension strategies instruction", In J. Osborn & F. Lehr (Eds.), *Literacy for all: Issues in teaching and learning* (pp. 113 - 133). New York: Guilford Press.
- Purcell-Gates, V. (1995), *Other people's words: The cycle of low literacy*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- RAND Reading Study Group. (2002), *Reading for understanding*. Santa Monica, CA: Rand Corporation.
- Robinson, J. L. (1987), "Literacy in society: Readers and writers in the worlds of discourse", In D. Bloome (Ed.), *Literacy and schooling* (pp. 327-353). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Rorty, R. M. (Ed) (1992), *The linguistic turn: Essays in philosophical method*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Rose, M. (1989), *Lives on the boundary*. New York: Penguin.
- Scribner, S., & Cole, M. (1981/1999), *The psychology of literacy*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Silverstein, M. (1985), "On the pragmatic "poetry" of prose", In D. Schiffrin (Ed.),

Meaning, form and use in context: Linguistic applications (pp.181-199).
Washington, DC.: Georgetown University.

Spring, J. (1994), *Deculturalization and the struggle for equality: A brief history of the education of dominated cultures in the United States.* New York, NY: McGraw-Hill, Inc.

Street, B. V. (1984), *Literacy in theory and practice.* New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Street, B. V. (1995), *Social literacies: Critical approaches to literacy in development, ethnography and education.* London: Longman.

Volosinov, V. (1929/1973), *Marxism and the philosophy of language [Trans: L. Matejka and I. Titunik].* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Willis, A. I. (1997), "Focus on research: Historical considerations", *Language Arts* 74(5), pp.387-397.

■ 국문초록

문식성 이론에서의 사회적·언어학적 전환에 대한 회고와 전망

데이비드 블룸 · 김민영

문식성 및 언어 교육 연구는 그 학문의 발달에 있어 사회과학에서의 언어적 전환과 문식성 연구에서의 사회적 전환이라는 두 차례의 철학적 전환을 경험했다. 이 두 전환점은 문식성의 정의를 변화시켰을 뿐만 아니라 - ‘탈맥락화된 인지적 언어적 기능’으로서의 문식성에서 ‘문자 언어가 중요하게 사용되는 사회적 실행’으로서의 문식성으로 -, 언어와 문식성, 심지어는 인간성의 본질에 대한 이해까지도 변화시켰다. 사회적 전환과 언어적 전환은 문식성에 대한 교육과 연구가 문화적·정치적으로 중립적이지 않으며, 국지적 혹은 포괄적 사회·경제·정치적인 맥락에서 분리될 수 없음을 시사하고 있다.

본고는 먼저 사회과학에서의 언어적 전환과 문식성 연구에서의 사회적 전환에 대한 철학적 논의를 간단히 살펴보았다. 다음으로, 실제 교실에서 일어나는 문식성 사건의 분석이 이 두 전환을 어떻게 반영하고 변형시키는지 보여주기 위해 실제 7학년 국어 수업을 분석하였다. 실제 교실 수업을 분석함으로써 학생들이 어떻게 문식성을 ‘하고’ 있는지를 논의하였는데, 특히, 개인이 속한 세계를 해체하고 재구성하는 도구로서 텍스트를 사용하는 방식을 자세히 살펴보았다.

[주제어] 문식성, 읽기, 쓰기, 사회적 실행, 담화분석, 내러티브, 교실, 언어 변이, 언어 이데올로기

■ Abstract

The Social and Linguistic Turns in Literacy Theory A Retrospective and Prospective View

David Bloome · Min-Young Kim

The study of literacy and language education has undergone two major philosophic shifts in its evolution: the social turn in the study of literacy and the linguistic turn in the social sciences. These shifts have changed not only what counts as literacy - from a set of decontextualized cognitive and linguistic skills to social practices in which the use of written language is non-trivial -, but also what the nature of language, literacy, and even personhood is. These turns also have revealed that the work of teaching and researching of language and literacy does not exist as culturally and politically neutral, separable from local and global social, economic, and political contexts.

In this manuscript, we briefly review the philosophical discussions of the linguistic turn in the social sciences and the social turn in the study of literacy. To illustrate how close analysis of classroom events reflects and refracts the linguistic turn and the social turn, we focus on analysis of a seventh grade classroom language arts lesson. Analysis of the classroom lesson reveals how students are *doing* literacy by using the text as a tool and prop for *deconstructing* and *reconstructing* the world in which they live.

[key words] literacy, reading, writing, social practice, discourse analysis, narrative, classrooms, language variation, language ideology.

[부록]

<p>Tw= Teacher, Ms. W. SS= Multiple students speaking at one S?= Unidentified student comment J= Jeanetta D= Danielle R= Randy C= Candace T= Tiffany M= Marcel An= Andrew</p> <p>↑ = rising intonation at end of utterance XXXX = unintelligible [nonverbal behavior]</p>	<p> = short pause = long pause</p> <p>⌋ = interrupted by the next line ⌌</p> <p>┌ line 1 = overlap └ line 2</p> <p>* = voice, pitch or style change *words* = boundaries of a voice, pitch or style change Transcriber <i>comments for clarification purpose</i> vowel+ = elongated vowel <u>stress</u></p>
--	---

01. Tw: We're talkin' about 1865.
02. And we're talkin' about a period of time when slavery was still instituted ↑
03. SS: Yes.
04. Tw: Was slavery still instituted? ↑
05. SS: Yes.
06. Tw: Were blacks allowed the same type of education as whites? ↑
07. SS: No
08. S?: XXXXXXXXX no
09. that's why. ⌋ .
10. Tw: ⌌ [Holds up hand] I'm still making my point
11. S?: OK, go ahead.

12. Just go ahead.
13. Tw: OK,
14. So if we know that slavery was still instituted
15. If we know that African Americans were not afforded the same education as other people
16. Is it a matter that they don't *quote unquote*know any better
17. or they never had the opportunity to get an education ↑
18. SS: XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX
19. Tw: I'm not asking you *Directed to students calling out responses*
20. I'm asking the person who made comment *Tiffany (T) had earlier made the comment Tw was referring to, that black people talked "that way" in 1865 "because they did not know any better"*
21. T: They didn't have the opportunity
22. Tw: Now.
23. Over a period of time
24. 1865 all the way to 1997
25. there are still people who use terms and phrases
26. *de, fo', folks*
27. that are similar to what we read in the poem
28. S?: ⊣ Yea but..
29. Tw: ⊣ Is that by choice ↑
30. S?: Choice
31. Tw: Or is that because *quote unquote* a lack of knowledge

32. We're not saying they don't know any better because
it's very clear that many people speak this way
33. Outside of African Americans
34. [Jeanetta raises her hand]
35. T: XXXXXXXX because you have a chancechoice
36. Tw: Jeannetta
37. J: I don't think it's choice.
38. I think like they used to it
39. cuz' like they ancestors it prob'ly runs down
40. ▭ cuz' I think.
41. T: ◡ XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX *T's talking overlaps lines 36 - 39.*
42. Tw: Tiffany I can't hear Jeanetta when you're talking
43. J: They prob'ly talking that way cuz they grandmama prob'ly talked that way and they prob'ly heard it so much
44. I don't think there's a choice.
45. Tw: So you think
46. overtime *Slowly rendered*
47. there is not any choice in how you talk
48. So after a while you hear your grandmother and your mom and your dad and your cousin and your aunt and you hear it like this all the time
49. you're gonna talk that way ↑
50. SS: XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX *Many students start to answer at the same time.*

51. Tw: Oh Oh
52. *Students stop talking*
53. Tw: *Points at a student, signaling a turn at talk.* Is it true
Candace ↑
54. C: Even though a lot of
55. Even though a lot of people like Africans or whatever
talked that way
56. that meant that the white people thought they were
better than everyone else
57. If we're talkin' about this point in time when there
were slaves and the white people talked all proper
58. then they probably thought they were better than
everyone else
59. Tw: OK
60. so you think it's still an issue of race and still an issue
of time
61. Randy you had a comment that I was interested in
hearin'
62. but XXXXXXX I can hear you over here
63. R: I said that XXXXXXXXXXXXX.
64. Tw: OK
65. How many of you say
66. You can put your hands down because I'm gonna go
on my little soap box now
67. How many of you say that you talk one way when
you're in the classroom and when you go home you

- talk another
- 68 It doesn't matter what that way is
69. I'm not askin' you if whether speak other languages
70. I'm not askin' you whether or not you don't curse
when you get home
- 71 I'm not askin' you the differences
72. but I am askin' you
- 73 when you come to school
- 74 When you walk into this classroom particularly
- 75 you choose to speak one way
- 76 when you go home | you speak another.
- 77 How many of you say yes ↑
78. SS: *Several students raise their hands*
79. Tw: *Marcel who did not raise his hand*
80. you mean the way you speak in class is the same
way you speak at home
81. the same way you speak at church
82. the same way you speak at the club
83. all day long
84. M: Yes XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX
- 85 Tw: Um ||
86. Alright |
87. Um ||
88. How many of you feel that when you *do* switch
89. we're gonna call this code-switching *Tw makes quote
marks with her fingers*

90. when you do switch
91. you do it by choice
92. or do you actually think *Ding*
93. *I'm in the classroom
94. I will now say this*
95. Or how many of you say that automatically soon as
you * fly+* into the classroom your words just change
96. you just know.*click*
- 97 SS: XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX *Many student raise their hands
and yell out responses*
98. Tw: OK
99. so this is the clicking group *Tw ia looking at a group
of students*
100. You gobang
101. *I'm in class*
102. So you mean you actually switch in and out of language ↑
103. Give me an example
104. S?: XXXXXXXXXXXX switching XXXXXXXXX
105. Tw: You switch ||
106. you say one thing at school
107. at home you say another
108. does have anything to do with the color of your skin ↑
109. but, why the XXXXXXXX Danielle ↑
110. D: It all depends how you carry yourself because
111. I mean
112. there some black people that talk proper and slang and

- there some white people who talk proper and slang
113. so it all depends if you wanna talk that way
114. you gonna talk that way
- 115: Tw: OK
116. What is proper and what is slang ↑
117. *Help me out*
118. let me give you a small story
119. You guys
120. where was I born ↑
121. You guys know this.
122. S?: Illinois ↑
- 123: Tw: no
124. S?: ≡ California
125. S?: || Chicago.
126. S?: ≡ I dunno.
127. Tw: I was born in New York and moved to California.
128. S?: Yea that's where you grew up.
129. Tw: When I moved to California I was teased when I was
little because people told me I talked white
130. How many of your ever heard that phrase *you sound
white* ↑
131. SS: XXXXXXXXXXXX *Many students talk at once and raise
hands*
132. Tw: Now
- 133: how come white people never hear that phrase *you
sound white* ↑

134. SS: XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX *Many students talk at once and yell out responses*
135. T: I've heard *you sound country* but not white
136. Tw: OK
137. Josh
138. could you *possibly* explain this concept to me maybe ↑
139. What is "sounding white"...
140. SS: XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX *Many students talk and once and yell out responses*
141. Tw: I'm asking Josh
142. No ↑
143. you have no idea
144. Who can explain to the concept of sounding white ↑
145. D: OK I have an example
146. When I be at lunch and I say like ⇓
147. An: ⇓ When I be laughs
148. Tw: *Wait a minute*
149. I'm sorry
150. when you said | when I be | Andrew said *when I be ha ha ha*
151. SS: XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX *Many students laugh and make comments*
152. D: That don't make no sense. [D's head is on his desk]
153. Tw: Holdon
154. I heard you say I am [Tw is looking at Danielle]
155. What does I be mean ↑
156. D: When I am [D's head is on his desk]

157. Tw: I really wanna hear this because your intellectualism
is dazzling me *Tw is looking at the whole class and
not at Danielle.*
158. I mean *I'm dancing now* *Tw does a little dance*
159. D: Like when I'm at lunch
- 160 She says when I be
161. T: Why are you correcting someone when you say it
yourself
162. Tw: Do I ever say that ↑
163. Have I ever said *I be you be he be she be we be * ↑
164. S?: You don't make mistakes
165. Tw: Is it a mistake ↑
166. S?: It's not mistake
167. it's how we talk
.....
401. Tw: OK
402. we're gonna save this part of the dialogue because I'm
gonna give you a second poem
403. S?: Ms. W
404. SS: *Students yell out comments, talk with each other*
405. Tw: OK
406. Hold on, hold on hold on
407. Whatever it is I want you to marinate on your thoughts
and then
408. think about yourself in relationship to your comments
409. use

410. a lot of you are making excellent comments but they are devoid of you as a person
411. It's very easy to make generalizations about people or about other people when you're able to take yourself out of it
412. But when you put yourself back into your statements
413. put yourself in relationship to your comments you're making
414. and then see if the comment still works