Greetings from the Chair

This year seems to have snuck up on me! I am finding it hard to believe that it has been over eight years since David Bloome nominated me for the role of treasurer of the Language and Social Processes SIG. This year is particularly important to me as I reflect on my time serving the LSP SIG and as I become Past Chair at the end of the 2011 conference.

I offer heartfelt thanks to all of the officers with whom I served, especially Louise Jennings, who mentored me into my role as a leader of the SIG and Beth Yeager who has worked so hard at creating powerful LSP SIG programs during my time as Chair. Thanks also to Doug Baker (Newsletter Editor), Mariana Souto-Manning (Secretary/Treasurer), Amy Carpenter Ford and Azure Stewart (Graduate Student Representatives), and Damian Jenkins (ESA Committee Chair) for your support during my time as Chair. I also extend thanks to our members who have made it possible for us to continue to find ways to create spaces for exploring issues in language and social processes at AERA.

Some highlights of the past several years include the re-design and re-shaping of our newsletter. Most recently Doug Baker, in his role as Newsletter Editor, has included short articles as a way to situate the SIG’s work over time through historical reflections. Through efforts initiated by Louise Jennings, the Early Scholar Award was instituted as a way to support and mentor scholars at the beginning of their careers. We also have established a web presence through the development of our website.

In my role as past chair I would like to continue to build a web presence for the SIG by making use of new technologies such as podcasting to make accessible our work to a broader international audience. I also would like to find ways of continuing to build our website so that it becomes a useful resource to further develop understanding of our field and for helping to establish mentor relationships between veteran and early career scholars. Aside from supporting intergenerational collaborations I hope to also create opportunities for setting up ongoing international collaborations between those interested in issues that are important to SIG members. Working across generations of
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A Message from the Program Chair

This year we’ve assembled a rich program that represents both the breadth and the depth of research on language and social processes. Please share the LSP-sponsored sessions with your colleagues and students and urge them to join us. They begin with a round table session on Friday at 2:15, continue with symposiums on Saturday, and end with two more round table sessions on Sunday. I want to draw particular attention to our ongoing efforts to focus on graduate students and early career scholars and to support their work. In addition to articles you’ll find elsewhere in our newsletter this year, please note the graduate student-organized symposium on becoming a researcher, on Saturday, at 12:25: “New and Emerging Scholars Studying Language-in-Use: The Non-Linear, Generative Process of Becoming a Researcher.”

I also strongly encourage you to spread the word about our LSP Business Meeting on Friday evening at 6:15 at the New Orleans Marriott. Not only will we be giving this year’s Emerging Scholar Award, we are also offering an exciting international panel that will include both experienced and early scholars. Read more about this unique panel in this newsletter and then tell your friends.

It’s been my great pleasure to serve as your Program Chair for the last two years. I want to thank all of you who have submitted proposals, served on our Review Panels, presented, and served as Chairs and Discussants. It is impossible to have a rich, LSP-sponsored program without you. Please be sure to submit proposals this year and to urge your colleagues and students to do the same. As you know, the more submissions we have, the more sessions we can offer. It will be an honor, after the conference, to turn this job over to our new Program Chair, Doug Baker. Thanks once again to my fellow officers, particularly our Chair, Vivian Vasquez, and to all of you for the past two years. I look forward to more exciting work with all of you as your new LSP Chair.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth V. Yeager
You are Invited to the Business Meeting!
Friday, April 8, 6:15-7:45 pm
New Orleans Marriott, La Galerie 1

This year, the Language and Social Processes SIG is privileged to present an international group of scholars, together with a group of early career scholars whose work they have informed, in an intergenerational panel presentation for its Business Meeting, Friday evening, April 8, from 6:15 until 7:45 pm, at the New Orleans Marriott, La Galerie 1.

For the past several years, LSP has been exploring, through its conference program, including its Business Meeting panel presentation, as well as through its oral/written history project, roots of and routes to current perspectives on language, discourse, literacy, and social processes as well as the work of members of our special interest group. We have done so with a view of the metaphorical importance of ‘standing on the shoulders’ of those who came before in order to inform both current and new directions taken by experienced and, importantly, emerging and future scholars in our field. This year’s LSP Business Meeting panel presentation builds on and extends this work through its intergenerational exploration of epistemological issues guiding studies of language, literacies, and social processes – in this case, through an ethnographic lens.

As an exciting approach to beginning a dialogue, in this panel, entitled, “Ethnography as Epistemology: Intergenerational Studies of Language, Literacy, and Social Processes”, each of five experienced ethnographers will raise a key epistemological issue encountered in the studies they present and describe how they addressed the challenge raised. Three early-career scholars, who will have reviewed papers prior to the AERA meeting, will then discuss issues these papers raised for their own work. The panel will then propose a set of guiding principles of operation grounded in this series of ethnographic studies in different national contexts to the audience for comment, and critique.

This presentation explores ethnography as epistemology; that is, ethnography as a way of knowing about the everyday lives, knowledge and meanings of members of particular social groups or communities. Each participant in this intergenerational and international group of scholars is conducting research in multi-generational contexts, multiple sites studies, and multi-year studies.

Experienced ethnographers describing epistemological issues they faced in a particular ethnographic study include:
- Maria Lucia Castanheira, Federal University of Minas Gerais, Brazil: Re-entering a context after 20 years: Literacy practices in home and community contexts and challenges of cross-case analysis
- Brian Street, Kings College, London: Cross-case analysis of academic literacies across disciplines in high school and university settings
- Judy Kalman, Centro de Investigación y Estudios Avanzados del IPN, Mexico City: Viability of employing ethnographic perspectives and methodology to study virtual classrooms and online educational contexts
- Judith Green, University of California, Santa Barbara: The impact of changing policy contexts on opportunities for learning in linguistically diverse classrooms across 10 years.

The following Early Career Scholars will explore these papers and will raise epistemological issues related to their own areas of research:
- Irán Guerrero, Centro de Investigación y Estudios Avanzados del IPN, Mexico City: What is involved in taking an insider perspective and exploring learning in the complex multi-modal classrooms and other educational settings
- John Hammond, University of California, Santa Barbara: (Re)examining video records from an ethnographic archive collected by earlier ethnographers
- Damian Jenkins, Pepperdine University: (Re)reading the world: Learning how to connect layers of actions and interactions.

We look forward to seeing you there!
Message from Treasurer/Membership:
What If? An Invitation

Greetings from the Membership/Treasurer! I want to thank you for your continuing interest in and support of the Language and Social Processes SIG. This time, instead of providing you with numbers, I ask you to take a few moments to consider the ways in which the Language and Social Processes SIG has impacted your professional development. As you do so, I invite you to consider the following questions:

What If?
What if we could invite others to join this wonderful group?

What if we could share the resources and opportunities by encouraging or gifting memberships?

According to our Chair, founding members such as David Bloome, Celia Genishi, and Judith Green, first imagined the Language and Social Processes Special Interest Group in the early 70s. Since its inception, the LSP SIG has provided for its members a space for thoughtful debate, discussion, and consideration of issues regarding language processes and the sociopolitical contexts through which these unfold. Over the years, veteran members have mentored newer members, by creating spaces for them to contribute to the field in powerful ways. (http://www.aera.net/Default.aspx?menu_id=410&id=1157)

The SIG continues to provide space for exploring directions in and issues of language and discourse practices, literacy, learning processes and social contexts through studies grounded in sociocultural, constructivist and constructionist perspectives. As we engage in this wonderful exploration, let’s invite others—students, new and established scholars—to join us, to enrich the conversation.

LSP SIG membership is $8 for AERA members and only $3 for students. For more information, visit https://www.aera.net/Default.aspx?id=274 or e-mail me at Souto-Manning@tc.edu. I will be happy to help!

Mariana Souto-Manning

LSP Sessions on the AERA Program

**Friday, April 8**
“Negotiating Disciplinary, Professional, or Institutional Borders to Build Collaborative Teaching Relationships: A Discourse Perspective”
2:15-3:45 pm – Sheraton/Grand Ballroom D
Session Type: Round Table

Language and Social Processes Business Meeting and Panel Emerging Scholar Award and Panel Presentation “Ethnography as Epistemology: Intergenerational Studies of Language, Literacy, and Social Processes”

**Saturday, April 9**
“New and Emerging Scholars Studying Language-in-Use: The Nonlinear, Generative Process of Becoming a Researcher”
12:25 – 1:55 pm – New Orleans Marriott/Preservation Hall 1
Session Type: Symposium

“Directions in the Semiotic Analysis of Young Children’s Literacy:

---

**continued on page 5**
Greetings, everyone. I appreciate the invitation from Doug Baker, Vivian Vasquez, and Beth Yeager to participate in the “oral” history of the SIG, a history that appropriately demonstrates how the oral and written are often fused, and to reflect on the place of language and social processes within the broad field of education research.

A year ago in the pages of this newsletter, former SIG chairs, Judith Green and David Bloome, offered complementary and comprehensive essays on the trajectory of language and social processes, including the signal ideas and controversies of which the SIG has been a part over the decades. Judith’s focus on the contributions of SIG members—past and present—delineated the SIG’s substantial contributions to theory-methods relationships in education research and posed an ambitious agenda for our future. David welcomed the tensions inherent in a field where discussions are productively messy, along with the continual challenge to add to the theoretical and methodological knowledge base about language.

So as not to overlap with what Judith and David said, I point toward the 2-year period, from 1982 to 1984, when I chaired the SIG and when its name was simply “Language Development.” This was intended to be a “big tent” name, incorporating development over time and spoken, nonverbal, and written language. The early 1980s and the name “Language Development” now seem both long ago and representative of a narrow slice of time and content. However, the early ’80s were also a slice that incorporated publications by SIG members and their close colleagues that impelled us to move in new directions. Here I cite a small number of publications that represent new directions, though such a small number can never adequately represent our multidirectional field, even within a narrow slice of time. At the time researchers held onto and foregrounded language data writ large—including talk, linguistic forms, or literacy undergirded by spoken language. In my view by the time my term as Chair ended in 1984, a watershed had been passed and literacy was not so much undergirded by spoken language as melded with it.

Throughout the ’80s—and before—language was theorized from multiple perspectives and woven into the threads of educational research in multiple settings in and out of school. Judith Green and Cynthia Wallat’s edited collection Ethnography and Language in Educational Settings (1981) contained chapters that problematized the nature of interaction, social context, social competence, and action research as it also offered methods and procedures. Thus the collection made aspects

continued on page 7
For this edition of the newsletter, experienced and early-career scholars contribute to professional conversations regarding the opportunities and history of the LSP SIG, and to descriptions of research that is unfolding. As members (and potential members) of the LSP SIG, we explore

- how people interact with language in social and educational contexts, and
- how these contexts are expanding globally and technologically.

Part of planning future events and opportunities for LSP SIG members is to examine our history, envision possibilities, and invite new members. The Oral (Written) History Project, initiated last year, provides insights into how LSP SIG founders and past chairs conceptualized its mission and potential. Celia Genishi and LeAnn Putney present accounts that, along with those from the previous year (Vivian Vasquez’s, Judith Green’s, and David Bloome’s), provide critical links for researchers to purposes and perspectives of the LSP SIG, which others can build on during present and future research. For example, Celia urges us

- to explore multimodality, and she challenges us to observe how research of early career scholars is shaping and exploring ways of expanding “the boundaries of education-related linguistic research”; and,
- to engage in “discussions of naming our multidisciplinary, multilingual, multimodal, and multicultural work together.”

LeAnn turns toward questions of policy and the potential role of LSP SIG members by encouraging us to consider:

- how “our dialogue needs to focus on how we are perceived by policy makers and politicians who are deciding our futures as public servants, and
- what research is needed to address the consequences of the privatization of public education in general.”

The future of the LSP SIG depends on the vitality of its membership. Mariana Souto-Manning asks: “What if we could invite others to join this wonderful group?” She not only encourages us to invite new members but also to support contributions by early career scholars.

In this newsletter, two early career scholars, Mariana Pacheco and April Baker-Bell, describe their research programs on issues of language diversity in classrooms. Mariana is exploring how “a focus on [bilingual] participation—as an index rather than outcome of learning—shifts our focus from students’ (in)competence to the linguistic constitution of learning and knowing.” April, a doctoral student, raises questions about how research on language diversity of African American students can contribute to the preparation of teachers.

Finally, since the role of language impacts fields across education and disciplines, we should invite colleagues from a variety of fields to contribute. In this vein, Derek Mueller, a composition scholar, presents research on how technology assists researchers’ use of distant reading, “a methodology coined by literary scholar Franco Moretti (2005) [that] consists of computational methods and data visualization techniques designed to aid us in apprehending a growing heap of materials-to-be-read.”

Please read the Members in the News section on (p. 11). There you will find an impressive list of scholarly activities by representative members of the LSP SIG that demonstrates how we are pushing “the boundaries of education-related linguistic research.”

Two final notes: Vivian Vasquez, among others, has suggested that we make “use of new technologies such as podcasting to make accessible our work to a broader international audience.” Let’s continue to build on her experiences as the LSP SIG chair, and those of others, as we interact with researchers locally, nationally, and internationally. Finally, thank you to Nikki Tharp for designing and formatting this newsletter.

W. Douglas Baker
Genishi, continued from page 5

of sociolinguistic research concrete while also provoking readers to think about what ethnography could mean in their own research.

Also published in 1981 was a collection edited by Richard Durán called *Latino Language and Communicative Behavior*. This was a seminal volume that reflected particular aspects of language variation, including language alternation or code-switching by bilingual or multilingual speakers and mother-child talk in Latino families. Alongside the Green and Wallat collection, that of Durán put educational and linguistic researchers on a broadly and deeply social path on which the stones marking the path's boundaries were movable, multifaceted, and multicolored. Interestingly, the controversies over whether dialects containing bilingual speakers’ code-switching are “permissible” in school settings are as alive today as they were 30 years ago. At issue is not so much whether a dialect defined by code-switching is rule-governed, a characteristic demonstrated by authors in the Durán volume and elsewhere, but whether students who code-switch are being deprived of entry into the English speakers’ club. It was argued 30 years ago, as it still is, that code-switching is an aspect of being bilingual and that bilingualism has a range of social and cognitive benefits, including becoming and being sociolinguistically flexible and versatile.

In 1982 a volume was published called *Communicating in the Classroom*, edited by Louise Cherry Wilkinson and including the work of a number of SIG members. These members can recall when the U.S. Department of Education supported the National Institute of Education, which in turn funded innovative, sometimes multidisciplinary research that had implications for practice in the prekindergarten to grade 12 range, but did not have to be tied immediately to student test outcomes. Significantly, the majority of chapters in Wilkinson’s volume focused on aspects of spoken discourse, at the same time that chapters whose topics were bilingualism/English learners, special education, and writing in the primary grades were included. Not many years later, these three topics would move closer to the center of research on classroom learning.

The publications I have named left the footprints of researchers doing language-related education research, reminding their audience that their path remained social and broadened as settings became more inclusive. My choice of research done largely in classrooms reveals my own interests, but I acknowledge that throughout the ‘80s language studied outside the school setting became increasingly prominent. An example is Shirley Brice Heath’s *Ways with Words*, a book that needs no introduction to SIG members. Heath’s analyses of communities within contrasting cultures have endured, though not without controversy. Decades later, researchers continue to be challenged by the question of how teachers may interpret or incorporate children’s ways with words in the classroom curriculum.

In the year preceding the publication of *Ways with Words*, Anne Haas Dyson began to respond to that question with respect to bidialectalism. In 1982 Anne, with me as second author, published her first article in Language Arts called “‘Whatta ya tryin’ to write?’: Writing as an interactive process.” Although the title featured young children’s writing, from the beginning Anne’s work demonstrated the inextricable links between orality and literacy. Language, including the African American Language of her participants, is rule-governed in ways that complexify how children learn to read and write and to become part of the social worlds of classrooms. In Anne’s research what children know about their own dialect enhances their interactions with each other and with printed text. Indeed without “each other” children’s learning may be hardly audible or visible. In the work that followed “Whatta ya tryin’ to write?” Anne has documented and theorized the importance of multiple entry points to conventional literacy, an approach now called multimodal.
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continued on page 16
Thanks to Doug Baker for extending an invitation to carry on the conversation regarding the history of the Language and Social Processes SIG. Working up through the ranks of the SIG, I was involved in the program processes of AERA, having been mentored by those who came before me. This close networking with LSP SIG scholars was a benefit that extended far beyond the annual meeting.

I was lucky to have worked closely with Louise Jennings, who was SIG Chair before me. As the Program Chair I worked with Louise as she strategized the directions of the sessions in 2004 and 2005. The direction of the LSP SIG at that time was geared toward linking theory, research, and practice in relation to language and literacy from around the globe. An invited panel from around the world offered critical responses to Alan Luke’s discussion of understanding globalization, languages, and literacy. Critical responses were offered by Hilary Janks (University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, South Africa), Barbara Comber (University of South Australia), and our current AERA president, Kris Gutiérrez (University of Colorado). Our program sessions focused on classroom discourse, ranging from understanding of identity and engagement in relation to literacy, to recognizing multimodalities and the use of technology as a tool in literacy development.

In Montreal in 2005, Louise brought forward Judith Green as one of the editors of the *Handbook of Complementary Methods* (published by AERA, 2006) to make visible the complementarity of research methods. While Judith gave an overview, David Bloome and Caroline T. Clarke, as well as Ricki Goldman, detailed their respective chapters in the handbook. Having one of the editors and some of the authors report first-hand about the handbook gave us a rare “insider glimpse” as to how the handbook was conceptualized and how we could best use the handbook in our own educational spaces. Our sessions focused on discursive practices of linguistically diverse students, both in and beyond classroom settings. In addition, Louise initiated an emerging scholar award, which was awarded for the first time in 2006.

As I took on the leadership of chairing the LSP SIG in 2006, I worked closely with the program chair, Malu Dantas, to construct the new directions panel that we traditionally schedule as a means to move the work of SIG members forward. To understand where we needed to go next, we looked backward with some of the pioneers in language, discourse, and social process research: Bud Mehan, Fred Erickson, and Ray McDermott, with commentary by emerging scholars Jason Raley and Martin Connell as to how their work had been influenced by the pioneers. While we marveled at how the technology used to carry out the work has changed, we also noted from the current work, some things have stayed nearly the same such as the need for championing causes for linguistically diverse students.

The look backward then spurred us to move forward in 2007 on our academic journey of exploring LSP issues, by convening a panel discussion led by Cynthia Lewis, centered around reframing sociocultural research on literacy in terms of identity, agency, and power. Other panel members included Elizabeth Moje, Patricia Enciso, Carolyn Fuller, Marjorie Orellana, and Bob Fecho along with discussants Eliane Rubenstein, and Brian Street.

As I look back on those issues, I believe that research in this realm is even more crucial in 2011, especially in the politically precarious times in which we find ourselves in terms of public higher education. Many of us are in the midst of losing colleagues, as entire departments, schools, and colleges in the higher education arena are being dismantled and reformulated, resulting in the removal of both untenured and tenured faculty. Perhaps our dialogue needs to focus on how we are perceived by policy makers and politicians who are deciding our futures as public servants, and what research is needed to address the consequences of the privatization of public education in general. To this end, a presidential session will address these issues in New Orleans in April, and I invite you to this session; and may the dialogues continue!
My research interests in the area of language and literacy learning across in-school and out-of-school settings are informed deeply by the institutional legacy of dominant perspectives that view non-English languages and non-“standard” varieties of English as deficits rather than as resources, assets, and strengths. My concern is that educational institutions narrowly define bi/multi/lingualism at the expense of curriculum practices that expand students’ participation across language communities in and outside of school. These narrow definitions, furthermore, fail to disrupt the continued marginalization of non-dominant students and communities. Conversely, a focus on participation—as an index rather than outcome of learning—shifts our focus from students’ (in)competence to the linguistic constitution of learning and knowing.

In my developing body of work, I continue to theorize the mutual constitution of language, culture, power and history, especially as they pertain to non-dominant students. In particular, my research has centered on socio-cultural circumstances that affect the academic potential of Chicano and Latino students who are developing their bilingual and biliterate capabilities in and outside of school. This exploration provoked my interest in community-based settings where apprenticeship models are used to facilitate literacy learning, and writing in particular.

Cultural-historical theoretical conceptualizations of language as the foremost “tool of tools” have been particularly useful across ethnographic studies for examining how English Learner and bilingual youth utilize their linguistic toolkits to engage in meaning making. Further, I am interested in how individuals navigate the numerous constraints and possibilities that characterize educational contexts. Through ethnographic research, I have employed an empirical focus on bilingual students’ changing participation in the valued cultural activities across cultural communities and the role language practices play in this process (Rogoff, 2003). In these contexts, I have documented ways that individuals (i.e., peers, adults) both organize and facilitate children and youth’s successful participation. My earlier research demonstrated that restrictive language policies and high-stakes school accountability significantly constrained bilingual teachers’ facilitation of their bilingual students’ linguistic repertoires and critical thinking (Pacheco, 2010). This research led my colleagues and I to investigate the consequences of curriculum practices that deliberately and strategically employed bilingual students’ translating practices, which revealed their meta-linguistic awareness, cultural-political community knowledge, and ability to shift across discourses (Martinez, Orellana, Pacheco, & Carbone, 2008; Pacheco, 2009).

In out-of-school settings, my research has examined teaching and learning practices that accommodate students’ languages and literacies. In one program, multilingual, migrant-farmworker students utilized their linguistic repertoires as they expanded their sociocritical literacies through academic writing across languages (Gutiérrez, Hunter, & Arzubiaga, 2009; Pacheco & Nao, 2009). Another multi-year study illustrated that robust forms of guidance, assistance, and support mediated diverse adolescents’ successful participation in a community-based, non-profit teen newspaper. This participation was facilitated strategically through an apprenticeship model wherein writing (and reading) was accomplished jointly between novices and their relatively capable adult and peer collaborators (Pacheco, under review-a; under review-b).

This body of research has highlighted how students’ participation in everyday practices is significantly affected by the accommodations made by both adults and peers, findings that have incited my current empirical focus on bilingualism-as-participation. Through this notion, I examine language forms required of bilingual youth as they participate across in-school and out-of-school—including

continued on page 10
on-line—contexts (e.g., church, home, Facebook). Preliminary analyses show that varied accommodations are made to affect bilingual youth’s participation as competent, valued members of the cultural communities they navigate in their everyday lives. As I continue these investigations, I will further examine the cultural-historical and ontological processes that structure particular linguistic and cultural processes, as we address the growing difference and diversity represented among public school students in our reformulation of equitable schooling.

References
outdated methods to approach this matter; and (3) the topic was rarely discussed during departmental meetings.

My findings left me with several questions: why hasn’t scholarship on AAL reached classroom teachers, even after the landmark 1977 Ann Arbor Black English Case and the Oakland Ebonics controversy of 1996? Are schools uninformed of the sociolinguistic scholarship and effective pedagogies available to them? Reflecting on my teaching experiences and my MA project reveals that there are gaps between discourses on AAL and classroom practice, which makes me think about how pre-service teachers become knowledgeable and prepared to address language diversity in their practice.

Currently, I am interested in examining how teacher education programs prepare pre-service teachers to meet the diverse language needs of their students. My most recent review of the literature reveals that scholars have argued for the past 30 years that pre-service teachers should take a language diversity class before exiting their teacher education programs; however, many teachers do not take such a course (Ball & Muhammad 2003). Where does this conversation stand at present? That is, (1) how many teacher education programs currently require pre-service teachers to take a course in language diversity?, and (2) of those teacher education programs that require such a course, how does the course prepare pre-service teachers to address language diversity?

In the immediate future, I plan to answer these questions by conducting personal interviews with faculty, instructors, and students in teacher education programs in the state of Michigan. While this study might only include a sample of teacher education programs, it has the potential to be used as a pilot study for a larger research project that seeks to examine if and how teacher education programs across the nation prepare pre-teachers to address the language needs of their linguistically diverse students.
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Note from Peter: I recently completed a year-long ethnographic case study involving five immigrant students in an all-girl secondary school in Singapore. My participants came from neighboring Asian countries and had been specially recruited by the Singapore government through a scholarship-awarding program. As they were placed in an English-medium school—the language of instruction in Singapore schools is English—I chose to track their English language development over the course of a school year. Recent publications based on this study include:
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Rosalind has contributed to the development of a new Interdisciplinary Learning and Teaching Doctoral Program at UTSA. She recently served as Chair of the Outstanding Paper Award for SIG 168, Doctoral Education Across the Disciplines. This award recognizes a work that makes substantial contributions to theory, research, policy or practices of doctoral education within and across disciplines.

The first such award will be granted at the AERA meeting in New Orleans at the SIG’s Business Meeting. The next award is to be given in 2013. Based on a grant from the U.S.-Mexico Center, Rosalind and Michelle Olvera Dart are studying Border Literacy of High Engaged Learners who travel regularly across the Texas-Mexico border. Representations of Border Crossings in Children’s and Adolescent Literature will be discussed at AERA on a Roundtable in New Orleans. Rosalind also continues research based on *Talking Texts: How speech and writing interact in school learning* (Taylor & Francis, 2007), which examines the role of speaking in the development and use of written language. The use of speech in writing will be addressed in a course on Oral and Written Discourse Analysis in Fall 2011.
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Note from Marjorie: We’re excited to share this link to an on-line repository of resources on language issues in education: http://centerx.gseis.ucla.edu/xchange-repository/ current-issue-fall-2010 ("What’s Language Got to Do with It?"). This includes resources for teachers (see the Teachers’ Work Room)—original lesson ideas for linking immigrant students’ everyday language practices to academic literacies.

LeAnn Putney, University of Nevada, Las Vegas


- Mariana Souto-Manning, Teachers College, Columbia University, NY (US)


**Vivian Vasquez**, American University, Washington D.C. (US)
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- Shatz, M. & Wilkinson, L. C. (2010). The education of English language learners: Research to practice. NY: Guilford Press. “This comprehensive volume describes evidence-based strategies for supporting English language learners (ELLs) by promoting meaningful communication and language use across the curriculum. Leading experts explain how and why learning is different for ELLs and pinpoint specific best practices for the classroom, illustrated with vivid examples. Particular attention is given to ways in which learning English is intertwined with learning the student’s home language. The book addresses both assessment and instruction for typically developing ELLs and those with language disabilities and disorders. It demonstrates how educators and speech-language professionals can draw on students’ linguistic, cognitive, socio-cultural, and family resources to help close the achievement gap.”
Distant reading, a methodology coined by literary scholar Franco Moretti (2005), consists of computational methods and data visualization techniques designed to aid us in apprehending a growing heap of materials-to-be-read. Heretical though this methodology is sure to appear at first, it nevertheless yields to wonder: what forms of knowledge—what patterns and insights, exactly—are available when we apply distant reading to a collection of scholarly articles? Today’s professoriate feels acutely the challenges of reckoning with a Sisyphean “reading problem” that is growing and unrelenting in scope.

In his now famous Atlantic Monthly article, “As We May Think,” Vannevar Bush (1945) cited similar challenges as a source of inventive speculation from which he prophetically sketched a solution to the reading problem: ‘There is a growing mountain of research. But there is increased evidence that we are being bogged down today as specialization extends” (para. 6). Bush famously went on to describe a suggestive precursor to today’s internet, the Memex, a desk-like apparatus designed to assist researchers with retrieving, searching, and filtering. Although he never framed it in quite this way, the Memex, with its associative index, was a mechanism for distant reading.

My own theorization and application of distant reading methods pertain specifically to College Composition and Communication (CCC), a flagship journal of the National Council of Teachers of English first published in 1949. Conventional reading of scholarly articles holds much practical, professional value; distant reading, because it exceeds the scale of the individual article, introduces complementary forms of knowledge. Consider, as an example, the provocation proposed by the title. Approached from the methodological orientation I have suggested so far, what can we learn from more than 400 scholarly articles in one sitting?

Quickly tallying page counts and citation counts for 409 articles published in CCC between 1987 and 2006, Figure 1 (a graph used to represent a form of distant reading) documents a gradual but vital transformation:

Over a twenty-year period, article lengths and citation counts have nearly doubled. What does this mean for journal stakeholders? Or for the field at large? The graph confirms a hunch: scholarship in this example case has grown longer and more citation-intensive, and this is likely to be true for work published over time in any emerging field. At face value, absent any attempt to corroborate this trend with publications in other journals or other fields, this can be perceived as an indication of growth and solidity in an emerging field’s research. Rather than seizing on factual inferences commonly associated with technical rationalism (i.e., reading statistics as proofs), the graph above evokes questions about sustainability, limits, and the future.

But what are the consequences if journal stakeholders—from editors, reviewers, and editorial board members to authors and subscribers—do not recognize the trend? This example of distant reading provides a suggestive precursor to today’s internet, the Memex, a desk-like apparatus designed to assist researchers with retrieving, searching, and filtering. Although he never framed it in quite this way, the Memex, with its associative index, was a mechanism for distant reading.

Derek N. Mueller
Eastern Michigan University, Ypsilanti

Figure 1. CCC Page and Citation Count by Year. Reprinted from Clouds, Graphs, and Maps: Distant Reading and Disciplinary Imagination, by Derek Mueller, 2009.
Reading proves promising as a heuristic, and these methods can guide the planning and design of this example journal and others. Information about the apparent acceleration of page lengths and numbers of citations confronts us with vital questions about future expectations.

In addition to graphs, other distant reading models focus on visually modeled aggregates of data related to scholarship: works cited, mined keywords and phrases, and geolocative information about authors and their affinities. Systematically noticing and tracing these crumbs is increasingly important for building and maintaining disciplinary currency. A close counterpart to distant reading operates tacitly and idiosyncratically as an essential practice for professors and graduate students alike. Yet the distant reading methodologies I argue for are intensified by computational processes, data visualization, and database development, which suggest their salience not only as a discrete practice but also as generalizable methods of inquiry worth applying and teaching in a variety of fields. Furthermore, such methods may aid us when we venture beyond our areas of primary disciplinary identification and need to grapple with new and unfamiliar research.

By showcasing slices of situated disciplines, however subtle their distinctions, distant reading implicitly promotes interdisciplinary understanding as well as interdisciplinarity itself, and so it stands to reason that more concerted efforts along these lines—developing, stabilizing, and refining this methodology and sharing its results—will yield promising opportunities for bridging across the fields we primarily identify with. I have elsewhere (2009) characterized this connective facility as “network sense,” an indispensible wherewithal shaped through tactical inquiry receptive to finding and moving just beyond the edges of what we know. Distant reading, thus, encourages a network-theoretic worldview responsive to shifting contingencies we must ever increasingly negotiate as teachers, scholars, and professionals.
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Genishi, continued from page 7

And multimodality brings this personalized and highly selective reflection up to the present, a rich present that is marked by further expansion of the boundaries of education-related linguistic research. The current name of our SIG, Language and Social Processes, may or may not be expansive enough for the leading-edge work of early career scholars like Ruth Harman, Audra Skukauskaite, Mariana Souto-Manning, and Karen Wohlwend, who maintain a focus on the social and linguistic, while also moving comfortably within the worlds of digital literacies. I look forward to the research, theory, and practices to come, as well as to future discussions of naming our multidisciplinary, multilingual, multimodal, and multicultural work together.
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