Identity in linguistic ethnography: a heteroglossic perspective of EFL learning in Pakistan

Imdad Ullah Khan (Corresponding author), University of Swat, Pakistan, Imdad.Khan@uswat.edu.pk, ORCID: 00000002-7933-901X
Akifa Imtiaz,Fatima Jinnah Women University, Pakistan.Akifa.Imtiaz@fjwu.edu.pk
Saood Khan, University of Swat, Pakistan.sauoodkhan896@gmail.com
Sidra Amina, University of Lahore, Pakistan.sidraAmina786@gmail.com
Aftab Ahmed, Qurtuba University, Pakistan, aftabkhattak78@yahoo.com

Abstract - Linguistic ethnography (LE) is an emerging approach to the study of language in social contexts. It combines the methodological approaches of ethnography and applied linguistics, generating a broad-based sociocultural research lens for scholars interested in addressing questions about the use of language in society. The following article demonstrates that LE provides a flexible approach to studying language as language is shaped by and, in turn, shapes its sociocultural context. The first part of the article gives a critical overview of how LE sits within the social and discursive turns in applied linguistics. It also delineates significant features of LE research in terms of its ontological and epistemological assumptions and explores the implications of some productive tensions in the field. Language and identity research provides a focal point for this argument. The second part of the article gives a practical demonstration of how LE can be approached from a Bakhtinian perspective through using 'heteroglossia' as an analytical lens. The data were generated through field observations, semi-structured interviews, fieldnotes, and a research journal. The data present language learning experiences of an adolescent female learner of English as a Foreign Language (EFL), studying in Grade-10 in the northern region of Pakistan. The analysis aims to understand how the student authors various aspects of her sense of'self' as she negotiates different ideological voices in her speech acts. It is argued that a heteroglossic understanding of language use and language learning can help researchers to expand the theoretical and methodological base of LE as a research approach. Equally, it can also be incorporated into language pedagogy which can have useful implications for enhancing the learning experience and educational achievements of EFL learners.

Keywords: **linguistic ethnography; identity; Bakhtin; dialogic 'self'; heteroglossia; translanguaging.**

I. INTRODUCTION

Language can be conceptualized as a cognitive skill or socio-cultural practice. Assumptions about the 'nature and functions of language have far-reaching implications for teaching, learning, and researching language (Blackledge & Creese, 2014, p. 16). Cognitive-skill-based models tend to see language as a system that can be learned, measured, and enhanced using psychological tools for performance evaluation and improvement. The sociocultural view of language, however, emphasizes the social and functional aspects of language within a community of language (Block, 2003). Influenced by social and discursive turns in social sciences, it views language as constitutive of and constituted by the cultural, historical, and political contexts in which it is practiced.

Linguistic ethnography (LE) is a subfield within the socio-cultural model of language. It is also a point of convergence for several research traditions including linguistic anthropology (LA) (Hymes, 1962; Silverstein, 1976); sociolinguistics (Bernstein, 2000; Labov, 1972); communication studies (Bakhtin, 1970); and social theory (Foucault, 1970). Adopting a linguistic ethnographic research gaze has ontological and epistemological implications. What exists in the world in terms of language, culture, and society; what is the interface between these constructs; and how can we know about points of convergence and disjuncture between them, are some of the key considerations for researchers who tend to view language and society within an ethnographic framework (Maybin & Tusting, 2011).

This article argues that LE provides a flexible methodological framework which is a challenging and vibrant tool for studying language as it is shaped by and, in turn, shapes its socio-cultural context. The article consists of two parts: a theoretical portion which gives a brief account of significant features of LE as it has evolved, and continues to evolve, over the last few decades. It attempts to outline how LE sits within the

social and discursive turns (Sealey & Carter, 2004, p. 44) in applied linguistics. It also delineates significant features of LE research in terms of its ontological and epistemological assumptions and some productive tensions in the field, using its application in language and identity research as a point in focus. The second part of the article gives a practical demonstration of how LE can function in practice when this approach to language use is applied to empirical data generated through field observations, semi-structured interviews, and fieldnotes. The data was generated in the context of a private school in Pakistan with a female student in grade 10 as a research participant.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

The historical trajectory of the development of LE can be seen to evolve along two inter-related strands emerging in the US on one hand and the UK and Europe on the other. In North America, ethnographic approaches to the study of language, culture, and society developed within the discipline of anthropology while in the UK and Europe similar approaches emerged not within anthropology but the broad field of Applied Linguistics (see Maybin & Tusting, 2011). Duranti(2009) categorizes the development of linguistic anthropology (LA) in the US in terms of the following three paradigms.

The first line of development starts in the 1880s when the project of LA was mainly concerned with documenting the languages and cultures of aboriginal societies in North America from a perspective of linguistic relativity (for example, Boas, 1940). The second stream of development emerged in the 1960s and 70s. Partly in reaction to the formalist paradigm of structural linguistics, as well as the cognitivist perspective of Chomskian linguistics, language use assumed primacy in the field. The emphasis shifted towards the situated use of language as it constitutes the cultural experiences of the users. Hymes(1962; 1964) is a major figure here along with subsequent contributors to this line of development in LA. The third stream of theoretical development in the field came from a growing interest in social constructionism in the 1980s and 90s, combined with the rise of poststructuralist ideas in the social sciences (Creese, 2008; Khan et al., 2021). The language was seen as contingent upon and constituted by the discursive practices within a socio-cultural context. Knowledge, power, subjectivities, multiple voices, and multiple meanings were seen as embedded within the discursive practices of the users of a language (Rampton, 2006).

In the UK, although the trajectory of LE developed under the influence of Hymes' work (Rampton, 2007), it is theoretically informed by the field of Applied Linguistics. In the UK, in recent years, this interest in how language at the micro-level interacts with the larger social processes has been called 'linguistic ethnography' (Creese, 2010). Instead of studying distant cultures of the 'other', as in anthropological works, LE is more concerned with social interaction at the small scale levels to explore the meanings and functions of human activities (Hammersley, 2007). Qualitative data is produced through observations, interviews, fieldnotes, etc. while analysis takes the form of verbal description and explanations in which descriptive quantitative data plays a minor role if any at all. LE practices aim to balance the tension between immersion in the context of the study (the emic point of view) with taking a step back to see the context from a distance through the lens of an analytical framework developed for the study (the etic point of view). Exploration of multiple meanings, voices, narratives and texts, identities, power structures, and ideologies are analyzed as these are seen embedded in language use. This interest in studying how social and cultural processes are dynamically entangled with the use of language makes it a useful lens for studying the language in educational contexts (Blackledge & Creese, 2014), which is the aim of this article.

Ontological assumption in linguistic ethnography

This section views LE in terms of its ontological and epistemological underpinnings and then, in the following section, considers some of the 'productive' tensions that keep it vibrant and evolving (Maybin & Tusting, 2011). This will set the stage for a subsequent section in the article which builds upon it as a theoretical foundation and attempts to see how these concepts about language in society can be put to use through analysis of empirical data. That section will use the interface between language and identity as a focal point to explore ethnographically the use of language in a school context from the perspective of a learner of English as a foreign language.

While considering the relevance and contribution of ethnographic approaches to the study of language in society, it is essential to first ask foundational questions about its emergence as a field of study. To start with, why has LE emerged now? How is it different from traditional approaches to the study of language in society?and what does it contribute, for example, to our understanding of language and 'identities'? LE as an ontological and epistemological approach emerged in the context of late modern societies due to the shifting role of language in society (Blackledge & Creese, 2016; Pérez-Milans, 2016). Rather than assuming

stability and predictability as ontological assumptions, LE rests on a conception of language that is ever in flux mainly due to increased mobility and advances in communication technologies in the contemporary era (Blommaert & Rampton, 2012). Homogeneity and stability are no longer seen as useful assumptions for studying language as it is practiced in a dynamic world characterized by migration, increasing contacts between cultures, changing patterns of communication, and so forth. In this context, languages as bounded systems of specific linguistic resources are insufficient for analyses of language in use in socially contingent contexts (Jørgensen, 2008).As an orientation towards the study of language and identities, LE differs from structuralist and modernist approaches. Rather than seeing languages as distinct, homogenous categories which can be used as analytical tools to understand identities of language users in social contact, LE, in general, can be characterized as follows:

Although LE research differs in how far it seeks to make claims about either language, communication, or the social world, linguistic ethnography generally holds that to a considerable degree, language and the social world are mutually shaping and that close analysis of situated language use can provide both fundamental and distinctive insights into the mechanisms and dynamics of social and cultural production in everyday activity. (Rampton et al., 2004, p. 13)

Thus language, from this perspective, is contingent upon the context in which it is used and also, in turn, shapes the social world. This characterization of ethnographic approaches to the study of language characterizes it as "a theoretical and methodological development orientating towards particular, established traditions but defining itself in the new intellectual climate of poststructuralism and late modernity"(Creese, 2008, p. 229). In line with the poststructuralist perspective, LE encourages research practitioners to look beyond the categorization of languages and language users in terms of monolingual, bilingual, or multilingual. Similarly, language and identity are not understood in terms of fixed categories 'but rather as emic positions which are self-identified by language users (Blackledge & Creese, 2016, p. 272).

This poststructuralist orientation of ethnographic studies of language entails that language use must be studied at the local minute level to see how it is contingent upon larger social processes and historically situated social, political, and economic discourses. Therefore, language and identities may not be seen as stable constructs which are in a linear relationship that can be studied in terms of fixed categories like ethnicity, gender, social class, etc. Rather identities of the language users are ever in flux as they interact in social contexts that are contingent both temporally as well as spatially. Relating ethnographic studies of language to the late modern condition of diverse social contexts, Blommaert et al. (2012) argue that emerging forms of diversity in the present period of modernity raise methodological challenges which cannot be met with 'modernist paradigms'. LE offers an alternative that may be able to speak to the challenges posed by the late modern world in which multilingualism, diversity, unpredictability, intercultural contact are the norm rather than exceptions.

Productive tensions in linguistic ethnography

The previous section considered how LE approaches the social world in terms of its ontological assumptions and what kind of epistemological decisions are taken to make sense of the social world. It characterized LE in terms of its analytical focus which rests upon the social and linguistic/discursive turns in social sciences in general that emerged since the 1960s and 70s. Thus far, we have considered LE as a broad-based field of inquiry with a wide focus of interest which makes it suitable for combining different methodological approaches to develop innovative ways of looking at language and culture as it is practiced in society (Maybin & Tusting, 2011). However, this breadth and openness of LE as a field of inquiry also entails certain tensions which provide positive impetus for researchers in the field to try to come to terms with them. Let us consider only two such creative tensions in the field.

Reflexivity in data interpretation

The preceding analysis shows that researchers in LE conceptualize specific instances of language use as constituted by and constitutive of the broader linguistic and cultural processes of a language context. Thus instead of dichotomously separating micro/macro levels of linguistic analysis, LE takes the insider/emic perspective of the participants and considers it in a broader theoretical framework developed by the researcher as outsider/etic perspective (Heath & Street, 2008). As Hammersley(2007) points out, there is a tension here between making validity claims based on data generated through qualitative research methods like interviews, observations, fieldnotes, etc. and the positionality of the researcher, their theoretical inclinations, and interpretive abilities and how it may influence the findings of a study. Reflexive research practices (e.g. bracketing techniques) have been used to mitigate the possibility of making 'truth claims' about data thatis not 'trustworthy' if the influence of the researcher upon the data remains opaque (Talmy, 2010).

Linguistic versus social aspects of data

Another productive tension in the field is related to the aim of LE to address linguistic and social issues to explore their relationship with one another. While the linguistic aspect of this relationship can be observed directly, the social processes side of the agenda (for example, identity, social class, gender, ethnicity, etc.) can only be inferred from the data. There is a danger here of 'reifying' analytical tools as empirical social phenomena – do these 'phenomena' really exist in the society or are they mere theoretical constructs that enable us to talk about the data? Is identity, for example, an empirical fact or a mere analytical category? Different researchers may take different theoretical positions vis-à-vis this tension, adopting, for example, a social constructionist (Duff, 2002) or a social realist position (Sealey & Carter, 2004) based on their assumptions about the social world. Building upon the strengths of these two perspectives, critical realism (Sealey, 2007) tries to explore the middle ground between realist and constructionist ontologies and epistemologies. Recognizing the limitations of such ontological assumptions and epistemological decisions as described above, is productive for promoting LE as an emerging field of qualitative inquiry.

III.   CONCEPTUAL FRAMING AND METHODOLOGY

The preceding sections considered LE as an approach that studies language in socially embedded contexts. LE attempts to ground etic perspectives about language in the emic positions that are selfidentified by the users of language and not imposed upon them by theoretical categories and constructs. This section attempts to show how this designation of LE can be applied in the service of empirical data which is analyzed in terms of situated identities of a learner of English as a Foreign Language. The analysis aims to understand from an emic perspective the identity positions taken by the student research participant and not in terms of fixed categories and binary opposition. The analysis assumes that LE is suitable to approach these self-identified positions taken by the research participant as it is conducive to highlight the local perspectives and how English as a foreign language plays out from within it (Blackledge & Creese, 2016).

Apart from focusing on the emic perspective of the research participants, the following analysis further designates identity positions taken by or ascribed to the research participant as neither unitary nor fixed. Rather they are viewed as responses to complex social processes that are bound up with historical contingency, political discourses, familial allegiance, and so on. The analysis argues that the complexity of the emic perspective of the participant can be understood by using the concept of 'heteroglossia'. For Bakhtin, the utterance is socially, politically, and historically entangled with the voices of 'others'(Bakhtin, 1981). In the context of late-modern diverse societies, this concept can be useful as it foregrounds the complexity of identity positions that are tied up with competing ideological positions in the social world. Instead of co-existing with each other as discrete linguistic positions taken by language users, instances of language use index ideological voices and positions that are deeply entangled with one another in a web of social, political, and historical contingency (Blackledge & Creese, 2014, p. 13).

Sociological studies of language claim that the use of language in the late modern period is changing (see, for example, Blackledge & Creese, 2016). Instead of conceptualizing languages as discrete systems, it is argued that it is analytically far more productive to focus on language users as savvy communicators who deploy their available linguistic repertoire to achieve specific communicative goals in concrete life situations that are culturally, politically, and historically contingent (Kramsch, 2009). Recently, researchers have turned to Bakhtin's concept of 'heteroglossia' to investigate language practices in diverse social contexts (Blackledge & Creese, 2014). For Bakhtin, language is viewed as a form of conceptualizing the world in words (Bakhtin, 1981) where competing points of views, ideologies, social positions, etc. are indexed by utterances. Heteroglossia is, therefore, not the simultaneous use of different language codes (as the concept of code-mixing/-switching would suggest) but rather the interplay of competing points of view within one or more than one language.

Adopting a heteroglossic view, the following analysis takes excerpts from data generated in the context of a private school in the northern region of Pakistan. Generated through interviews, classroom observations, fieldnotes, and researcher bracketing journal, the data focuses on how a female learner of English as a Foreign Language (EFL) in grade 10 authors aspects of her 'self'concerningthe English language. The analysis attempts to understand how the research participant navigates ideological, historical, and institutional positions as they compete in her heteroglossic utterances. The analysis tries to demonstrate that LE approached through a heteroglossic gaze may lead to a more nuanced understanding of her language use than is possible through a cognitive or psychoanalytic approach.

In the initial phase of data generation, the researcher spent several weeks in the school to conduct field and classroom observations. After seven classroom observations, three interviews were conducted with the

student Sara (pseudonym) to build upon data generated during observations. She is a proficient speaker of Pashto (first language), Urdu, and English. Her father is a retired Pakistan military officer and business while her mother is a house wife who holds a postgraduate degree in English literature. Before coming to Global, she had attended schools in different provinces in Pakistan and in other countries including Jordan where she studied from class 2 to 7 when her father was posted there. Her mother and elder sister have been supporting her in her studies especially to learn the English language.Throughout the fieldwork, interviews, and the writing phase, the researcher maintained a bracketing journal to help him reflexively analyze his preconceptions, responses, assumptions, and to assimilate the researcher as a data generation instrument into the analysis of data (Blackledge & Creese, 2016, p, 279). Sara's interview extracts in the analysis below are glossed versions of the actual English data with minor corrections for better comprehension.

IV.   DATA ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

'Limited space': centrifugal and centripetal voices in her voice

Bakhtin sensed tension between normative use of language that pulls centripetally and deviation from norms that pulls centrifugally (Blackledge & Creese, 2016, p. 280). For Bakhtin (Bakhtin, 1981, p. 272), "every concrete utterance of a subject serves as a point where centrifugal, as well as centripetal forces, are brought to bear. The process of centralization and decentralization, of unification and disunification, intersect in the utterance". This tension in language use can also be understood in terms of a tension between aspects of the agency of a language user who is navigating discursive and ideological positions in a language context. Centrifugal voices within the 'speech acts' resist dominant discourses while centripetal acceptance of norms allows the language used to augment his or her position by aligning themselves with normative pressures. These contradictory voices within the voice of a speaker index aspects of the 'self thatare conflictual and non-unitary (Vitanova, 2005, p. 152). In this framework, 'self' is not authored in a linear coherent fashion (as a cognitivist or psycholinguistic analysis might suggest) but is changing all the time as it engages in a dynamic dialogue with the ideologies and discourses already embedded in the language. From a Bakhtinian perspective, multivoicedness is the ground on which the consciousness of a language user authors its dynamic and changing aspects of the 'self'(Vitanova, 2010, p. 30).

In Extract 1, Sana tries to make sense of how she was affected by shifting from an exclusive girls' school to a mixed boys' and girls' school as her father was transferred to another city.

Extract 1

I found the shift really hard […]. When I came here I got bound because the society over here doesn't allow you [to] think you can do things which you can over there. Limited space. I was in co-education from class 2 till 7. We had a separate girls section. So moving on with boys here was at first quite tough for me. You know you cannot express yourself the way you want. You cannot communicate with the teachers the way you want to do. This is, as we know, like a male dominant society. Girls here are oppressed. For me, the change was initially really hard but slowly and gradually I got used to it. Now it seems comfortable. (Interview 2: September 13, 2019)

As she engages in dialogue with the voices of the 'other', Sana's utterances use 'non-referential indexicality' (Blackledge&Creese, 2014, p. 5) to address a generalized 'other'rather than a specific addressee. She uses general terms like 'when I came here, 'the society over here' etc. to author her subject position vis-à-vis the 'generalized other' (Vitanova, 2005, p. 154). As Bailey (2012, p. 508) points out that what is characteristic of heteroglossia 'is not its reference to different kinds of linguistic signs and forms, but rather its focus on social tension inherent in language'. As her utterances echo the voices of the generalized other as oppressive voices of a 'male dominant society', it allows her to engage with these voices in an 'internal polemic discourse' (Blackledge & Creese, 2014, p. 8). She confronts male-dominant ideologies by taking a gendered position of resistance to normative expectations about gender roles. However, her centrifugal voice does not oppose social normative (centripetal) voices by confronting them directly. Instead, her gendered voice pushes back against these dominant discourses through evocative statements about how girls are treated in this social context. This form of resistance which merely 'echoes' the voices of imagined 'other'leaves room for her centripetal voice when she acquiesces to gender expectations in the school. According to Wortham(2001, p. 50), "a voice is a social position from the stratified world, as presupposed by stratified language". By merely implying the voices of imagined oppressive gender ideologies, Sana exercises her agency obliquely, leaving room for her subsequent subject position as a docile gendered 'self' who 'slowly and gradually … got used to' the gendered position ascribed to her in a mixed boys' and girls' school.

As she continues her dialogic discourse, Sana constructs another aspect of herself that is closely related to the above-mentioned gendered aspect of her identity. In Extract 2, she authors her 'learner identity' from a centrifugal position:

Extract 2

If study-wise we look things are not much different. The communication, the curriculum, how the teacher communicates, how you communicate. I think it mostly depends on you. How you communicate. If you want to learn well so it doesn't depend on the school. So for me things, if looking onto the education, are not much different. Because I know I didn't change. I am the way I am. So for me, like, the surroundings changed but looking onto the learning, my results, my spoken language, nothing changed. (Interview 2: September 13, 2019)

For Bakhtin, 'addressivity' (Vitanova, 2010, p. 27) is a consistent feature of language use. We are always in dialogue with the 'other'. As Sana continues her 'internally polemical discourse' in Extract 2, who is addressed in her voice? How does she position herself concerning the voice of the other?'.As she authors her learner identity, her voice does not address only the present. For her, things are not much different in this school as compared to the previous one she attended. Her construction of 'self'in the present moment is grounded in the history of her educational career. However, our words are not only in dialogue with the past and the present but also anticipate other words in the future (Hall, Vitanova, & Marchenkova, 2005, p. 2). The 'self' in any given moment is always caught up in a dynamic discourse between what has been said before and what might be said.

In Extract 1, Sana's concluding utterance positioned her as 'comfortable' with the gender-biased environment of her new school as she grew accustomed to gender expectations in this new cultural space. However, in Extract 2, she authors her 'self' centrifugally by claiming that she has not changed as a learner ("Because I know I didn't change"). This apparent contradiction between her identity positions can be understood by paying attention toaddressivity in her speech. That is to say, as she performs 'identity work' (Block, 2009, p. 229) in Extract 2, who is being addressed and whose words might be anticipated in her utterances? In the previous extract, her words were in a dialogic discourse with generalized other voices which were 'male-dominant and provided 'limited space' for female gender roles. Here, in Extract 2, she seems in dialogue with the imagined voices of those 'others'who want her to perform well in terms of educational achievements. These might be the voices of her parents, siblings, friends, relatives, fellow students, etc. for whom she foregrounds a different aspect of her dialogic 'self'. As she distances herself from her gendered identity (Extract 1), she aligns herself more with her non-gendered position as a learner. Here she pushes her gender identity to the background and asserts her position as a learner for whom it does not matter which school she is attending as long as she is 'motivated' towards her studies and 'communicates' effectively in the school. As she said, "I think it mostly depends on *you*. How *you* communicate. If *you* want to learn well so it doesn't depend on the school" [emphasis added]. Here the onus of her identity work is on her efforts in education and her interest in her studies. As she asserts that 'nothing changed' for her as a learner, it allows her to adopt a non-gendered position in which she is confident to assert: "[...] I know I didn't change. I am the way I am". If the two extracts are considered in conjunction, it shows that foregrounding her learner identity enabled her to assert her centrifugal position more openly (Extract 2) while foregrounding her gendered identity (Extract 1) resulted in her taking an ambivalent position that resisted the male-dominant ideologies of the generalized 'other'by merely implying their voice without openly resisting them.

Translanguaging for identity investment

Bakhtin thought that our voice overflows with the words of other people to the extent that when we speak we speak mostly with the words of other people (Bakhtin, 1981, p. 295). From a dialogic perspective, the words of the 'other' always creep into our consciousness when we are languaging discursive positions at a particular historical moment, in a particular cultural setting. From this point of view, translanguaging signals the use of communicative repertoire for achieving specific goals through speech acts(see, for example, García, 2009). A code-mixing or code-switching perspective, on the other, focuses on the linguistic code in use in a given speech event. Instead of focusing on what cultural and subjective positions are at stake when a speaker translanguages in a specific context, focus on language as a code system treats speech events as a matter of understanding how much each code is used and what is the effect of that usage on the communicative event.

The following analysis takes a dialogic view of translanguaging as it focuses on whose ideologies are addressed as Sana employs her linguistic resources in the service of identity work, especially in the context

of her family life? Very early in the interview, she brings up the stance of her grandmother towards speaking English at home:

Extract 3

Well, my grandmother scolds us for speaking in English. Not scold actually but she doesn't like it. She wants us to communicate in Pashto. She doesn't approve of it. She is like "*da angrizanojaba da*" (Pashto: 'it is the language of the English people'). But my mother, she like lived abroad so developed it. She knows English. So some sentences we speak in English. Not Urdu but English and Pashto. I try to communicate with her in English. We read English books. In school, it's like I have this one friend with whom I communicate in English. The rest of it is Pashto. So I don't want my spoken language to, you know, go down.(Interview 3: September 22, 2019)

Here, Sana's utterance seems to address concrete 'other', the voices of her grandmother and mother, as against generalized 'other' addressed in the previous two extracts. As she makes sense of the symbolic and cultural value of English in her family life, she positions herself very carefully concerning the voice of her grandmother. First, she describes her grandmother's reaction to the use of English at home as 'scolding' but then mitigates it as not really 'scolding' but 'disapproval'. In the first four utterances in the extract, Sana seems to struggle to find the right tone in the English language which can convey her grandmother's reaction to the use of English. She translanguages to Pashto, her first language, in the fifth sentence probably because she is not satisfied with her performance in English to convey the sense of her grandmother's disapproval of the English language.

Da angrezanojaba da (Pashto: 'it is the language of the English people') is not easily translated into English without losing some of the connotative meanings attached with the Pashto word '*angrez*' (English people) in the postcolonial context of this speech act. The older generation can still remember the era of the British colonial empire in the region and position themselves differently concerning the discourses around the positive/negative role played by the British in the Indian subcontinent. For this generation, *angrez* may connotatively imply non-believers or someone who is against Islam. However, for Sana, the voice of her grandmother is hard to understand because for her *angrizan* are not associated with these negative connotations. Elsewhere in the interview, she describes the attitude of her grandmother as "she is like *angrezankafiran di* ('the English are non-believers'). I know it's like a creepy and weird thing to say". She also emphasized how the British colonial rule in the subcontinent 'introduced useful technologies like the railway'.

Caught up in this tension-filled interaction (Blackledge & Creese, 2014, p. 7) between the voice of her grandmother against the English language and that aspect of her linguistic identity which positions her in favor of this language, Sana negotiates her identity through translanguaging her communicative repertoire with key phrases from Pashto. She described her grandmother as "she likes Pashto a lot. She wants all of us to be *srapukhtana*(hard-core Pashtuns)." While *sra* means 'of red color', in the cultural context of this research it is metaphorically associated with either hard-core or revolutionary ethnic identities. For Sana, the disapproving voice of her grandmother is offset by the approving voice of her mother who holds a master's degree in English literature and has lived abroad in Jordan where, according to Sana, she developed her English language skills. Another supportive voice is that of her school friend with whom she speaks in English. Sana does not want to lose these supportive voices which help her improve her English language skills. She complains at the end of the extract about the predominant use of Pashto in the school, and home environment which she thinks will lead to her losing confidence in speaking English.

In Extract 3, Sana dialogically authors aspects of her 'self' as she engages with the voices of concrete 'other'and positions herself vis-à-vis these voices. She resists the ascribed identity of someone who speaks English as speaking the language of the non-believers. She distances herself from this position and aligns herself with the identity of a serious learner of the English language who takes pride in the support of her mother, and her school friend, with both of whom she can practice speaking in English. She further strengthens this aspect of her 'self'by attempting to downplay the voice of her grandmother in the following extract:

Extract 4

But she also uses English words sometimes. Last time we were deciding like on the color of some clothes and she was like *da* color *me na de khwakh*[I don't like this color]. And we were like all looking at her saying, '*da* (this)color?'. (Interview 3: September 22, 2019)

Sana translanguages here to mimic her grandmother who apparently opposes the use of English at home but still prefers to use an English word'color', as against a Pashto word. This attempt on Sana's part to

weaken the antagonistic voice of her grandmother can be seen as an act of identity investment in learning a foreign language (Norton, 2013). As she pushes back against the voices that are not supportive of her ambitions to learn how to speak 'good' English, she enhances the prospects of her investment in the English language by weakening the voice of her grandmother. Equally, this attempt on Sana's part to delegitimize the voice of her grandmother is an attempt to manage stakes as Sana attempts to show that in her home life English can no longer be kept at bay, despite the oppositional voices coming from the older generation. This act of claiming greater 'legitimacy' (Kramsch, 2012) for the English language within her domestic life can strengthen her resolve to learn the language because her identity as a Pashtun and a Muslim may, after all, not be incongruous with learning the language of the so-called 'non-believers' because the author of this voice, her grandmother, is herself translanguaging in English, albeit unintentionally.

V.   CONCLUSION

It is perhaps a truism to state that the data presented above can neither be considered sufficient to make an argument about the flexibility of linguistic ethnography as a methodological approachnor it can be deemedenough for a heteroglossic understanding of how a foreign language learner negotiates ascribed or self-projected aspect of her identity in the context of this research study. Further studies are needed to view empirical data more thoroughlyin association with field observations to develop a more nuanced and rich understanding of the subjectivity of learners of English as a foreign language in specific cultural contexts. With the due acknowledgment of such limitations, the above analysis attempted to show that Bakhtinian concepts, for example, heteroglossia, can provide a useful perspective to make sense of identity formation and negotiation in the context of English as a foreign language. It can help us to see how the subjectivities of a female learner are negotiated multilingually through a dialogic process of engagement with other voices that are embedded in speech acts in this cultural/historical/political context.

Apart from its implication for expanding the theoretical boundaries of linguistic ethnography (Maybin & Tusting, 2011) and identity studies through the use of Bakhtinian ideas, the analysis has some useful implications about adopting a heteroglossic perspective for improving learning experiences and pedagogy in EFL classrooms. Sana positions herself as a female learner of English in a male-dominant society with opposing ideological positions coexisting and competing in her speech. Her discourse about the school, the importance of the English language at home, and her gendered identity form a complex ideological texture that cannot be adequately accounted for from a cognitivist or psychoanalytical perspective. On the contrary, adopting a heteroglossic perspective foregrounds the importance of seeing the subjectivity of a language learner as 'entangled' (Hall et al., 2005, p. 154) in a dialogic relationship with the social, political, historical, and cultural voices embedded in her communicative repertoire.

VI.   FUTURE SCOPE

Future EFL pedagogy based on the above model would remain sensitive to the complexity of language learning which goes beyond personal 'motivation', or lack thereof, and the notion that language learners are autonomous cognitive systems who are personally responsible for their learning irrespective of who they are. Along with encouraging greater sensitivity to the needs of language learners with multilingual backgrounds, a heteroglossic understanding of language learning and pedagogy in an ethnographic framework is arguably more conducive to learning as it can help construct a democratic learning environment in the classroom where the diverse linguistic resources of learners may be nurtured and assimilated into classroom activities.

REFERENCES

1.   Bailey, B. (2012). Heteroglossia. In A. Blackldge, & A. Creese (Eds.), *The Routledge   handbook of multilingualism* (pp. 499-507). New York, NY: Routledge.
2.   Bakhtin, M. M. (1970). *Speech genres and other late essays*. London: Tavistock.
3.   Bakhtin, M. M. (1981). In Holquist M. (Ed.), *The dialogic imagination: four essays* (C.   Emerson, M. Holquist Trans.). Austin: University of Texas Press.
4.   Bernstein, B. B. (2000). *Pedagogy, symbolic control, and identity: Theory, research, critique.* Oxford: Rowman & Littlefield.
5.   Blackledge, A., & Creese, A. (2014). Heteroglossia as practice and pedagogy. *Heteroglossia   as practice and pedagogy* (Blackledge, Adrian;Creese, Angela; ed., pp. 1-20).   Netherlands: Springer.

6. Blackledge, A., & Creese, A. (2016). A linguistic ethnography of identity: adopting a heteroglossic fame. In S. Preece (Ed.), *The Routledge handbook of language and identity* (pp. 272-288). New York, NY: Routledge.

7. Block, D. (2009). Identity in applied linguistics: The need for conceptual exploration. *Contemporary Applied Linguistics, 1*, 215-232.

8. Block, D. (2003). *The social turn in second language acquisition*. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.

9. Blommaert, J., Leppänen, S., & Spotti, M. (2012). Endangering multilingualism. In J. Blommaert, S. Leppänen & T. Raisanen (Eds.), *Dangerous multilinugalism: northern perspectives on order, purity, and normality* (pp. 1-21). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

10. Blommaert, J., & Rampton, B. (2012). Language and superdiversity. *Diversities, 13*(2), 1-22.

11. Boas, F. (1940). *Race, language, and culture*. New York, NY: The Free Press.

12. Creese, A. (2008). Linguistic ethnography. In K. A. King, & N. H. Hornberger (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of language and education* (2nd ed., pp. 229-241). New York, NY: Springer.

13. Creese, A. (2010). Linguistic ethnography. *Research Methods in Linguistics* (Litosseliti, Lia ed., pp. 138-154). London: Continuum.

14. Duff, P. A. (2002). The discursive co-construction of knowledge, identity, and difference: An ethnography of communication in the high school mainstream. *Applied Linguistics, 23*(3), 289322.

15. Duranti, A. (2009). *Linguistic anthropology: A reader*. Oxford: John Wiley & Sons.

16. Foucault, M. (1970). The order of things: An archaeology of the human sciences. London: Tavistock.

17. García, O. (2009). Bilingual education in the 21st century: A global perspective. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.

18. Hall, J. K., Vitanova, G., & Marchenkova, L. A. (2005). *Dialogue with Bakhtin on second and foreign language learning: New perspectives*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

19. Hammersley, M. (2007). Reflections on linguistic ethnography. *Journal of Sociolinguistics, 11*(5), 689-695.

20. Heath, S. B., & Street, B. V. (2008). *Ethnography: approaches to language and literacy research*. New York: Teacher's College Press.

21. Hymes, D. (1962). The ethnography of speaking. *Anthropology and Human Behavior, 13*(53), 11-74.

22. Hymes, D. (1964). Introduction: Toward ethnographies of communication. *American Anthropologist, 66*(6), 1-34.

23. Jørgensen, J. N. (2008). Polylingual languaging around and among children and adolescents. *International Journal of Multilingualism, 5*(3), 161-176.

24. Khan, I. U., Rahman, G., & Hamid, A. (2021). Poststructuralist Perspectives on Language and Identity: Implications for English Language Teaching Research in Pakistan. *Sir Syed Journal of Education & Social Research*, *4*(1), 257-267.

25. Kramsch, C. (2012). Authenticity and legitimacy in multilingual SLA. *Critical Multilingualism Studies, 1*(1), 107-128.

26. Kramsch, C. (2009). The multilingual subject: what foreign language learners say about their experience and why it matters. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

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

28. Maybin, J., & Tusting, K. (2011). Linguistic ethnography. *The Routledge Handbook of Applied Linguistics* (Simpson, J. ed., pp. 515-528). New York, NY: Routledge.

29. Norton, B. (2013). *Identity and language learning: extending the conversation* (2nd ed.). Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.

30. Pérez-Milans, M. (2016). Language and identity in linguistic ethnography. *The Routledge Handbook of Language and Identity* (Preece, Sian ed., pp. 83-97). New York, NY: Routledge.

31. Rampton, B. (2006). *Language in late modernity: Interaction in an urban school*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

32. Rampton, B. (2007). Neo-Hymesian linguistic ethnography in the United Kingdom. *Journal of Sociolinguistics, 11*(5), 584-607.

33. Rampton, B., Tusting, K., Maybin, J., Barwell, R., Creese, A., & Lytra, V. (2004). UK linguistic ethnography: a discussion paper. Retrieved from www.lancaster.ac.uk/fss/organisations/lingethn/.../discussion_paper_jan_05.pdf

34. Sealey, A. (2007). Linguistic ethnography in realist perspective. *Journal of Sociolinguistics, 11*(5), 641-660.

35. Sealey, A., & Carter, B. (2004). *Applied linguistics as social science*. London: Continuum.

36. Silverstein, M. (1976). Shifters, linguistic categories, and cultural description. In K. H. Basso, & H. A. Selby (Eds.), *Meaning in anthropology* (pp. 11-55). Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.

37. Talmy, S. (2010). Qualitative interviews in applied linguistics: From research instrument to social practice. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 30*, 128-148.

38. Vitanova, G. (2005). Authoring the self in a non-native language: a dialogic approach to agency and subjectivity. In J. K. Hall, G. Vitanova & L. Marchenkova (Eds.), *Dialogue with Bakhtin on second and foreign language learning: New perspectives* (pp. 149-169). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

39. Vitanova, G. (2010). *Authoring the dialogic self: Gender, agency and language practices*. Amsterdam, The Netherlands: John Benjamins Publishing.

40. Wortham, S. (2001). Ventriloquating Shakespeare: Ethical Positioning in Classroom Literature Discussions. *Working Papers in Educational Linguistics, 17*, 46-64.