

Tilburg University

Super-diversity discourse

Arnaut, Karel; Spotti, Max

Publication date:
2014

Document Version
Peer reviewed version

[Link to publication in Tilburg University Research Portal](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Arnaut, K., & Spotti, M. (2014). *Super-diversity discourse*. (Tilburg Papers in Culture Studies; No. 90).

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Tilburg Papers in Culture Studies

Paper 90

Super-diversity discourse

by

Karel Arnaut[©] & Massimiliano Spotti[©]

(KU Leuven / Tilburg University)

karel.arnaut@soc.kuleuven.be
m.spotti@tilburguniversity.edu

© January 2014

Draft -- Do not quote

Entry: Super-diversity discourse

For: The International Encyclopedia of Language and Social Interaction (Wiley Blackwell)

Editor: Karen Tracy

Authors: Karel Arnaut (KULeuven) & Massimiliano Spotti (Tilburg University)

E-mail addresses: m.spotti@uvt.nl ; karel.arnaut@soc.kuleuven.be

Abstract:

Super-diversity discourse is a relatively new, primarily academic discourse whose increasing presence in the domains of social work, institutional policy, urban and national politics, and the media is signalling a rapidly growing uptake, albeit one that is disciplinarily fragmented and geographically unevenly spread. Arguably, super-diversity's uptake suggests that its discourse is catching the imagination of the humanities and social sciences as a recognizably productive and an auspiciously novel vantage point that sits comfortably with certain existing explicitly post-colonial anthropological and sociolinguistic takes on diversity and identity, as well as with more recent diversity-related shifts or 'turns' towards, among other things, complexity and (urban, digital, etc.) translocality. After presenting the notion of super-diversity, exploring its conceptual Umwelt and its uptake most prominently in sociolinguistics, attention is given to the future prospects and perceived dangers surrounding its discourse.

1. Super-diversity and its conceptual Umwelt

Super-diversity rests on the growing awareness that over the past two and a half decades the demographic, socio-political, cultural and socio-linguistic face of societies worldwide has been changing as a result of (a) ever faster and more mobile communication technologies and software infrastructures, along with (b) ever expanding mobility and migration activity related to major geo-political changes around 1990 (Blommaert 2012). The latter comprise the collapse and fragmentation of the Soviet communist bloc, the ending of Apartheid in South Africa, heralding a new era of democratisation and international incorporation, China's conversion to capitalism as well as India's economic reforms (Parkin and Arnaut 2012). When coining the term 'super-diversity', Vertovec (2006) tried to grasp this new condition of transnationality in which global flows of people are changing profoundly, both quantitatively and qualitatively. While the amount of people migrating keeps rising at a

steadily growing pace, Vertovec observes how the migration flows are radically diversifying. This diversification not only applies to the range of migrant-sending and migrant-receiving countries, but also to the socio-economic, cultural, religious, and linguistic profiles of the migrants as well as to their civil status, their educational or training background, and their migration trajectories, networks and diasporic links (Vertovec 2007).

More than merely capturing the recent diversification of diversity and situating its onset in global history, super-diversity discourse can be taken as an emerging perspective on change and unpredictability in ever more intensively encroaching social and cultural worlds (Arnaut 2012). In this capacity, it aligns itself with critical perspectives in transnational studies which reject simplifying and reifying schemes for the complex realities of 'overheated globalisation' (the term is Eriksen's 2012) along national and/or ethnic lines – denounced as 'methodological nationalism' (Wimmer and Glick Schiller 2003) and the 'ethnic lens' (Glick Schiller, et al. 2006), respectively. As such, super-diversity continues a research tradition in British social theory and (black) cultural studies about 'new identities' and 'new ethnicities' which harks back to the work of, among others, Hewitt (1986), Mercer (1994), Hall (1996), Gilroy (1996), and Back (1996), and is revisited more recently by Harris and Rampton (2010) and Werbner (2013), and explicitly brought into the ambit of super-diversity discourse by Fanshawe and Sriskandarajah (2010), Erel (2011), Rampton (2013b), and Wessendorf (forthcoming).

Several authors argue that a super-diversity perspective has a liberating potential in that it endeavours to find a "new way of talking about diversity" (Fanshawe and Sriskandarajah 2010: 33) beyond the strictures of classic multiculturalism (Phillimore 2011) or multilingualism (Blommaert and Rampton 2011; Makoni and Pennycook 2007: 29). As a representative of post-multiculturalism, super-diversity discourse discards the "big battalions" (the term is Rampton's 2010) of cultural, social and linguistic 'groupism' and the old binaries of national culture versus minority cultures, natives versus migrants, and local versus global. Such binary constructs often assume a zero-sum game in which the migrants' stronger transnational patterns of association imply that the latter is only partially integrated in local (native) society (Vertovec 2010: 90).

In contradistinction, super-diversity discourse hinges heavily on the metaphor of simultaneity as exemplified for instance in (a) 'multiple embeddedness' of migrants who, according to Glick Schiller and Çağlar (2013: 499) form networks of social relations and multiple social fields (see e.g. Berg and Sigona 2013; Schmoll and Semi 2013; Sepulveda, et al. 2011), (b) intersectionality, as "the complex, irreducible, varied, and variable effects which ensue when multiple axis of differentiation – economic, political, cultural, psychic, subjective and experiential – intersect in historically specific contexts (Brah and Phoenix 2004: 76; and see: Wessendorf 2010: 28-30), and (c) scalarity, which in Kell's (2013: 19)

sophisticated treatment of it implies “reading out” both the horizontal links (threads) and the vertical moves (jumps) of the interaction events and meaning-making processes unfolding over time and across contexts (see also Jørgensen, et al. 2011; Van Dijk 2011: 107; Varis and Wang 2011). In sum, the metaphor of simultaneity combines the idea of (a) superimposition, nesting, and palimpsest – of earlier and later ‘generations’ of migrants in particular neighbourhoods, for instance (Blommaert 2012: 98-102) – with the idea of (b) intersection and entanglement – for instance the combination of different codes or idioms carrying different national, class-based or ethnic indexicalities into one ‘urban vernacular’ (Rampton 2011a) whether or not understood as instances of ‘polylinguaging’ as “the use of features associated with different ‘languages’” (see also: Creese and Blackledge 2010; Jørgensen, et al. 2011: 33).

Finally, super-diversity discourse can be situated in two even more broader sets of ideas: (a) one that dates back to earlier anthropological and sociolinguistic critical studies of diversity and globalisation from the 1960s and ‘70s, and a second one (b) consisting of a number of more recent conceptual and empirical reorientations towards complexity and translocality. The first set of ideas arose from a radical postcolonial critique of anthropological practice voiced by, among others, Eric Wolf (1964), Del Hymes (1972), and Johannes Fabian (1978; 1998) (see also Arnaut 2012). Among other things, Hymes proposed reframing (cultural, linguistic, etc.) diversity in a post-colonial world, no longer in an ongoing trend of diversification – through dispersion and fragmentation in an ever ‘expanding’ world – but in processes of “*reintegration* within complex units” (Hymes 1972: 32-33; emphasis in the original). Fabian’s contribution (1978; 1998) lies in his reconceptualization of ‘culture’ via ‘popular culture’ of which he highlights (a) its internally plural character, (b) its boundary transcending potential, and (c) its infinitely emerging nature – at no point a bounded whole. Arguably, these ideas dovetail with key notions of Cultural Studies (see above) and have been mainstreamed into the anthropological concept of culture. Likewise, in sociolinguistic research on Internet-based popular culture, culture is seen above all as “outward-looking, exogenous and focused on hybridity, translation and identification” (Leppänen 2012a: 235).

The second set of ideas which lends theoretical credence and plausibility to super-diversity revolves around increasingly popular notions of complexity and translocality that intersect in discourses of urbanity, mobility and digital communication. Complexity, according to Urry (2005: 3) “investigates emergent, dynamic and self-organizing systems that interact in ways that heavily influence the probabilities of later events. Systems are irreducible to elementary laws or simple processes.” Likewise, translocality goes beyond mere transnationality in that it is “less scripted and more scattered” (Lionnet and Shu-mei-Shih 2005), and in that it allows for finer, intra-urban distinctions in connectivity and scalarity (Van Dijk 2011) opening up to spaces far beyond global cities, in rural towns and in seemingly more marginal sites worldwide (Li and Juffermans 2011; Moore forthcoming;

Wang, et al. 2013). Taken together, these two sets of ideas can shape the contours of an emerging research programme in the humanities and the social sciences that thinks through the idea that globalisation signifies the end of the world as having “an outside”; hence that human creativity realises itself in the “re-composition of the sensible”, the “poetic reconstruction of life from the inside” in a world that is finite and yet limitless (Negri 2008: 68-69, 239). In the field of contemporary sociolinguistics and linguistic anthropology, this is exemplified in new conceptualisations of (super-)diversity variably situated in late modern social conditions (Rampton 2006), in unequal globalization (Blommaert 2003; 2010) or in contemporary conditions of migration-driven post-nationality (Silverstein 2013).

2. Super-diversity discourse and linguistic production

In sociolinguistics, ‘diversity’ is firmly lodged in a long tradition of variationist studies which endeavour to correlate variously distributed (sets of) linguistic features with stratifications of different sorts. In Eckert’s reconstruction of this tradition, she distinguishes between three waves in which actors, speakers and writers, participants in communication, become increasingly endowed with agency to transcend the established correlations between the variables of their speech and certain social categories. The third wave of variation studies, Eckert (2012: 97-98) argues, mainly referring to Silverstein’s ‘indexical mutability’ and Agha’s ‘enregisterment’, has almost reversed the relation between language and society: speakers have become “stylistic agents, tailoring linguistic styles in ongoing and lifelong projects of self-construction and differentiation” – postmodern processes which Rampton (2006: 22) identified as ‘reflexive language and artful performance’ involving agents which Jacquemet (2005: 261) typically labelled “semiotic operators”. Equally reversing the logic of variationism, Pennycook (2012: 124) recently argued that genres, discourses and styles need to be understood “as practices that form the texts, knowledge and identity of which they speak. This position then makes it possible to see language practices as part of the formation of the social.”

This take on diversity in sociolinguistics dovetails not only with the ‘new ethnicities’ or post-ethnic ‘new identities’ Cultural Studies discourse mentioned in the previous section, but also with attempts by sociolinguistics to reckon with decolonisation, globalization and the far-going repositioning of the nation-state and the way it seeks to manage, regulate, or indeed regiment ‘linguistic diversity’ and the ‘language communities’ it recognises. Although it was signalled by many others before – e.g. by Rampton (2006: 22), Blommaert (2010), Makoni and Pennycook (2007) and Mufwene and Vigouroux (2008) – Silverstein (2013) recently stressed the post-national and translocal dimension of linguistic super-diversity, remarking that: “what is captioned as ‘superdiversity’, emphasizing a plenitude of in-migrated socio-cultural and linguistic difference and hybridity beyond that countenanced by existing state

mechanisms, [is] an empirical site that ought to stimulate a new kind of sociolinguistics that renders problematic the concepts of state-focal vision.”

To some extent, this ‘new kind of sociolinguistics’ is heir to a ‘linguistics of contact’ (Pratt 1987) which has been steadily moving away from the idea of languages and speakers as discernable units towards that of sociolinguistic resources and repertoires. Overall, this implies a double shift (a) away from unitary, localized and quantifiable speech communities to transnational ones, both ‘real’ and ‘virtual’ (Leppänen 2012a; Pennycook 2012; Rampton 2000), and (b) away from presupposed fully-fluent native speakers’ competence to a sociolinguistics that looks at the individual whose competences consist rather of a plurality of ‘registers’ (Agha 2004), ‘styles’ (Rampton 2011b) and genres (Blommaert and Rampton 2011: 6) that constitute ‘super-diverse repertoires’ (Blommaert and Backus 2013). Thus, the sociolinguistics that feeds into super-diversity discourse sees people as deploying sets of resources from various ‘languages’. Among the many notions for such multilingual or, more broadly speaking, transidiomatic practices (Jacquemet 2005), some have been explicitly associated with the notion of super-diversity: ‘polylinguaging’ (Jørgensen 2008) and ‘translinguaging’ (Blackledge and Creese 2010; Creese and Blackledge 2010), and more recently a ‘multilingualism of entanglement’ (Williams and Stroud 2013). Moreover, certain (named) sets of mixed features have been explicitly aligned to super-diversity, examples being ‘contemporary urban vernaculars’ (Rampton 2013b), heteroglossia (Leppänen 2012b), and supervernaculars (Blommaert 2011; but see: Makoni 2012; Orman 2012; Velghe 2011).

While locating and articulating the “agentive, liberating and resistant” dimensions of multi-modal and multilingual ‘linguaging’ (Jaspers and Verschueren 2011: 1159), contemporary sociolinguistics seeks to map ideological dynamics in the form of emerging normativity, for instance, or new, national as well as post-national regimes of surveying and controlling diversity, heteronormativity, etc. Sociolinguistics possesses a range of analytical tools to deal with situated normativity and meaning-making frames, in the form of Indexical orders (Silverstein 2003) or registers (Agha 2004), some of which are being rearticulated in the context of super-diversity, such as: normative regimentation (Rampton 2013b), orders of indexicality (Blommaert 2007), emerging normativity (Leppänen 2012a), enregistering (Blommaert and Varis 2011), language testing regimes (Blackledge 2009; Spotti 2011)..

Apart from bolstering methodological renewal either at the theoretical level of envisioning diversity or at the analytical level of dealing with language form, practice and ideology – the three dimensions of the ‘total linguistic fact’, coined by Silverstein (1985) and recently revitalized by Rampton (2013a) – sociolinguistic research introduces into super-diversity discourse a rapidly expanding range of explorative and programmatic ethnographic work in various empirical fields. Among the established fields are those of (a) youth language, most often with a special interest in identity-work both offline and online (e.g., chatting and

texting) (Jørgensen 2010; Jørgensen, et al. 2011; Leppänen, et al. forthcoming; Li and Juffermans 2011; Rampton 2013b; Spotti forthcoming; Velghe 2011), and (partly overlapping with) (b) a range of popular culture practices mostly, but not exclusively online (Leppänen and Piirainen-Marsh 2009; Madsen in press; Varis and Wang 2011; Wang 2010; Williams and Stroud 2013), (c) school or (language) teaching contexts both formal and informal (Creese and Blackledge 2010; Moore forthcoming), and (d) literacy practices mostly but not exclusively situated in the complexity of globalized urbanity (Arnaut forthcoming; Blommaert 2012; Vigouroux 2011).

3. Outlook: two challenges for super-diversity discourse

The above-mentioned developments in the sociolinguistics of globalisation allow us to discern at least two of the main challenges for the future conceptualisation of super-diversity. The first challenge consists in listing the various types of diversity (from above) the second in mapping its creative potential (from below). The overall issue is raised in connection with diversity *tout court* by keen observers like Marianna Valverde and Kenneth Prewitt, former Director of the US Census Bureau. Valverde rejects assessments of certain cities or neighbourhoods as “more diverse” than others. She argues (2008: 920-921) that given the instability of diversity one cannot even hope to “quantify diversity or even locate it in any kind of stable manner”. Along similar lines, Prewitt foresees two possible outcomes, in the face of rising complexity and uncertainty in diversity classification: “either a push toward measurement (like censuses) using ever more finely-grained classifications, or system collapse – the end of measurements of difference” altogether (in Vertovec 2012: 303-304). To a large extent, the polylinguaging model of investigating multilingualism (Jørgensen, et al. 2011) or the “urban vernacular” take on “multi-ethnic heteroglossia” (Rampton 2011a) may be seen as exemplifying such a ‘system collapse’. In the words of Michael Silverstein (2013), the question is whether superdiversity is an incremental or a transformative condition.

The move from the one to the other may well resemble the shift recently called for by both Rampton (2013a) and Fabian (2012). Realizing the extent to which sociolinguists are “operating in a potentially dizzying ambience of superdiversity, post-structuralism, late modernity etc., etc.”, Rampton (2013a: 2) poses the question: “[...] how do we even start to conceptualise what the job of really fine-grained linguistic description actually entails?”. Referring to the era when culture ceased to be seen as (a collection of) bounded, countable units, Fabian (2012: 443) states: “what we lost in theoretical certainty (or security) we gained in renewed ethnographic fervour that made us study the unruly, boisterous, seemingly anarchic yet inexhaustibly creative forms of contemporary survival”. However, unless this new human and social science of ‘poiesis’ is going to be radically agency-centred

or ontology-driven (Parkin 2012), it will have to “understand how creative activity is both enabled and constrained by the conditions in which it takes place” (Calhoun, et al. 2013). In the meantime, it appears that super-diversity is negotiating this balance by re-engineering its conceptual toolbox along the structure-agency dividing line. Along with crossing, styling, and artful performance in sociolinguistics (Rampton 2009), the notions of conviviality (Blommaert 2012; Gilroy 2006; Goebel 2013; Williams and Stroud 2013) or local solidarities (Oosterlynck and Schuermans forthcoming) are meant to grasp the agentivity of diversity-driven interaction. Likewise, in line with ‘emerging normativity’ (Leppänen 2012a), notions like ‘infrastructures’ (Calhoun, et al. 2013; Simone 2010) or ‘pathways of emplacement’ whether linked to opportunity structures or not (Glick Schiller and Çağlar 2013: 500) may add much-needed structure-sensitive notions to super-diversity discourse.

Through conceptual exercises like these, super-diversity discourse may begin to accommodate some of the basic concerns underlying the multiculturalism discourse that it seeks to replace: (a) inequality, discrimination and marginalisation, on the one hand, and (b) internet surveillance, social sorting and profiling, on the other. Regarding the latter, it is becoming increasingly clear that the interactive Internet (Web 2.0), being an important site of consumption, socialisation and identity-work, affords a “deep government and industrial drive toward gathering and extracting maximal value from data, be it information that will lead to more targeted advertising, product design, traffic planning or criminal policing” (Crawford in Varis forthcoming). More generally speaking, digital media constitute a post-panoptical governmentality whose subjectivity effects arise, among other things, from “identity formation that works through mathematical algorithms to infer categories of identity” (Cheney-Lippold 2011: 165) and, indeed ‘diversity’. Recently, Varis (forthcoming) and Arnaut (2012; 2013) have discussed these issues in connection with super-diversity. While sharing a common concern over how the ‘superdiverse’ subject may be neoliberalism’s ideal multifaceted, 360° consumer, Arnaut (2012: 10ff) calls for a ‘critical sociolinguistics of diversity’ while Varis specifically draws attention to the dangers of internet-driven people and populations management – Lyon’s ‘social sorting’ and the way it inscribes existing and new inequalities into contemporary ‘superdiverse’ societies.

With respect to the issue of inequality, Makoni (2012: 193) conjectures that “superdiversity contains a powerful sense of social romanticism, creating an illusion of equality in a highly asymmetrical world [...]” (see also: Berrey 2005: 145; Block 2012: 59). Recently, Rampton (2013a: 3) observed that “potentially crucial aspects of their informants’ social, political, rhetorical or linguistic positioning are obscured, and this lets in the romantic celebration of difference and creative agency that has been so common in sociolinguistics, or the presumption of deficit and remedial need in SLA (Second Language Acquisition)”. More generally, Sepulveda, et al. (2011) point out that “... the manner in which views concerning

the diversification of diversity have been taken forward into the political agenda has led to an overemphasis upon cultural and localised differences at the expense of structural inequalities and a politicized retreat from multiculturalism.” One of the main challenges to superdiversity, so it seems, has already been formulated in a critique of its kindred notion of intersectionality by one of the latter’s founding mothers, Nira Yuval-Davis (1999: 95): “differences are important [...], but [...] notions of difference should encompass, rather than replace, notions of equality.” With super-diversity continuing to accommodate and nourish such critical debates as that of listing its various types versus focusing on its transformative qualities, or that of difference versus inequality, it may well gain centre stage in any future re-keying of the human and social sciences.

**SEE ALSO: →Multiculturalism→Minorities→Communication Theory and Philosophy
→Identities and Discourse→Diversity→Globalisation→Digital media→Digital Culture→Self
→Cultural and Critical Theory**

Further Reading:

Arnaut, Karel 2012. Super-diversity: elements of an emerging perspective. *Diversities*, 14, 1-16.

Blommaert, Jan 2012. Chronicles of complexity: Ethnography, superdiversity, and linguistic landscapes. *Tilburg Papers in Culture Studies* 29. Tilburg: Babylon.

Blommaert, Jan & Ben Rampton 2011. Language and superdiversity: A position paper. *Diversities*, 13, 1-21.

Creese, Angela & Adrian Blackledge 2010a. Towards a sociolinguistics of superdiversity. *Zeitschrift Fur Erziehungswissenschaft*, 13, 549-572.

Jørgensen, Jens Normann, Martha Sif Karrebæk, Lian Malai Madsen & Janus Spindler Møller 2011. Polylinguaging in superdiversity. *Diversities*, 13, 23-38.

Leppänen, Sirpa 2012. Linguistic and discursive hybridity on the translocal Internet: the case of web writing. In: Sebba, Mark, Mahootian, Shahrzad & Jonsson, Carla (eds.) *Language mixing and code-switching in writing: Approaches to mixed-language written discourse*. Pp. London: Routledge.

Rampton, Ben 2013a. Drilling down to the grain in superdiversity. *Working Papers in Urban Language & Literacies*, 98, www.kcl.ac.uk/ldc.

Spotti, Massimiliano 2011. Ideologies of success for superdiverse citizens: The Dutch testing regime for integration and the online private sector. *Diversities*, 13, 39-52.

Vertovec, Steven 2007. Super-diversity and its implications. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 30, 1024-1054.

References

Agha, Asif

2004 Registers of language. *In* A companion to linguistic anthropology. A. Duranti, ed. Pp. 23-45. Oxford: Blackwell.

Arnaut, Karel

2012 Super-diversity: elements of an emerging perspective. *Diversities* 14(2):1-16.

2013 Review of: Nicholas Mirzoeff (2011), *The Right to Look: A Counterhistory of Visuality*, Durham: Duke University Press. *Cultural History* 2(1):106-111.

forthcoming *Writing along the margins: literacy and agency in a West African city*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Back, Les

1996 *New ethnicities and urban culture: Racisms and multiculturalism in young lives*. London: UCL Press.

Berg, Mette Louise, and Nando Sigona

2013 Ethnography, diversity and urban space. *Identities* 20(4):347-360.

Berrey, Ellen C.

2005 Divided over diversity: Political discourse in a Chicago neighborhood. *City & Community* 4(2):143-170.

Blackledge, Adrian

2009 "As a Country We Do Expect": The Further Extension of Language Testing Regimes in the United Kingdom. *Language Assessment Quarterly* 6(1):6-16.

Blackledge, Adrian, and Angela Creese

2010 *Multilingualism, a critical perspective*. London: Continuum.

Block, David

2012 Economising globalisation and identity in applied linguistics in neoliberal times. *In* *Neoliberalism and Applied Linguistics*. D. Block, J. Gray, and M. Holborow, eds. Pp. 56-85. London: Routledge.

Blommaert, Jan

2003 Commentary: A sociolinguistics of globalization. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 7(4):607-623.

2007 Sociolinguistics and discourse analysis: Orders of indexicality and polycentricity. *Journal of Multicultural Discourses* 2(2):115-130.

2010 *The sociolinguistics of globalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

2011 *Supernomads and their dialects*. *In* *Tilburg Papers in Culture Studies* 9. Tilburg: Babylon.

2012 *Chronicles of complexity: Ethnography, superdiversity, and linguistic landscapes*. *In* *Tilburg Papers in Culture Studies* 29. Tilburg: Babylon.

Blommaert, Jan, and Albert Maria Backus

2013 *Superdiverse repertoires and the individual*. *In* *Multilingualism and multimodality*. I. de Saint-Georges and J.J. Weber, eds. Pp. 11-32. Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.

Blommaert, Jan, and Ben Rampton

2011 *Language and superdiversity: A position paper*. *Diversities* 13(2):1-21.

Blommaert, Jan, and Piia Varis

2011 *Enough is enough: The heuristics of authenticity in superdiversity*. *In* *Working Papers in Urban Language & Literacies*, 76, www.kcl.ac.uk/ldc.

- Brah, Avtar, and Ann Phoenix
2004 Ain't I a woman? Revisiting intersectionality. . *Journal of International Women's Studies* 5(3):75-86.
- Calhoun, Craig, Richard Sennett, and Harel Shapira
2013 Poiesis means making. *Public Culture* 25(2):195-200.
- Cheney-Lippold, John
2011 A new algorithmic identity: Soft biopolitics and the modulation of control. *Theory, Culture & Society* 28(6):164-181.
- Creese, Angela, and Adrian Blackledge
2010 Towards a sociolinguistics of superdiversity. *Zeitschrift Fur Erziehungswissenschaft* 13(4):549-572.
- Erel, Umut
2011 Complex belongings: Racialization and migration in a small English city. *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 34(12):2048-2068.
- Eriksen, Thomas Hylland
2012 Overheating: The three crises of globalisation: An anthropological history of the early 21st century. ESRC Project Outline.
- Fabian, Johannes
1978 Popular culture in Africa: findings and conjectures. *Africa* 48(4):315-334.
1998 Moments of freedom: anthropology and popular culture. Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia.
2012 Cultural anthropology and the question of knowledge. *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* 18(2):439-453.
- Fanshawe, Simon, and Dhananjayan Sriskandarajah
2010 'You Can't Put Me In A Box': Super-diversity and the end of identity politics in Britain. London: Institute for Public Policy Research
- Gilroy, Paul
1996 British Cultural Studies and the pitfalls of identity. *In Black British Cultural Studies: A reader.* H. Baker, M. Diawara, and R. Lindeborg, eds. Pp. 223-239. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
2006 After empire. Melancholia or convivial culture? Abingdon: Routledge.
- Glick Schiller, Nina, and Ayse Çağlar
2013 Locating migrant pathways of economic emplacement: Thinking beyond the ethnic lens. *Ethnicities* 13(4):494-514.
- Glick Schiller, Nina, Ayşe Çağlar, and Thaddeus C. Guldbrandsen
2006 Beyond the ethnic lens: Locality, globality, and born-again incorporation. *American Ethnologist* 33(4):612-633.
- Goebel, Zane
2013 Language, media & superdiversity: Indonesians knowledging at home and abroad. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Hall, Stuart
1996 New ethnicities. *In On postmodernism and articulation: An Interview with Stuart Hall.* D. Morley and K.-H. Chen, eds. Pp. 441-449. London: Routledge.
- Harris, Roxy, and Ben Rampton
2010 Ethnicities without guarantees: An empirical approach. *In Liveable lives: negotiating identities in new times.* M. Wetherell, ed. Pp. 95-119. Basingstoke: Palgrave.
- Hewitt, Roger
1986 White talk, black talk: Inter-racial friendship and communication amongst adolescents. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hymes, Dell

- 1972 The use of anthropology: critical, political, personal. *In* Reinventing anthropology. D. Hymes, ed. Pp. 3-82. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press.
- Jacquemet, Marco
 2005 Transidiomatic practices: Language and power in the age of globalization. *Language & Communication* 25(3):257-277.
- Jaspers, Jürgen, and Jef Verschueren
 2011 Multilingual structures and agencies. *Journal of Pragmatics* 43(5):1157-1160.
- Jørgensen, J. Normann, ed.
 2010 Love ya hate ya : the sociolinguistic study of youth language and youth identities. Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars.
- Jørgensen, Jens Normann
 2008 Polylingual languaging around and among children and adolescents. *International Journal of Multilingualism* 5(3):161-176.
- Jørgensen, Jens Normann, et al.
 2011 Polylinguaging in superdiversity. *Diversities* 13(2):23-38.
- Kell, Catherine
 2013 Ariadne's thread: Literacy, scale and meaning making across space and time. *In* Tilburg Papers in Culture Studies 81. Tilburg: Babylon.
- Leppänen, Sirpa
 2012a Linguistic and discursive hybridity on the translocal Internet: the case of web writing. *In* Language mixing and code-switching in writing: Approaches to mixed-language written discourse. M. Sebba, S. Mahootian, and C. Jonsson, eds. London: Routledge.
 2012b Linguistic and generic hybridity in web writing: The case of fan fiction. *In* Language mixing and code-switching in writing. M. Sebba, S. Mahootian, and C. Jonsson, eds. Pp. 233-254. New York: Routledge.
- Leppänen, Sirpa, and Arja Piirainen-Marsh
 2009 Language policy in the making: an analysis of bilingual gaming activities. *Language Policy* 8(3):261-284.
- Leppänen, Sirpa., et al.
 forthcoming Linguistic and discursive heterogeneity in superdiverse social media. *In* The Language of Social Media: Communication and Community on the Internet. P. Seargeant and C. Tagg, eds. Basingstoke: Palgrave.
- Li, Jinling, and Kasper Juffermans
 2011 Multilingual Europe 2.0: Dutch-Chinese youth identities in the era of superdiversity. *In* Working Papers in Urban Language and Literacies, paper 71, www.kcl.ac.uk/ldc.
- Lionnet, Françoise, and Shu-mei-Shih
 2005 Thinking through the Minor, Transnationality. *In* Minor transnationalism. F. Lionnet and Shu-mei-Shih, eds. Durham & London: Duke University Press.
- Madsen, Lian Malai
 in press Discourses on integration and interaction in a martial arts club. *In* Sports governance, development and corporate responsibility. B. Segaeert, M. Theeboom, C. Timmerman, and B. Vanreusel, eds. London: Routledge.
- Makoni, Sifree
 2012 A critique of language, languaging and supervenacular. Uma crítica à noção de língua, linguagem e supervenáculo. *Muitas Vozes, Ponta Grossa* 1(2):189-199.
- Makoni, Sifree, and Alastair Pennycook
 2007 Disinventing and reconstituting languages. *In* Disinventing and reconstituting languages. Pp. 1-41. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Mercer, Kobena
 1994 Welcome to the jungle: New positions in black cultural studies. New York: Routledge.
- Moore, Robert

- forthcoming "Taking up speech" in an endangered language: Bilingual discourse in a heritage language classroom. *In Super-diversity and the sociolinguistics of the interstices*. K. Arnaut, M. Karrebæk, and M. Spotti, eds. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Mufwene, Salikoko S., and Cécile B. Vigouroux
2008 Colonization, globalization and language vitality. *In Globalization and language vitality : perspectives from Africa*. C.B. Vigouroux and S.S. Mufwene, eds. Pp. 1-31. London: Continuum.
- Negri, Antonio
2008 *Empire and beyond*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Oosterlynck, Stijn, and Nick Schuermans
forthcoming *Superdiversiteit: Solidariteit herdenken*. Alert.
- Orman, Jon
2012 Not so super: The ontology of 'supervernaculars'. *Language & Communication* 32(4):349-357.
- Parkin, David
2012 From multilingual classification to translanguaging ontology: Concluding commentary. *Diversities* 14(2):71-83.
- Parkin, David, and Karel Arnaut
2012 *Super-diversity, a digest*. Göttingen: Max Planck Institute for the Study of Religious and Ethnic Diversity.
- Pennycook, Alastair
2012 *Language and mobility: Unexpected places*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Phillimore, Jenny
2011 Approaches to health provision in the age of super-diversity: Accessing the NHS in Britain's most diverse city. *Critical Social Policy* 31(1):5-29.
- Pratt, Mary Louise
1987 Linguistic utopias. *In The linguistics of writing: Arguments between language and literature*. N. Fabb, D. Attridge, A. Durant, and C. Maccabe, eds. Pp. 48-66. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Rampton, Ben
2000 *Speech Community*. *In Working Papers in Urban Language & Literacies*, 15, www.kcl.ac.uk/lldc.
- 2006 *Language in late modernity: Interaction in an urban school*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- 2009 Interaction ritual and not just artful performance in crossing and stylization. *Language in Society* 38(02):149-176.
- 2010 An everyday poetics of class and ethnicity in stylization and crossing. *In Working Papers in Urban Language & Literacies*, 59, www.kcl.ac.uk/lldc, Vol. 59.
- 2011a From 'Multi-ethnic adolescent heteroglossia' to 'Contemporary urban vernaculars'. *Language & Communication* 31(4):276-294 (also available as *Working Papers in Urban Language & Literacies*, vol. 61, www.kcl.ac.uk/lldc).
- 2011b Style contrasts, migration and social class. *Journal of Pragmatics* 43(5):1236-1250.
- 2013a Drilling down to the grain in superdiversity. *In Working Papers in Urban Language & Literacies*, 98, www.kcl.ac.uk/lldc.
- 2013b From 'youth language' to contemporary urban vernaculars. *In Das Deutsch der Migranten. Jahrbuch des Instituts für Deutsche Sprache*. A. Deppermann, ed. Berlin / New York: De Gruyter.
- Schmoll, Camille, and Giovanni Semi
2013 Shadow circuits: urban spaces and mobilities across the Mediterranean. *Identities* 20(4):377-392.
- Sepulveda, Leandro, Stephen Syrett, and Fergus Lyon

- 2011 Population superdiversity and new migrant enterprise: The case of London. *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development* 23(7-8):469-497.
- Silverstein, Michael
 1985 Language and the culture of gender. *In* *Semiotic mediation*. E. Mertz and R. Parmentier, eds. Pp. 219-259. New York: Academic Press.
- 2003 Indexical order and the dialectics of sociolinguistic life. *Language & Communication* 23:193-229.
- 2013 How language communities intersect: Is 'superdiversity' an incremental or transformative condition. *In* *Language and Super-diversity: Explorations and interrogations*. Jyväskylä: 5-7 June, 2013.
- Simone, AbdouMaliq
 2010 The social infrastructures of city life in contemporary Africa. Discussion paper (Nordiska Afrikainstitutet, Uppsala) 51.
- Spotti, Massimiliano
 2011 Ideologies of success for superdiverse citizens: The Dutch testing regime for integration and the online private sector. *Diversities* 13(2):39-52.
- Spotti, Max
 forthcoming Identities in question. MMG Working Papers.
- Urry, John
 2005 The complexity turn. *Theory, Culture & Society* 22(5):1-14.
- Van Dijk, Rijk
 2011 Cities and the social construction of hot spots: Rescaling, Ghanaian migrants, and the fragmentation of urban spaces. *In* *Locating migration: Rescaling cities and migrants*. N. Glick Schiller and A. Çağlar, eds. Pp. 104-122: Cornell University Press.
- Varis, Piia
 forthcoming Digital diversity: Architectures and algorithms. *In* *Super-diversity and the sociolinguistics of the interstices*. K. Arnaut, M. Karrebæk, and M. Spotti, eds. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Varis, Piia, and Xuan Wang
 2011 Superdiversity on the Internet: A case from China. *Diversities* 13(2):71-83.
- Velghe, Fie
 2011 Lessons in textspeak from Sexy Chick: Supervernacular literacy in South African instant and text messaging. *In* *Tilburg Papers in Culture Studies* 1.
- Vertovec, Steven
 2006 The emergence of super-diversity in Britain. *In* *Research on immigration and integration in the metropolis*, Vol. No. 06-14: Working Paper Series: Vancouver Centre of Excellence.
- 2007 Super-diversity and its implications. *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 30(6):1024-1054.
- 2010 Towards post-multiculturalism? Changing communities, conditions and contexts of diversity. *International Social Science Journal* 61(199):83-95.
- 2012 "Diversity" and the social imaginary. *European Journal of Sociology* 53(3):287-312.
- Vigouroux, Cecile
 2011 Magic marketing: Performing grassroots literacy *Diversities* 13(2):54-69.
- Wang, Xuan
 2010 'I am not a qualified dialect rapper': Genre innovation as authenticity. *In* *Working Papers in Urban Language and Literacies*, 64, www.kcl.ac.uk/ldc.
- Wang, Xuan, et al.
 2013 Globalization in the margins. *Tilburg papers in Culture Studies* 73.
- Werbner, Pnina
 2013 Everyday multiculturalism: Theorising the difference between 'intersectionality' and 'multiple identities'. *Ethnicities* 13(4):401-419.
- Wessendorf, Susanne

- 2010 Commonplace diversity: Social interactions in a super-diverse context. MMG Working Papers 10-11. Max Planck Institute for the Study of Religious and Ethnic Diversity (Göttingen). forthcoming 'Being open, but sometimes closed': Conviviality in a super-diverse London neighbourhood. *European Journal of Cultural Studies*.
- Williams, Quentin, and Christopher Stroud
2013 Multilingualism in transformative spaces: contact and conviviality. *Language Policy* 12(4):289-311.
- Wimmer, Andreas, and Nina Glick Schiller
2003 Methodological nationalism, the social sciences and the study of migration: An essay in historical epistemology. *International Migration Review* 37(3):576-610.
- Wolf, Eric R.
1964 *Anthropology*. New York: Norton.
- Yuval-Davis, Nira
1999 What is 'transversal politics'? *Soundings* 12:94-98.