

Editor's Note

As the *Working Papers in Educational Linguistics* nears its 30th anniversary and Penn's Graduate School of Education its centennial, we find ourselves in search of new ways to synthesize and reconceptualize the "golden oldies" of Educational Linguistics to which Hymes (1992, p. 8) alludes. New developments in technology and mass mobility, as well as a rise of critical framings of histories that were previously taken for granted have to some extent changed our field of inquiry. Throughout this volume, authors explore these developments by synthesizing previously dichotomous viewpoints, capitalizing on citizen participation and metacommentary, and historicizing policy discourses within their socio-political contexts. All of these add additional layers of understanding to analyses of our rapidly changing world.

In our first paper, Junko Hondo bridges the frequently discussed divide between social and cognitive approaches to second language acquisition through a mixed-methods analysis of reflection in a task based language learning session. She collects quantitative data capturing students' language production as well as their own reflections on their interactional experience. These student-generated commentaries add a layer of understanding to the cognitive analysis. In doing so, Hondo seeks to broaden the view of second language development to account for the complexities of these interactions.

Betsy Rymes and Andrea Leone expand on traditional researcher-as-observer frameworks to introduce a new methodology of *citizen sociolinguistics*, in which participants' opinions and comments about language are legitimized and utilized as sociolinguistic data. In this egalitarian framing, sociolinguistic analysis descends from the realm of the ivory tower and becomes a form of *participatory culture* (Jenkins, 2009) in which laypeople can and are encouraged to participate, often through mass mediated technologies, such as YouTube, Twitter, and others. They suggest that this is the direction in which sociolinguists ought to move, particularly since the internet provides a vast repository of archived data, often with timestamps, making tracing the circulation of ideas and discourses much easier than it once was.

Drawing on this citizen sociolinguistic methodology, Mark Lewis considers the manner in which *citizens* understand and frame the five paragraph essay (5PE) that pervades the English and writing courses of most American school children. Gleaning data from the online spaces of Reddit and YouTube, and building on *enregisterment* (Agha, 2007) and Foucauldian understandings of *governmentality* (Foucault, 2007), Lewis demonstrates how the discourses of participants in such spaces govern the experiences of those new to the 5PE, resulting in a mode of governmentality that then affects the socialization of new writers. In doing so, he reveals the manner in which the 5PE is constructed as a genre entirely dependent on the authoritarian specifications of educators and the exams to which they subject their students.

Also building on Foucault's (2007) *governmentality*, Defu Wan seeks to historicize assumptions of modern language planning in China and consider their foundations in the nation's colonial history. In doing so, he applies a critical lens to

the history of language policy in China and traces the origins of China's equation of language, nationality, and ethnicity. In this way, he questions the concerns of national unity and economic development that dominate discussions of China today and draws attention to the historically-rooted preconceptions on which these initiatives are built.

In the final paper, Andrea Leone closely examines the citizen sociolinguistic commentary on a single controversial case about the Roman dialect on YouTube and Facebook. Like others in this volume, she shifts the focus of a sociolinguistic analysis from the static, linguistic characteristics of the YouTube video itself to the social values with which citizen sociolinguists imbue it through metacommentary. In doing so, she capitalizes on YouTube videos and threads as an ongoing record of both primary linguistic practices as well as citizens' metacommentary, alignment, and resistance to such representations.

Our readers will note that this trend of complexifying our understandings of educational linguistics spans time and space, both virtually and physically, and questions core assumptions of theory, policy, and methodology. The authors of this issue have explored these and other matters, demonstrating the ways in which shifting views and methods in the field can and are yielding novel insights to practices and realities that have been hitherto unexplored.

I would like to here recognize Coleman Donaldson's contributions to the early planning of this issue as co-Editor-in-Chief, as well as the input of my former co-editors Miranda Weinberg and Siwon Lee. I also extend most heartfelt gratitude to Mark Lewis, who oversaw the time consuming production and design process, and to the Editorial Staff and Advisory Board of the *Working Papers in Educational Linguistics*, without whose support and expertise the issue you hold now would not exist. It has been an honor and pleasure to work with so talented and dedicated an editorial staff.

Geeta Aneja
September 27, 2014

References

- Agha, A. (2007). *Language and social relations*. Cambridge, UK; New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Foucault, M. (2007). *Security, territory, and population: Lectures at the College de France 1977-1978*. New York, NY: Picador.
- Hymes, D. (1992). Inequality in language: Taking for granted. *Working Papers in Educational Linguistics*, 8(1): 1-30.
- Jenkins, H. (2009). What happened before YouTube? In J. Burgess & J. Green, *YouTube: Online video and participatory culture* (1st ed., pp. 109-125). Cambridge, UK; Malden, MA: Polity.