INVESTMENT AND LANGUAGE LEARNING IN THE 21ST CENTURY

Ron Darvin, Bonny Norton

Investment and Language Learning in the 21st Century

Ron Darvin and Bonny Norton
University of British Columbia
ron.darvin@ubc.ca; bonny.norton@ubc.ca

Introduction

When Norton published her essay, "Social identity, investment, and language learning" (Norton Peirce, 1995), it marked a watershed moment in the field of applied linguistics, integral to the sociocultural turn in language education (Block, 2007). Her study of five immigrant women in Canada was emblematic of a historical moment when large-scale migrations were transforming post-industrialist societies into more heterogeneous and multicultural spaces. As migrants sought to carve a space in their country of settlement, the acquisition of the country's official language was crucial to integration and employment. How they negotiated relations of power at work, school, and other community settings enabled them to assert their rightful place in their adopted country and to imagine better futures. In this context, Norton drew on the poststructuralist writings of Weedon (1987) to make the case that learning a language is a powerful political act, in which language constructs both social organization and the sense of self. At the same time, Norton recognized the centrality of agency in language learning, and a language learner's capacity to claim more powerful identities from which to speak, read, and write the target language. Second language acquisition (SLA) research was at that time beginning to emerge from its predominantly cognitive orientation to examine how social factors facilitated or inhibited language learning (Firth & Wagner, 1997). All these changes were raising new questions of identity, and Norton saw the need to develop social theories complementary to cognitive theories, which would capture the complexity of

language learning as both a social and cognitive process. By responding to both a political impetus and an epistemological shift, Norton's work acquired "historical significance" (Kramsch, 2013, p. 192).

Theorizing the complex relationship between the language learner and the social world, Norton (1995; 2000; 2013) sought to examine under what conditions social interaction takes place, and to what extent relations of power limit opportunities for language learners to speak (Bourdieu, 1991). In this sense, commitment to learning is understood not just as a product of motivation, which in earlier research assumed a unitary, fixed and ahistorical "personality" and relied on the dichotomies associated with traditional conceptions of the learner (good/bad, motivated/unmotivated, anxious/confident, introvert/extrovert). Norton argued that the psychological construct of motivation did not suffice in explaining how a learner may be highly motivated, but may resist opportunities to speak in contexts where he or she is positioned in unequal ways.

Inspired by the work of Bourdieu (1990, 1991), Norton's construct of investment recognizes that language learners have complex, multiple identities, changing across time and space, and reproduced in social interaction. By highlighting the socially and historically constructed relationship between learners and the target language, investment provides a critical lens that allows researchers to examine the relations of power in different learning contexts, and to what extent these conditions shape how learners commit to learning a language. Learners invest in a language because it will help them acquire a wider range of symbolic and material resources, which will in turn increase the value of their cultural capital and social power (Norton, 2013). At the same time, to what extent learners are able to invest in a target language and claim legitimacy as speakers is contingent on how power is negotiated in different fields, with varying outcomes. In addition to asking "Are students motivated to learn a language?" researchers pose the question, "To what extent are students and teachers invested in the language and literacy practices of a given classroom and community?" Because identity is multiple and frequently a site of struggle, investment is also complex, contradictory, and often in a state of flux.

Over the past two decades, Norton has advanced these ideas, and identity and investment are now considered foundational in language education (Cummins, 2006; Kramsch, 2013; Miller & Kubota, 2013; Ortega, 2009; Swain & Deters, 2007).

Kramsch (2013, p. 195) points out how

> Norton's notion of *investment,* a strong dynamic term with economic connotations … accentuates the role of human agency and identity in engaging with the task at hand, in accumulating economic and symbolic capital, in having stakes in the endeavor and in persevering in that endeavor. In the North American context*, investment* in SLA has become synonymous with 'language learning commitment' and is based on a learner's intentional choice and desire. (2013, p. 195)

In this paper, we interrogate further this "intentional choice and desire" by examining how the new social order marked by mobility and superdiversity (Blommaert, 2013) has constructed new issues of structure and learner agency. Two decades after Norton's original conceptualization of investment, the mechanisms of globalization and advancements in technology have transformed the social world. New modes of productivity and socialization and the compression of time and space have shaped identities, allegiances, and notions of citizenship in profound new ways. As learners traverse local and global boundaries, occupying multiple online and offline spaces, this fluidity of movement provides new constraints and affordances in learning that impact their investment. At the same time, how power operates in these shifting contexts and networks constructs new forms of inequality. While the discourses of globalization and technology promote a sense of interconnectedness, they obscure the operation of ideologies that construct these inequalities. To respond to this obfuscation, this paper looks towards cosmopolitanism (Beck, 2006; Delanty; 2006) as a construct that helps articulate how learners can imagine a more inclusive global community, and discusses: (i) how technology and mobility have transformed identities, language practices, and power dynamics; (ii) how Darvin and Norton's (2015) model of investment addresses the ideological issues associated with these evolving practices and dynamics, and (iii) how cosmopolitanism, as a counterdiscourse to globalization, can shape an investment that challenges rather than reproduces the inequalities of this new social order.

2. Language and identity in the new world order

As both a compression of the world and a growing awareness of the world, facilitated through the transnational flow of capital, goods, people and ideas (Appadurai, 1991), globalization has been an ongoing project for decades. The rapid development of technology in recent years, however, together with the intensification of neoliberal pressures on different economies, has resulted in globalization processes that are

new in scope and scale (Blommaert, 2010). As these processes impact societies in distinct ways, the paradox of globalization is that while we increasingly develop a sense of the interconnectedness of the world, with the immediacy and simultaneity of news and social media, the world has become increasingly fragmented. The lived realities in urban centres in post-industrialist societies are markedly different from those in impoverished villages of developing countries. Not only are there social, cultural and political differences across the horizontal spaces of neighborhoods, regions, and countries, but also in the vertical spaces of class, gender, and ethnicity. At the same time, the virtual world also provides an axis where people of shared interests and tastes are able to construct new communities and ideas of co-citizenship (Gee & Hayes, 2010). It is the intersection of these axes in the 21st century that shapes identities and language in new, profound ways (Darvin, in press; Darvin & Norton, 2014a).

In this rapidly globalizing world, mobility has become "the ideology and utopia of the twenty-first century" (Elliott & Urry, 2010, p. 8). This mobility fuels a 'networked individualism' where people are linked by scheduling, monitoring, surveillance and regulation. Identities become unbounded and deterritorialized, no longer tied to fixed localities, patterns, or cultural traditions, transforming life strategies, while exerting new demands on the self (Elliott & Urry, 2010). Blommaert (2013) characterizes this state of mobility, complexity, and unpredictability as *superdiversity*, where identities are differently organized and distributed over online and offline sites. Within this superdiversity, communities of interest that transcend national boundaries are able to connect and interact. Learners engage with others and negotiate shared values and norms of collective behavior (Facer, 2011).

Social media platforms, by promoting the notion that all space is potentially public, has become the arena in which identities are perpetually performed, curated, and transformed. These identities are now literally lived and enacted by means of real-time representations, and language learners become increasingly capable of differentiating themselves through ways of speaking, seeing, thinking or acting, and participating in more divergent discourse communities. As a tool that mediates interaction, the digital becomes an extension of the self, and transforms what learners can do and mean, how they think and relate to others, and who they can be (Jones & Hafner 2012; Hafner, 2014). At the same time, learners are able to access information and narratives from different parts of the world. As these texts are created, shared and consumed, their reach and impact are shaped by

how learners both position themselves and are positioned by others in the context of classrooms, communities, and nations, within a global network.

Apart from constructing multiple spaces that socialize and disperse learners in new ways, technology has also radically transformed language by triggering an explosion of new vocabularies, genres, and styles, and by reshaping both the meaning and practice of literacy. By developing a mode of communication where writing approximates speaking, instant messaging (IM) and texting have facilitated the production of new words and styles that bridge the interactive nature of speech and the documental capacity of writing (Warschauer & Matuchniak 2010). Through the digital, literacy has become even more critical in claiming the right to speak (Janks, 2010 ; Moje & Luke, 2009).The constant evolution of new media has also spurred the growth of multimodal affordances, enabling people to assemble texts that integrate language with visual, aural, gestural and spatial modes (Darvin, 2015). Constructing new spaces of language acquisition and socialization (Lam, 2013; Ito et *al*, 2010), social media capabilities have facilitated cross language interaction (Warschauer 2009 ; Luke 2003) and fertilized transcultural and translingual practices (Canagarajah, 2013). Learners are not only able to produce and share texts with greater ease, but they are also able to get immediate feedback and reshape and remediate these texts, making people active creators in a society of reflexive co-construction (Cope & Kalantzis, 2010).

Because of the dynamic nature of these spaces, and the increasing diversity of those who occupy them, the distribution of power in learning and using language no longer rests on the simple dichotomy of native speaker and language learner. Learners are able to participate in a greater variety of multilingual communities and assert themselves to varying degrees as legitimate speakers (Norton, in press). As they occupy and move across these spaces governed by different value systems, not only do they have to perform multiple identities and linguistic repertoires, they are also positioned in new, often invisible ways. How language teachers, researchers and policy makers are able to map out these increasingly complex spaces, as they produce new pedagogies, theories and policies, while simultaneously negotiating competing ideologies, is perhaps one of the greatest challenges of language education in the new world order.

3. A model of investment

As digital affordances continue to offer a more flexible engagement with the world, the impact of the virtual on identity is significant. Language learners move fluidly across online and offline spaces, and

their capacity to identify and navigate systemic patterns of controls impact their investment in particular language and literacy practices. As spaces of socialization and knowledge construction continue to multiply, two distinct questions confront educators interested in investment in language learning. First, how do language learners negotiate new forms of sociality, which require continually evolving forms of literacy? Second, how does power operate within the increasingly unbounded yet isolated spaces of language learning? To provide a critical framework that recognizes the perpetual shifting of identities, the complexity of linguistic repertoires, and the negotiation of power, Darvin and Norton (2015) have constructed a model that locates investment at the intersection of identity, capital, and ideology. Designed to examine how specific communicative events are indexical of the macrostructures of power, this model draws attention to the institutional processes and systemic patterns that construct communicative practices in the technologically driven 21st century.

Figure 1. Darvin and Norton's 2015 Model of Investment

As learners move across spaces, ideologies collude and compete, shaping learners' identities and positioning them in different ways. The value of a learner's economic, cultural or social capital shifts as it travels across time and space. It is subject to but not completely constrained by the ideologies of different groups or fields that determine how the capital of learners is "perceived and recognized as legitimate" Bourdieu, 1987, p. 4), or transformed into symbolic capital. To what extent teachers recognize the linguistic or cultural capital of learners—their prior knowledge, home

literacies, and mother tongues— as symbolic capital can impact the extent to which learners will invest in the language and literacy practices of a given classroom. A closer examination of the three central constructs of the model (identity, ideology, and capital) provides further insight into this expanded theory of investment, with the caveat that these constructs are not mutually exclusive, but have common overlapping characteristics.

3.1 Performing multiple identities

Fundamental to this model of investment is identity, which Norton (2013) defined as "how people understand their relationship to the world, how that relation is constructed across time and space, and how people understand their possibilities for the future" (p. 4). Understanding one's "relationship to the world" is akin to what Bourdieu (1987) explains as a sense of one's place.

> This sense of one's place is at the same time a sense of the place of others, and, together with the affinities of habitus experienced in the form of personal attraction or revulsion, is at the root of all processes of cooptation, friendship, love, association, etc., and thereby provides the principle of all durable alliances and connections (p. 5).

Learners position themselves and others, accord or refuse them power, because of this sense developed through habitus, "a system of durable, transposable dispositions … principles which generate and organize practices and representations" (Bourdieu, 1990, p. 53). Habitus is durable because it is "constructed across time and space", shaped by ideology, reproduced through "practices and representation", and fortified by "alliances and connections." As disposition, habitus provides a conceptual understanding of what is reasonable and possible and a tendency to think and act in specific ways. It configures in learners an idea of their rightful place in society and predisposes them to do what they believe is expected of them and to develop relations that are deemed appropriate. At the same time, Norton speaks of identity as an understanding of "possibilities for the future", and in this sense, the multiple subjectivities that converge in the self are not just constructed by habitus but also imagined and desired.

> Guided by one's sympathies and antipathies, affections and aversions, tastes and distastes, one makes for oneself an environment in which one feels 'at home' and in which one can achieve that fulfillment of one's desire to be which one identifies with happiness" (Bourdieu, 2000, p. 150).

One feels "at home" because of habitus, but one finds happiness through the fulfillment of desire. Although what learners want can also be shaped by habitus, it is desire that opens up new "possibilities for the

future" through imagination. Whether it is because they want to be part of a country or a peer group, to find romance, or to achieve financial security, language learners invest because there is something that they want for themselves. Motha & Lin (2013) assert that desire is situated, co-constructed and intersubjectively constituted and shaped by multiple contexts. At the center of language learning is desire for a target language, the identities represented by particular accents and varieties, and the recognition, security and symbolic ties that are associated with the learning of this language.

For Heller & Duchêne (2012), languages are selected, promoted and defended through mechanisms of pride and profit. While learning certain languages can serve an instrumental purpose and provide material benefits, "structures of feeling" like pride of membership, a key element in the construction of nationhood, legitimize discourses and forms of expression that sustain this imagined community. In the same way, learning a lingua franca allows learners to imagine other forms of belonging, such as global citizenship. These structures of feeling may align with or contradict more benefit-driven motivations, as emotion itself is linked to the ideological (Lewis & Tierney, 2011; Wohlwend & Lewis, 2011), a connection increasingly obscured in the digital era. As digital media provide affordances that can communicate structures of feeling in powerful, innovative ways, they construct emotions and desires, while concealing the ideological mechanisms that shape these affective responses. To develop a critical understanding of investment thus requires an examination of how worldviews construct learner desires and imagined identities that can be complicit with reproducing social inequalities. In this sense, identity remains a site of struggle, as it is continually buffeted by the contradictions of habitus and desire, of dominant ideologies and alternative futures, of a limited sense of one's place and a boundless imagination of new possibilities.

3.2 Navigating ideologies

The power of ideology is its ability to render itself invisible, whether because it has naturalized itself as common sense, or because its mechanisms are intentionally concealed. Neoliberal ideology, for instance, with its logic of profit and market forces, becomes deeply entrenched not just in systems of governance, but also in ways of thinking. The rhetoric of the self as entrepreneur (Foucault, 2008) can aggrandize the pursuit of individual gain while overshadowing more collective aspirations. This has great implications for the way investment is

interpreted, and how learning is understood as a means to achieve both personal and societal benefits. In the digital age, ideologies are complicit in the control and flow of information and ideas on the Internet. For example, technology can filter the data made available to users through algorithms in search engines and social media platforms (Darvin, forthcoming). As language learners are socialized into the practices technologized around specific tools, not only do these media shape the way they behave and communicate with one another, they can also promote particular versions of reality and make possible some kinds of relationships more than others (Jones & Hafner, 2012).

The paradox of the discourses of globalization and technology is that while they highlight 'mobility,' 'flows,' 'flexibility' and 'de-regulation,' ideological sites continue to exercise greater control and regimentation (Duchêne, Moyer, & Roberts, 2013). Whether we speak of the movement of people across national boundaries or across online and offline contexts, these flows are regulated by mechanisms of power reproduced by institutional conditions and recursive hegemonic practices. The multiplicity of spaces thus requires a more polylithic and porous conception of ideology that recognizes the distribution of *ideologies*— "dominant ways of thinking that organize and stabilize societies while simultaneously determining modes of inclusion and exclusion" (Darvin & Norton, 2015, p. 72). Examining how ideologies operate in these spaces enables an understanding not only of the dynamics of power within communicative events, but also the structures of power that determine entry into the spaces where these events occur. This pluralized formulation complements the view that identity is multiple and fluid, and that capital shifts values in different contexts. Such formulations are more congruent with the new social order of mobility and fluidity, but also allow for a conception of investment that engenders greater agency and capacity for resistance.

As face-to-face and virtual contexts operate to transform a particular set of ideas into a dominant way of thinking, ideology has to be understood not as a static, monolithic worldview, but as a complex space where ideational, behavioral, and institutional aspects interact and sometimes contradict one another. Dominance and hegemony are processes rather than facts, and meanings are reproduced because of the repeated performance of specific practices (Blommaert, 2005). This reality draws attention to the fact that the reproduction of dominant culture is sustained by both coercion and consent, through the conscious or tacit acceptance of hegemonic practices. To resist this hegemonic pull, language learners need to identify and navigate systemic patterns of control and understand how

ideologies operate. By developing this critical skill, learners are able to not only access and produce legitimate knowledge, but also assert their place as legitimate speakers.

3.3. Negotiating forms of capital

Through this more nuanced understanding of ideology, we can also examine more closely the nature of capital, its role in investment, and the ways it can serve as a tool of both social reproduction and transformation. Learners invest in a language because they perceive it will deliver certain benefits: to gain meaningful employment, to enter into university, or to develop new skills. These benefits however are not limited to the material or economic. Learners may wish to learn a language to make friends or to pursue a romantic relationship. In these diverse cases, learners draw from the resources they possess to fulfill a certain desire: whether it involves using cultural capital to engage in conversation with an acquaintance about current events or special interests, or tapping into the social capital of a network of friends to connect to a prospective partner.

For Bourdieu (1986), capital is power and it extends from the material/economic to the cultural and social, and how these forms of capital are distributed represents the immanent structure of the social world. Learners are positioned in the social space based on the volume, composition, and trajectory of their capital. As the rules of the game vary in different fields and continually evolve, the value of a person's capital also shifts as it travels across time and space. The form the different types of capital take "once they are perceived and recognized as legitimate" (Bourdieu, 1987, p. 4) is *symbolic capital*. This conceptualization highlights how learners, because of their personal histories and lived experiences, are already equipped with capital as they enter the classroom. They have their own material resources, knowledges, linguistic skills, and social networks. It addresses whether the capital learners possess will be recognized as legitimate or valuable, and utilized as affordances for learning. That capital needs to be converted into symbolic capital reiterates how capital itself is fluid and dynamic, subject to – but not completely constrained by – the dominant ideologies of specific groups or fields. This conversion is frequently a site of struggle, especially if capital valued in one place is radically devalued in another.

When learners move across borders, the linguistic capital they bring with them is subject to what Blommaert (2010) calls different orders of indexicality. Learners' styles and registers are measured against a value

system that reflects the language ideology of the larger sociocultural context. Functions that are valid in local settings are imposed on the ways transnationals speak, and discourses only gain value when they are constructed as valuable. Language teachers need to reflect on whether they treat the linguistic and cultural capital of learners as affordances rather than constraints, and this requires being able to question and reevaluate the taken-for-granted value systems used to assess this capital. For Rojo (2013), understanding how symbolic capital is operationalized in the classroom is bound to how learners are represented as legitimate or nonlegitimate participants in the educational system. Linguistic demands and requirements establish hierarchies in educational programs, and not valuing learners' previous schooling, languages and knowledge discourages the formation of new capital, and orients learners towards unskilled jobs and lower positions in the labor market.

Through this interplay of identity, ideology and capital, we are able to examine the dynamics in which learners invest in language and literacy practices of classrooms and communities. This model of investment seeks to make visible how power operates in different learning contexts, and raises the following questions for language teachers (i) To what extent do I recognize and respond to the material, unequal lived realities of learners and their multiple identities? (ii) What dominant ideologies and systemic patterns of control circumscribe these realities? How does my own worldview position these learners in specific ways? (iii) In what ways do I recognize or overlook, value or devalue the linguistic and cultural capital that learners are equipped with? (Darvin, 2015). It is by addressing these questions that educators can develop a pedagogy that enables learners to invest in learning that does not just reproduce dominant ideologies, but challenges and transforms the different spaces of learning.

4. Two case studies: Ayrton and Henrietta

To illustrate how this model can be used as a critical lens to understand the impact of material conditions and ideological structures on the investment of diverse learners, we turn to two case studies of learners of contrasting geographical and social locations. Ayrton, a 16 year old Filipino male from a wealthy neighborhood in Vancouver, Canada, who participated in a study that examined the digital literacies of learners with contrasting socioeconomic backgrounds (Darvin & Norton, 2014b), and Henrietta, an 18-year-old female student from a rural village in Uganda, who took part in a study on the use of digital resources for HIV/AIDS

education and enhanced English language learning (Norton, Jones & Ahimbisibwe, 2011). We use the three central constructs of the model to organize the discussion below.

Identity. Ayrton and his family immigrated to Canada through the Investor Class, which requires immigrants to have a net worth of at least CAN\$1.6 million. His father was an entrepreneur who managed multiple businesses in the Philippines remotely, while his mother was a home-maker. The social position of Ayrton as part of a privileged class in a highly industrialized country has made technology a regular feature of his daily life, providing him with all the affordances of learning. His parents and older siblings were all skilled users, and served as digital literacy role models who shaped his conception of the uses of technology. His access to resources enabled him to claim the identity of a technologically adept user. Sharing his father's entrepreneurial spirit, he signed up for an online course on currency trading, where he engaged in online discussions with adult professionals from a global network. By carefully curating his social media profiles and shifting language registers as necessary, he was able to conceal his age and express opinions about market trends and opportuni-ties. Through this strategy, he was able to assert his place as a legitimate speaker in these spaces, and gain even greater knowledge valued in capi-talist contexts. Although it was his parents who paid a premium for this course, he described enrolling in the course as "one of the greatest invest-ments" of his life.

Henrietta, on the other hand, never had any experience with com-puters prior to participating in the digital literacy study. Her village had limited electricity and no running water, and people lived with a per-capita income of less than \$1 a day. The researchers brought Henrietta and her peers to an Internet café in a neighboring town to learn how to use the web to find information about HIV/AIDS. She expressed her investment in digital literacy as follows: "My main interest in learning more about computers is to know how they use Internet, to communicate to people in the outside countries." She recognized that knowledge gained through the Internet would enhance self-knowledge, as she would "learn more about [her]self through sharing view with Canadian people." Her desire to "join the group of knowledgeable people in the world" expressed an imagined identity.

Capital. Each member of Ayrton's family had a phone, and either a laptop or tablet or both. One section of the house had a desktop with a printer. Their connectivity was seamless as they moved from Wi-Fi at home or school to LTE or 3G in public spaces. Whether technology

was used for doing schoolwork, engaging in social media, or getting news updates, it had been completely integrated into Ayrton's daily life. He was visibly adept in it, multitasking with great ease, while jumping from one application to another. Asked about what technology meant to him, Ayrton described it as a bridge "that connects me to people as far as Orlando in the United States or people back in the Philippines." Because his privileged position allowed him to travel extensively, he did not seek to connect to a generic "group of knowledgeable people in the world," but he referred to a concrete network of people he knew in specific geographical locations with access to similar technologies. His possession of the resources, knowledge and social networks allowed him to position himself as a legitimate participant and contributor in the different affinity spaces he occupied online. By interacting with equally resourced learners in his currency trading course, he increased not only cultural capital in the form of entrepreneurial knowledge, but also social capital as well.

For Henrietta, on the other hand, developing her digital literacy to "join the group of knowledgeable people in the world" may prove to be unsustainable. Not only was her own economic capital limited, but also the technological infrastructure of her local context was poorly resourced. In Henrietta's case, both her own social location and the economic position of rural Uganda constrained access to the technology necessary for Henrietta to master literacies relevant to the knowledge economy. While she may have been driven by a strong desire to learn more about computers and to connect with other people, her social location made it very difficult for her to enter these new spaces of socialization. Even though her desire to engage in transnational conversations could be seen as a way to increase her social capital, how this perceived benefit would enable her to gain knowledge that advances her social mobility is unknown.

Ideology. When Ayrton spoke of the currency trading course as "one of the greatest investments" of his life, he reflected a very strong entrepreneurial disposition, undoubtedly role-modeled by his father. This identification aligns with neoliberal ideology that regards the individual as *homo economicus* or "an entrepreneur of one's self" (Foucault, 2008), who is held completely accountable for his or her own economic success or failure. Ayrton's investment in the imagined identity of a currency trader came with tangible measurements of success and translated into the accumulation of more economic capital. At the same time, his description of the migration experience reflected existing ideologies about globalism. "Moving [to Canada], I had to get out of that isolated world." As a developing country that ranks low in the global class hierarchy,

the Philippines was seen as "isolated" from the rest of the world, while Canada, as a wealthy, industrialized country, was made to occupy a more central position in this imagined "world."

In contrast, because of the discourses of globalization and technology that constructed her conceptions of value, Henrietta positioned herself as inadequate, as one who was not sufficiently "knowledgeable". This hegemonic view reflects ideologies where the global is privileged over the local, and the global North is seen as more knowledgeable than the global South. As she sought to gain access to affordances of learning like devices and books, systemic patterns of control also determine this access: the allocation of technology budgets to local schools, the development of connectivity infrastructure in rural Uganda, and business processes that impact the affordability of devices. Ideologies that privilege urban versus rural, middle versus lower class, or male versus female will also position Henrietta further and shape her capacity to gain other affordances of learning. In terms of linguistic capital, although she speaks English, which has become the *de facto* lingua franca of the Internet, her access to valued forms of English is limited. Indeed, what she finds particularly appealing about the Internet is that it gives her the opportunity to "understand more about English language." As she noted, "I got communication. I have learnt the English language because the English in Internet has been very create and it has arranged properly." How interlocutors online and offline will position her as a teenage girl from rural Uganda, speaking a specific variety of English, will shape the dynamics of their interaction. Her identity and linguistic capital will be measured against other systemic patterns of control.

While their investment in the language practices of their communities is shaped in different ways because of dominant ideologies and unequal levels of capital, both Ayrton and Henrietta recognized the power of the digital and envisioned more cosmopolitan futures. Henrietta aspired "to communicate to people in the outside countries" and believed that she would "learn more about [her]self through sharing view with Canadian people." Her imaginary conception of the world outside Uganda stirred the desire to connect with others to better understand herself. For Ayrton, this future was tied to claiming a powerful imagined identity. "With how the world is just connected and how information is at your fingertips, you can be anyone or anything you want to be and it's just right there." He recognized the connectedness of the world, and its value in enabling him to claim ownership of a desirable future.

5. Investment and a cosmopolitan future

In this paper we have argued that in the 21st century conditions of superdiversity, including increased mobility and digital innovation, make investment more complex, necessitating a greater appreciation for the connections between identity, capital, and ideology. On the one hand, the construction of networked relationships and the transcultural flows of knowledge have fostered new modes of cooperation and a greater sense of global interconnectedness. Paradoxically, however, it is also the multiplicity of spaces and the fluidity of this communicative landscape that have facilitated greater autonomy and fragmentation. Technology has provided learners with highly customized options that reduce the need for collective negotiation, while enabling the pursuit of more individual goals. Because of the fluidity with which learners can move in and out of diverse spaces, they attain greater agency to not just engage but also disengage from others, to invest in and disinvest from shared practices, and to seek or shun a collective endeavor. Data from Ayrton and Henrietta demonstrate that as learners continue to connect with others, the networked relationships they build and the imagined communities they seek can also be ideologically implicated and can reproduce inequities on a global scale. Hence, a critical pedagogy should not only examine the material conditions of the present, but also the desires and imaginations of learners as they envision diverse social futures. While the model of investment helps capture and dissect existing inequities, cosmopolitanism, we believe, is a theoretical construct that can scaffold the imagination of a more equitable future.

As counterdiscourse to the individualism of neoliberal ideology, cosmopolitanism promotes the identity of "citizen of the world" (Hansen, 2010). This global citizen not only cultivates a disposition of open-mindedness and mutual regard (De Costa, 2014), but recognizes the ethical responsibilities one has towards others and the world (Appiah, 2006). Cosmopolitanism does not seek to find what is universal, but recognizes the diversity of cultural capital, and calls for dialogue and the respectful imagining of others across cultural and historical differences (Hull & Stornauiolo, 2010). To imagine cosmopolitan futures, learners need to navigate individual aspirations, on the one hand, and a sense of global responsibility, on the other. As Beck (2012) notes, cosmopolitanism is not the exclusive jurisdiction of wealthy, mobile learners who are able to travel internationally, but also those who occupy more fixed locations, yet desire greater connectedness with the rest of the world. In the 21st century, as technology collapses national boundaries and enables the transcultural flow of ideas and infor-

mation, cosmopolitanism provides a framework for imagining a more global and interconnected community. It imagines alternative ways of life and rationalities while recognizing the macro-interdependencies of cultures and global networks and respecting differences among people and nations (Beck, 2002; Vertovec & Cohen, 2002).

As technology provides learners with more opportunities to pursue self-interest with greater autonomy, we call for a critical pedagogy that enables learners to invest in cosmopolitanizing practices and to envisage a more inclusive global future. For cosmopolitanism to remain conceptually productive in imagining this future, it must reject being conflated with a globalism governed only by the logic of market forces. It needs to resist becoming an expansion of a naïve multiculturalism that celebrates difference through essences, while erasing inequalities. Through a critical dissection of identity, capital and ideology, the construct of investment continues to challenge teachers and researchers to question the logic of the current world order and to address inequitable language, literacy and learning practices. It enables an examination of how learners are positioned, constrained or empowered as they navigate diverse spaces and perform a range of identities. The hope is for learners like Ayrton and Henrietta to overcome the barriers of their agentive possibilities, and to cultivate a disposition where they not only seek to benefit personally but also contribute to the greater good. The investment of learners in language and literacy practices that can shape this cosmopolitan future represents the greatest hope for language education in the 21st century.

References

Appadurai A. (1990), "Disjuncture and difference in the global cultural economy", *Theory, Culture and Society 7*(2-3), p. 295-310.

Appiah A. (2006), *Cosmopolitanism: Ethics in a world of strangers* (1st ed.), New York, W.W. Norton.

Beck U. (2012), "Redefining the sociological project: The cosmopolitan challenge", *Sociology, 46* (1), p. 7-12.

— (2006), *The cosmopolitan vision*, Cambridge, UK Polity.

— (2002), "The cosmopolitan society and its enemies", *Theory, Culture & Society 19* (1-2), p. 17-44.

Block D. (2007) "The rise of identity in SLA research, post Firth and Wagner (1997)", *The Modern Language Journal 91* (1), p. 863-876.

Blommaert J. (2005), *Discourse: A critical introduction*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

— (2010), *The sociolinguistics of globalization*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

— (2013), *Ethnography, superdiversity and linguistic landscapes: Chronicles of complexity*, Bristol, Multilingual Matters.

Bourdieu P. (1986), "The forms of capital", in J. F. Richardson (ed.), *Handbook of theory and research for the sociology of education*, New York, Greenwood Press, p. 241-58

— (1987), "What makes a social class? On the theoretical and practical existence of groups", *Berkeley Journal of Sociology 32*, p. 1-17.

— (1990), *The logic of practice,* Stanford, Stanford University Press

— (1991), *Language and symbolic power*, Harvard, Harvard University Press.

— (2000), *Pascalian meditations*, Stanford, Stanford University Press.

Canagarajah A. S. (2013), "Negotiating translingual literacy: An enactment", *Research in the Teaching of English* 48 (1), p. 40-67.

Cope B. and Kalantzis M. (2010), "New media, new learning", in D. Cole and D. Pullen (eds), *Multiliteracies in motion: current theory and practice*, London, Routledge, p. 87-104.

Cummins J. (2006), "Identity texts: The imaginative construction of self through multiliteracies pedagogy", in O. Garcia, T. Skutnabb-Kangas & M. Torres-Guman (eds), *Imagining multilingual schools: Languages in education and glocalization*, Clevedon, Multilingual Matters, p. 51-68.

Darvin R. (forthcoming), "Language, power and critical digital literacy", in S. Thorne and S. May (eds) *Encyclopedia of Language and Education*, vol. 9, Springer.

— (in press), "Language and identity in the digital age", in S. Preece (ed.), *Routledge handbook of language and identity*, Oxon, Routledge.

— (2015), "Representing the margins: Multimodal performance as a tool for critical reflection and pedagogy", *TESOL Quarterly* 49 (3), p. 590-600.

Darvin R. & Norton B. (2015), "Identity and a model of investment in applied linguistics", *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics* 35, p. 36-56.

— (2014a), "Transnational identity and migrant language learners: The promise of digital storytelling", *Education Matters: The Journal of Teaching and Learning* 2 (1), p. 55-66.

— (2014b), "Social Class, Identity, and Migrant Students", *Journal of Language, Identity & Education* 13 (2), p. 111-117.

De Costa, P. (2014), "Reconceptualizing cosmopolitanism in language and literacy education: Insights from a Singapore school", *Research in the Teaching of English* 49 (1), p. 9-30.

Delanty, G. (2006), "The cosmopolitan imagination: critical cosmopolitanism and social theory", *The British journal of sociology* 57 (1), p. 25-47.

Duchêne A., and Heller M. (eds) (2012), *Language in late capitalism: Pride and profit* (Vol. 1), Oxon, Routledge.

Duchêne A., Moyer M., and Roberts C. (eds) (2013), *Language, migration and social inequalities: A critical sociolinguistic perspective on institutions and work,* Bristol, Multilingual Matters.

Elliott A. and Urry J. (2010), *Mobile lives,* Oxon, Routledge.

Facer K. (2011), *Learning futures: Education, technology and social change*, London: Routledge.

Firth A. and Wagner J. (1997), "On discourse, communication, and (some) fundamental concepts in SLA research", *The Modern Language Journal* 81 (3), p. 285-300.

Foucault M. (2008), *The birth of biopolitics* (G. Burchell, Trans.), London, Palgrave Macmillan.

Gee J. P. & Hayes E. R. (2011), *Language and learning in the digital age,* Oxon, Routledge.

Hafner C. A. (2014), "Embedding digital literacies in english language teaching: Students' digital video projects as multimodal ensembles", *TESOL Quarterly* 48 (4), p. 655-685.

Hansen D. (2010), "Cosmopolitanism and education: A view from the ground", *Teachers College Record* 112 (1), p.1-30.

Hull G. A. and Stornaiuolo A. (2010), "Literate arts in a global world: Reframing social networking as cosmopolitan practice", *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy* 54 (2), p. 85-97.

Ito M. and *al.* (2010), *Hanging out, messing around, and geeking out*, Cambridge, MA, MIT Press.

Janks H. (2010), *Literacy and power*, New York and London, Routledge.

Jones R. H., and Hafner C. A. (2012), *Understanding digital literacies: A practical introduction*, Oxon, Routledge.

Kramsch C. J. (2013), "Afterword", in B. Norton, *Identity and language learning: Extending the conversation* (2nd ed.), Bristol, UK, Multilingual Matters, p. 192-201.

Lam W. S. E. (2013), "Multilingual practices in transnational digital contexts", *TESOL Quarterly* 47 (4), p. 820-825.

Lewis C. and Tierney J. D. (2011), "Mobilizing emotion in an urban English classroom", *Changing English* 18 (3), p. 319-329.

Luke C. (2003) "Pedagogy, connectivity, multimodality, and interdisciplinarity", *Reading Research Quarterly* 38 (3), p. 397-403.

Miller E. and Kubota, R. (2013), "Second language identity construction", in J. Herschensohn and M. Young-Scholten (eds), *The Cambridge handbook of second language acquisition,* New York, Cambridge University Press, p. 230-250.

Moje E. and Luke A. (2009), "Literacy and identity: Examining the metaphors in history and contemporary research", *Reading Research Quarterly* 44 (4), p. 415-437.

Motha S. and Lin A. (2014), "'Non-coercive rearrangements': Theorizing desire in TESOL", *TESOL Quarterly* 48 (2), p. 331-359.

Norton B. (in press), "Identity and the ownership of English", in A. Fuad (ed) *The nonnative English teacher, TESOL Encyclopedia of English Language Teaching*, Wiley.
— (2013), *Identity and language learning: Extending the conversation* (2nd ed.), Bristol, Multilingual Matters.
— (2000), *Identity and language learning: Gender, ethnicity and educational change*, Harlow, England, Longman/Pearson Education.

Norton B., Jones S., and Ahimbisibwe D. (2011), "Learning about HIV/AIDS in Uganda: Digital resources and language learner identities", *Canadian Modern Language Review/La Revue Canadienne des Langues Vivantes* 67(4), p. 568-589.

Norton Peirce B. (1995), "Social Identity, Investment, and Language Learning", *TESOL Quarterly 29* (1), p. 9-31.

Ortega L. (2009), *Understanding second language acquisition*, Oxford and New York, Routledge.

Rojo L. M. (2013), "Capitalising students through linguistic practices: A comparative analysis of new educational programmes in a global era", in A. Duchêne, M. Moyer, C. Roberts (eds), *Language, migration and social inequalities: a critical sociolinguistic perspective on institutions and work,* Bristol, Multilingual Matters, p. 118-146.

Swain M. and Deters P. (2007), "New" mainstream SLA theory: Expanded and enriched", *The Modern Language Journal* 91 (s1), p.820-836.

Vertovec S., and Cohen R. (2002), *Conceiving cosmopolitanism: Theory, context and practice*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Warschauer M. (2009), "Digital literacy studies: progress and prospects", in M. Baynham and M. Prinsloo (eds), *The future of literacy studies*, London, Palgrave Macmillan, p. 123-40.

Warschauer M. and Matuchniak T. (2010), "New technology and digital worlds: Analyzing evidence of equity in access, use, and outcomes", *Review of Research in Education* 34 (1), p. 179-225.

Weedon C. (1987), *Feminist practice and poststructuralist theory*, Oxford, Basil Blackwell.

Wohlwend K. E. and Lewis C. (2011), "Critical literacy, critical engagement, and digital technology: Convergence and embodiment in local spheres", in D. Lapp and D. Fisher (eds.), *Handbook of research on teaching the English language arts* (3rd ed.), Mahway, NJ, Lawrence Erlbaum, p. 188-194.