
1 **Language, Identity, and Investment**
2 **in the Twenty-first Century**

[AU1](#)

3 Ron Darvin and Bonny Norton

4 **Contents**

5	Introduction	2
6	Early Developments	2
7	Major Contributions	4
8	Work in Progress	7
9	Problems and Difficulties	8
10	Future Directions	9
11	Identity	10
12	Capital	10
13	Ideology	11
14	Related Articles in the Encyclopedia of Language and Education	11
15	Cross-References	12
16	References	12

17 **Abstract**

18 The construct of investment, developed by Norton in the mid-1990s, represents
19 the historically and socially constructed commitment of learners to language
20 learning. Now considered a significant explanatory construct in language educa-
21 tion research (Cummins 2006; Kramsch 2013), this construct serves as a socio-
22 logical complement to the psychological construct of motivation and is an index
23 of identity and power. Of central interest is the question, “What is the learner’s
24 investment in the language and literacy practices of classrooms and communi-
25 ties?” Because identities are multiple and sites of struggle, the investment of
26 learners is always a dynamic negotiation of learning in specific contexts. This
27 chapter traces how investment has been taken up in language education research

R. Darvin (✉) • B. Norton
Department of Language and Literacy Education, Education Centre at Ponderosa Commons,
University of British Columbia, Vancouver, BC, Canada
e-mail: ron.darvin@ubc.ca; bonny.norton@ubc.ca

28 internationally, including journal special issues in Asia and Europe. The chapter
29 addresses both the origins of the construct as well as the recent development of a
30 comprehensive model that locates investment at the intersection of identity,
31 capital, and ideology (Darvin and Norton 2015). Responding to the changing
32 social and digital landscape, the model recognizes the capacity of both learners
33 and teachers to move fluidly across both time and space in an increasingly digital
34 world. The chapter concludes with a discussion of investment research directions
35 for the future, given evolving conceptions of identity, capital, and ideology, and
36 how such research can impact language education policy.

Keywords

37 Identity • Investment • Ideology • Capital • Digital • Language learning
38

Introduction

39
40 Recognizing that learners are social beings with complex identities, the construct of
41 *investment*, introduced by Norton in 1995, highlights the socially and historically
42 constructed relationship between learners and the target language (Norton 2013;
43 Norton Peirce 1995). This construct demonstrates that commitment is not just a
44 product of motivation, but that learners invest in a language because they recognize
45 how it will help them acquire a wider range of symbolic and material resources,
46 which will in turn increase the value of their cultural capital and social power. At the
47 same time, how learners are able to invest in a target language is contingent on the
48 dynamic negotiation of power in different fields and how learners are granted or
49 refused the right to speak (Norton 2013; Norton Peirce 1995). A learner may be
50 highly motivated, for example, but may resist opportunities to speak if a given
51 classroom is racist, sexist, or homophobic. Over the past two decades, Norton has
52 advanced these ideas, and identity and investment are now considered foundational
53 in language education (Cummins 2006; Kramsch 2013; Miller and Kubota 2013;
54 Ortega 2009). This chapter illustrates how both emerging and established scholars in
55 the international community have taken this work in new directions and in diverse
56 scholarly and linguistic communities, with important implications for language
57 policy.

Early Developments

58
59 In her classic study of immigrant women in Canada, Norton (2013; Norton Peirce
60 1995) observed that existing theories of motivation in the field of language learning
61 often conceptualized the learner as having a unitary, fixed, and ahistorical “person-
62 ality.” She argued that this conception was inconsistent with the findings from her
63 research and did not do justice to the identities and experiences of language learners
64 in immigrant contexts. Inspired by the work of Bourdieu (1990, 1991) and Weedon

65 (1997), *investment* recognizes the language learner as having complex, multiple
66 identities, changing across time and space, and reproduced in social interaction. If
67 learners “invest” in the target language, they do so with the understanding that they
68 will acquire a wider range of symbolic and material resources, which will increase
69 the value of their cultural capital and social power. By collapsing the dichotomies
70 associated with traditional conceptions of the learner (good/bad, motivated/
71 unmotivated, anxious/confident, introvert/extrovert), investment recognizes that
72 the conditions of power in different learning contexts can position the learner in
73 multiple and often unequal ways, leading to varying learning outcomes.

74 Norton also made the case that an investment in the target language is an
75 investment in the learner’s own identity. In addition to asking “Are students moti-
76 vated to learn a language?” researchers pose the question “To what extent are students
77 and teachers invested in the language and literacy practices of a given classroom and
78 community?” A learner may be highly motivated, for example, but not necessarily
79 invested in the language practices of a given classroom, if the classroom exhibits
80 racist, sexist, or homophobic tendencies. In the same way that identity is a site of
81 struggle, how learners are able to invest in a target language is contingent on the
82 dynamic negotiation of power in different fields, and thus investment is complex,
83 contradictory, and in a state of flux (Norton 2013; Norton Peirce 1995).

84 By demonstrating the socially and historically constructed relationship between
85 language learner identity and learning commitment, investment soon secured a
86 significant place in language learning theory. As Kramsch (2013) notes:

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

93 Since its inception, the construct of investment has been used analytically in
94 diverse research studies. For example, McKay and Wong (1996) examined how four
95 Mandarin-speaking secondary students from a California school were invested in
96 learning English, while Skilton-Sylvester (2002) drew on investment to analyze the
97 participation of four Cambodian women in adult ESL classes in the USA. While
98 Haneda (2005) focused on the engagement of two university students in an advanced
99 Japanese literacy course, Potowski (2004) and Bearse and de Jong (2008) analyzed
100 how learners invest in the context of two-way Spanish-English immersion programs.
101 In a “meta study” of two nonnative English-speaking (NNES) international students
102 in an English-speaking graduate school in the USA, Chang (2011) examined how the
103 students were able to exert their own agency “to fight their academic battle” (p. 228)
104 and selectively invest in areas that would increase their market value in their current
105 and imagined communities. In a study of low-level adult ESL classrooms in
106 Australia, Ollerhead (2012) drew on the constructs of investment and imagined
107 communities to understand teacher responses to learner identity and to demonstrate

108 how the aspirations of learners are integral to this identity. A comprehensive
109 literature review on investment by Pittaway (2004) underscored the growing signif-
110 icance of the construct, and in 2006 Cummins asserted that investment had emerged
111 as a “significant explanatory construct” (p. 59) in second language learning research.

112 Major Contributions

113 While earlier research on identity and investment was mostly from North America,
114 major contributions in recent years have been more international in orientation. In
115 the African context, Norton and her colleagues (Andema 2014; Early and Norton
116 2014; Norton et al. 2011; Norton 2014; Norton and Williams 2012) have worked in
117 different countries, particularly Uganda, to better understand the investment of
118 learners and teachers in the English language, digital literacies, and language policy.
119 The researchers observed that as learners and teachers developed valued digital
120 skills, they gained greater cultural capital and social power. One teacher named
121 Betty indicated that when she used a digital camera, she “felt like a man”:

122 I feel very powerful like a man because I had never held a camera in my life. I have always
123 seen only men carrying cameras and taking photos in big public functions like may be
124 independence celebration, political rallies and wedding ceremonies. But now as I move in
125 the community taking pictures with my camera, I feel I am also very powerful, like a man.
126 (Andema 2014, p. 91)

127 Norton and colleagues observed that both Ugandan students and their teachers are
128 highly invested in new literacy practices because the use of digital technology
129 extends the range of identities available to them and expands what is socially
130 imaginable in the future. Advanced education, professional opportunities, study
131 abroad, and other opportunities have become a component of their imagined futures
132 and imagined identities. Recognizing that what is socially imaginable in the African
133 context is not always available. Norton and Williams (2012) have looked to the work
134 of Blommaert (2010) to theorize the investments of learners in language and literacy
135 practices associated with digital resources. This conception sought to extend
136 Blommaert’s notion of “uptake” with reference to the construct of investment.
137 While Blommaert argues that discourses shift their value, meaning, and function
138 as they travel across borders, Norton and Williams (2012) point out, similarly, that
139 when digital tools travel, they are subject to different sociopolitical and economic
140 conditions, which shape their social meaning. This in turn has a concomitant impact
141 on the investments of learners and teachers, who navigate a range of identities in
142 taking up and sometimes rejecting these new digital resources.

143 The construct of investment has also proven productive in the Asian context. To
144 respond to the questions, “Who owns English?” and “What are learner and teacher
145 investments in the English language?,” the *Journal of Asian Pacific Communication*
146 published a special issue on investment (Arkoudis and Davison 2008) that focused
147 on the social, cognitive, and linguistic investment of Chinese learners in English

148 medium interaction. The research in this issue included studies of an English Club
149 that allowed mainland Chinese learners in Hong Kong to practice English (Gao et al.
150 2008), college students from nonurban areas in China (Gu 2008), and English for
151 Academic Purposes (EAP) learners in an English medium university in Hong Kong
152 (Trent 2008). More recently, De Costa (2010) drew on the construct of investment to
153 understand how and why a Chinese language learner in Singapore embraced stan-
154 dard English to inhabit an identity associated with being an academically able
155 student. With reference to Chinese learners of English, Norton and Gao (2008) note:

156 As Chinese learners of English continue to take greater ownership of the English language,
157 redefine the target language community, and develop unique forms of intercultural compe-
158 tence, scholars interested in English language learning and teaching need to reframe their
159 research questions and reconsider their assumptions. (p. 119)

160 In the South American context, Carazzai (2013) and Sanches Silva (2013), like
161 Reeves (2009), have focused on the investments of language teachers. Their doctoral
162 theses examine the construction of teacher identity in the Brazilian states of Santa
163 Catarina and Mato Grasso, where Portuguese is the dominant language. They
164 concluded that the imagined identities of students and teachers were crucial in
165 explaining investments in English language learning and teaching, together with
166 the opportunities afforded to them for both face to face and virtual interaction with
167 English speakers internationally. Mastrella-de-Andrade has also helped to extend
168 theories of identity and investment to her Portuguese-speaking colleagues in Brazil
169 (Mastrella-de-Andrade and Norton 2011). Although at the time a graduate student in
170 the United States, Uju Anya (forthcoming) conducted data collection in the Afro-
171 Brazilian city of Salvador, where she studied the investments of African-American
172 language learners of Portuguese in a study abroad program. She demonstrated how
173 the learners co-constructed and negotiated multiple racialized, gendered, and classed
174 identities in the learning of Portuguese and how their investments influenced second
175 language acquisition.

176 Research interest in identity and investment has also been gathering momentum
177 in Europe. German-speaking European educators have found the relationship
178 between literacy, identity, and investment productive for classroom-based research
179 with youth (Bertschi-Kaufmann and Rosebrock 2013), and research on English as a
180 Lingua Franca (Jenkins 2007) has drawn considerably on the construct of invest-
181 ment. A 2014 international symposium at the University of Lausanne in Switzerland
182 organized by Bemporad and Jeanneret (2014) focused entirely on the construct of
183 investment. The purpose was “to recontextualize the notion of investment in the field
184 of the francophone *didactique des langues* and to consider its possible develop-
185 ments, articulating theoretical considerations and empirical analyses from various
186 research contexts” (Symposium Program, para. 3). Opening with a paper by Norton
187 and Darwin, the symposium addressed a wide range of issues, including the chal-
188 lenges of translating research on investment from English to French (Zeiter and
189 Bemporad 2014); the relationship between materiality and investment (Dagenais and
190 Toohey 2014); and the political economy of language investment (Duchêne 2014).

Fig. 1 Darvin and Norton's 2015 model of investment



191 The rich discussions during the symposium are the subject of a special issue of the
 192 journal of *Langage et Société* (Bemporad [in press](#))

193 Responding to how technology has radically changed lifestyles and modes of
 194 productivity (Darvin 2016), compressing time and space, while ushering people into
 195 more private, isolated spaces, Darvin and Norton (2015) have extended theories of
 196 identity and investment to address the realities of this new world order. For these two
 197 scholars, the individualization of labor and the virtualization of social processes have
 198 made the mechanisms of power more difficult to detect. As people occupy more
 199 fragmented spaces, it also becomes challenging to determine how specific commu-
 200 nicative events are indexical of the macrostructures of power. Hence, there needs to
 201 be a critical framework of language learning that attempts to lay bare the invisible
 202 and reexamine the situated against the backdrop of institutional processes and
 203 systemic practices. Responding to this need, they have proposed an expanded
 204 model of investment (Darvin and Norton 2015) that challenges educational agents
 205 to examine how discrete events are indexical of communicative practices and how
 206 learners both position themselves and are positioned not only within the contexts of a
 207 classroom or workplace but within community, national, and global networks. To
 208 achieve this, the model is built on the constructs of identity, capital, and ideology
 209 (see Fig. 1).

210 Recognizing a more polythetic and porous conception of ideology, Darvin and
 211 Norton refer to *ideologies* as “dominant ways of thinking that organize and stabilize
 212 societies while simultaneously determining modes of inclusion and exclusion”
 213 (p. 72). It is a pluralized formulation because ideologies are constructed by different
 214 structures of power and reproduced by both institutional conditions and recursive
 215 hegemonic practices. In an age of mobility, learners are able to move fluidly across
 216 spaces where ideologies collude and compete, shaping their identities and position-
 217 ing them in different ways. Such a conception complements the view of identity as
 218 multiple and fluid, and in the same way this model recognizes that the value of one’s
 219 economic, cultural, or social capital shifts across time and space – subject to but not
 220 completely constrained by the ideologies of different groups or fields. It is when

221 capital is “perceived and recognized as legitimate” (Bourdieu 1987, p. 4) that it
222 becomes symbolic capital. Hence, the extent to which teachers are able to recognize
223 the value of the linguistic or cultural capital learners bring to the classroom – their
224 prior knowledge, home literacies, mother tongues – will impact the extent to which
225 learners will invest in the language and literacy practices of their classrooms.

226 The conception of identity in this model aligns well with the theoretical under-
227 pinnings of Norton’s 1995 definition, which describes identity as multiple, a site of
228 struggle, and continually changing over time and space. What Darwin and Norton do
229 in this later work is to elucidate further the struggle as one that wrestles with the
230 conflict of habitus and desire, of competing ideologies and imagined identities.
231 Ideologies shape a learner’s habitus, an internalized system “of durable, transposable
232 dispositions” (Bourdieu 1990, p. 53) that allow him or her to make sense of the
233 world. While one’s social location shapes habitus, which in turn structures the way
234 one thinks and behaves, there is also desire that may align with or contradict this
235 predisposition. Learners exercise agency by choosing what they perceive as benefi-
236 cial to their existing or imagined identities, by consenting to or resisting hegemonic
237 practices and by investing or divesting from the language and literacy practices of
238 particular classrooms and communities.

239 Work in Progress

240 Since the expanded model of investment has only recently been made available in
241 the literature, research which draws on the model is in its early stages. In a 2015
242 *TESOL Quarterly* article on language learner strategy research (Cohen and Griffiths
243 2015), Darwin and Norton explore strategies associated with what Bourdieu calls
244 *sens pratique* or practical sense, which is an important component of the model. This
245 “feel for the game” comes with knowing the various rules, genres, and discourses
246 that inform learners’ practices and help them make strategic decisions across diverse
247 spaces. Learners need to be able to read multimodal cues and communicate with not
248 just the visual but also the gestural and other embodied signs; they need to know how
249 to gain access to spaces where communication is taking place; and they need to
250 manage communication gatekeepers, in order to claim the right to speak.

251 In a teaching issues article for the *TESOL Quarterly*, Darwin (2015) uses the
252 model of investment to chart how teachers can reflect critically on a short play,
253 written by Darwin, about a migrant caregiver mother in Canada and her teenage son
254 in the Philippines. A dramatization of the issues of long-term family separation
255 instigated by temporary migrant worker arrangements, the play was written primar-
256 ily for an audience of teachers and school administrators to understand how this
257 predicament impinges on migrant learners’ imagined identities and investments and
258 has been performed in a range of schools and teacher education institutions in
259 Vancouver. In the article, Darwin draws on the model of investment to pose questions
260 to teachers for critical reflection: (1) To what extent do I as a teacher respond to the
261 material, unequal lived realities of learners, and their transnational identities?
262 (2) What dominant ideologies circumscribe these realities, and how does my own

263 worldview position these learners? and (3) In what ways do I recognize and value the
264 linguistic and cultural capital that these learners are equipped with? By challenging
265 educators to examine specific classroom events and their own recurring classroom
266 practices, the model of investment serves as a critical framework for both language
267 teaching and language policy. It compels teachers and policymakers to recognize
268 that the classroom itself is a microcosm of political economic forces that inscribe an
269 increasingly globalized world. A greater awareness of how these macro forces shape
270 the investment of learners can help teachers and policymakers develop more equi-
271 table teaching strategies and educational policies.

272 In other recent work, Mendoza (2015) examines data from interviews with eight
273 international graduate students in Canada, analyzing how cultural and social capital
274 shaped student investments in their imagined identities. Students from China,
275 Singapore, and different parts of Europe, who had prior knowledge about Western
276 popular culture and academic socialization and developed a local social network,
277 were able navigate the personal and professional demands of studying in a foreign
278 country. By using the model of investment as a way to frame her argument, Mendoza
279 examined how the positioning of these students and their capacity to negotiate their
280 own capital shaped their investment in higher education.

281 At an April 2015 “think tank” in Calgary that discussed how literacy needs are
282 evolving in the new world order, Darvin and Norton (forthcoming) explored how the
283 model can be used to theorize pedagogy in transcultural, cosmopolitan times. By
284 framing the imperatives of this critical pedagogy through the constructs of identity,
285 capital, and ideology, they asserted the need to equip learners with the capacity to:
286 (i) negotiate individual aspirations with a sense of global citizenship; (ii) recognize
287 the value of different knowledges and the material inequalities that circumscribe
288 them; and (iii) examine differences in worldviews and discern how these enable or
289 constrain a cosmopolitan imagination. They argue that by developing these skills,
290 learners can be fully invested not just in the identity of a global citizen but the
291 imagination of an equitable future.

292 **Problems and Difficulties**

293 Perhaps the fundamental challenge in identifying ideology as a means to examine
294 learner investment is that ideologies often operate invisibly and that people subscribe
295 to ideologies both consciously and unconsciously. By structuring habitus, ideology
296 makes particular relations and ideas normative and common sense. To dissect
297 ideology thus requires a “stepping back” that allows one to critically examine the
298 constructed nature of one’s own dispositions and convictions. Achieving this reflex-
299 ivity is difficult, especially as ideological mechanisms become increasingly invisible
300 in the twenty-first century. The paradox of the discourses of globalization and
301 neoliberalism is that while they highlight “mobility,” “flows,” “flexibility,” and
302 “de-regulation,” ideological sites continue to exercise greater control and regimen-
303 tation (Duchêne et al. 2013). The logic of capitalism and the supremacy of market
304 forces and profit become deeply entrenched into systems of governance. The rhetoric

305 of the self as entrepreneur (Foucault 2008) aggrandizes the pursuit of individual
306 gain, naturalizing it in a way that overlooks or neglects more collective aspirations.
307 This has great implications for the way investment is interpreted and how learning is
308 understood as a means to achieve both personal and societal benefits.

309 In the digital age, the control of the flow of information and ideas on the
310 Internet also contributes to the preservation of ideologies. Technology can filter
311 the data made available to users through algorithms in search engines like Google
312 and social media platforms like Facebook. The value of a piece of data is determined
313 by its popularity among users or by one's own search history and location. Facebook
314 newsfeeds push status updates and posts of friends with whom a user interacts the
315 most. As users are socialized into the practices technologized around specific tools,
316 not only do these media shape the way people behave and communicate with one
317 another, they can also promote particular versions of reality and make possible some
318 kinds of relationships more than others (Jones and Hafner 2012).

319 When teachers and researchers analyze the investment of learners through the
320 lens of ideology, they need to exercise greater reflexivity by examining how their
321 own worldviews and conceptions of such categories as race, gender, and class shape
322 their interpretation of what learners are capable of and can invest in. This critical
323 reflection allows teachers to understand how their own assumptions position learners
324 and value or devalue the capital they possess. Norton (2017), for example, describes
325 how Keeley Ryan (2012), a teacher working in an adult English language learner
326 classroom in Vancouver, found that reflection on issues of investment led to a much
327 higher retention rate in her classes. Prior to drawing on investment, Ryan found that
328 9 out of 25 students remained in her adult class; after drawing on investment, 25 of
329 29 students remained till the end. As Ryan notes, "I began by imagining what a good
330 English teacher would look like for my students . . . I altered my practice to reflect
331 what I imagined their idea of a good school would look like." De Costa and Norton
332 (2017) assert that globalization is impacting language teacher identity in diverse
333 ways. The expanded model of investment may help researchers investigate the
334 degree to which teachers consent to or dissent from the pressures of a neoliberal
335 ideology and how this will shape curricula, classroom materials, and practices. The
336 call to decenter and decolonize teaching becomes increasingly relevant in a social
337 order that emphasizes accountability and adherence to common standards.

AU2

338 **Future Directions**

339 As teachers, researchers, and policymakers confront issues of reflexivity and power
340 to examine learner investment, the constructs of identity, capital, and ideology,
341 which are key to investment, need to be continually researched and developed for
342 such constructs to prove useful in the new social order.

343 Identity

344 Recognizing the shifting social landscape, De Costa and Norton (2016) and Norton
345 and De Costa (2018, forthcoming) consider future directions in identity research and
346 propose a number of research tasks on identity and investment. They highlight, for
347 example, the importance of intersectionality (Block and Corona 2014) in under-
348 standing identities as always a convergence of different social categories. Research
349 needs to examine how racial, ethnic, gender, and class identities are often inextrica-
350 bly linked as learners navigate the spaces of home, school, and community. They
351 point out how other categories like sexual orientation and religion are under-
352 researched and that new insights can still be drawn from a diverse range of research
353 populations that include lingua franca speakers, heritage language learners, and
354 study abroad learners. In a study of how transnational Mexicans construct their
355 identity in offline and online contexts, Christiansen (2015) identified four emic
356 criteria: language, color, transnationality, and display of culture. She looks at how
357 the perceived level of Mexicanness negotiated through Facebook establishes a place
358 of influence that disrupts a hierarchy traditionally built on age and gender. By
359 examining how online interactions influence those offline, this study presents new
360 ways of understanding how authenticity or adequacy of one's ethnic identity is
361 negotiated through social media. These gradations of identity across different social
362 categories, performed in digital media, provide new opportunities for research.

363 Capital

364 As learners move fluidly across boundaries and oscillate between online and offline
365 spaces, they enter these spaces equipped with their own material resources, linguistic
366 skills, and social networks. For learners, occupying new spaces involves not only
367 acquiring new material and symbolic resources but also using the capital they
368 already possess as affordances and transforming it into symbolic capital. What is
369 valued in one place however may be greatly devalued in another, and thus the
370 process of transformation is always a site of struggle. Within the digital landscape,
371 what is perceived as valuable is also shifting. The simultaneity of communicative
372 events and tasks made possible through digital tools creates a distinct need to
373 structure attention. People have begun to live in a state of "continuous partial
374 attention" where they feel they always need to attend to information from their
375 communication devices. In the knowledge economy that runs on the exchange of
376 information, the most valuable commodity becomes attention, and this shift has
377 shaped digital literacy practices of representing the self and of sharing and creating
378 information (Jones and Hafner 2012). It has also promoted the use of an affective
379 discourse style that employs a high degree of intensification. This includes frequent
380 use of boosters like "very" or "really," exclamation marks, capitalization, and
381 exaggerated quantifiers like "all" and "everyone" (Page 2012). Recognizing that
382 value is created from the exchange of attention has important implications for how
383 linguistic, economic, and cultural capital is transformed into the symbolic. How

384 learners produce and consume digital texts and how they use language in social
385 media to obtain attention promises to be an exciting area of research. The choices
386 they make to participate in this attention economy and how these in turn shape their
387 identity have important links to investment.

388 **Ideology**

389 To understand ideology as a complex, layered space of sometimes contradictory
390 ideational, behavioral, and institutional meanings, one needs to recognize domi-
391 nance and hegemony as processes rather than facts. Ideology is not a static, mono-
392 lithic worldview that rests on either acceptance or resistance. At the same time, while
393 language can be ideological, “this does not mean all language is ideological or that
394 discourse doubles up as ideology” (Holborow 2012, p. 31). For Holborow (2012),
395 when discourse is conflated with ideology, dynamic social processes are isolated
396 from analysis. Real world events like the economic crisis of 2008, the rise and fall of
397 economies, and the implementation of policies in trade, labor, and migration make
398 and unmake ideologies. Research on how material and historical conditions and
399 events shape educational policies, language ideologies, and other patterns of control
400 becomes increasingly significant (Kramsch 2013; Block et al. 2012; Duchêne and
401 Heller 2012).

402 An examination of learner and teacher investment and its relationship to identity,
403 capital, and ideology can help shape language education policy by demonstrating
404 how classroom practices are indexical of larger relations of power. As learners today
405 participate in multilingual online and offline spaces, how multilingualism is recog-
406 nized as cultural capital is key to policymaking. At the same time, the research
407 discussed in this chapter demonstrates that the valuing of different languages is often
408 unequal and associated with language ideologies and other political/economic
409 forces. Our hope is that our model of investment, which represents an organic
410 integration of identity, capital, and ideology, will serve as a resource for scholars
411 in the future, as they examine the intriguing relationship between classroom practice
412 and language policy in the twenty-first century.

413 **Related Articles in the Encyclopedia of Language and Education**

- 414 Eva Lam: [Identity in Mediated Contexts of Transnationalism and Mobility](#). In
415 Volume: Language, Education, and Technology
- 416 Kevin Leander: [Literacy and Internet Technologies](#). In Volume: Literacy
- 417 Mark Warschauer: [The Digital Divide in Language and Literacy Education](#). In
418 Volume: Language, Education, and Technology
- 419 Monica Heller: [Language Choice and Symbolic Domination](#). In Volume: Discourse
420 and Education

421 **Cross-References**

AU3

422 ▶ [Language, Class and Education](#)423 ▶ [Teaching Language and Power](#)424 **References**

425 Andema, S. (2014). Promoting digital literacy in African education: ICT innovations in a Ugandan
 426 primary teachers' college (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from [http://elk.library.ubc.ca/han-](http://elk.library.ubc.ca/handle/2429/48513)
 427 [dle/2429/48513](http://elk.library.ubc.ca/handle/2429/48513)

428 Anya, U. (forthcoming). *Speaking blackness in Brazil: Racialized identities in second language*
 429 *learning*. New York: Routledge.

430 Arkoudis, S., & Davison C. (Ed.), (2008). Chinese students: Perspectives on their social, cognitive,
 431 and linguistic investment in English medium interaction. [Special issue]. *Journal of Asian*
 432 *Pacific Communication*, 18(1), 3.

433 Rose, C., & de Jong, E. J. (2008). Cultural and linguistic investment: Adolescents in a secondary
 434 two-way immersion program. *Equity and Excellence in Education*, 41(3), 325–340.

AU4

435 Bemporad, C. (Ed). (in press). Language investment, une notion majeure pour saisir les dynamiques
 436 sociales de l'appropriation langagière. *Langage et Société*.

437 Bemporad, C., & Jeanneret, T. (2014, May). Symposium program for Dialogues autour de la notion
 438 d'investissement dans l'appropriation langagiere, L'Ecole de français langue étrangère de
 439 l'Université de Lausanne, Lausanne, Switzerland.

440 Bertschi-Kaufmann, A., & Rosebrock, C. (Eds.). (2013). *Literalität erfassen: Bildungspolitisch,*
 441 *kulturell, individuell*. Weinheim/München: Juventa.

442 Block, D., & Corona, V. (2014). Exploring class-based intersectionality. *Language, Culture and*
 443 *Curriculum*, 27(1), 27–42.

444 Block, D., Gray, J., & Holborow, M. (2012). *Neoliberalism and applied linguistics*. Oxon:
 445 Routledge.

446 Blommaert, J. (2010). *The sociolinguistics of globalization*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University
 447 Press.

448 Bourdieu, P. (1987). What makes a social class? On the theoretical and practical existence of
 449 groups. *Berkeley Journal of Sociology*, 32, 1–17.

450 Bourdieu, P. (1990). *The logic of practice*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

451 Bourdieu, P. (1991). *Language and symbolic power*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

452 Carazzai, M. R. (2013). The process of identity (re)construction of six Brazilian language learners:
 453 A poststructuralist ethnographic study (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from [https://](https://repositorio.ufsc.br/handle/123456789/105150)
 454 repositorio.ufsc.br/handle/123456789/105150

455 Chang, Y. J. (2011). Picking one's battles: NNES doctoral students' imagined communities and
 456 selections of investment. *Journal of Language, Identity and Education*, 10(4), 213–230.

457 Christiansen, M. S. (2015). Mexicanness and social order in digital spaces contention among
 458 members of a multigenerational transnational network. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sci-*
 459 *ences*, 37(1), 3–22.

460 Cohen, A., & Griffiths, C. (2015). Revisiting LLS research 40 years later. *TESOL Quarterly*, 49,
 461 414.

AU5

462 Cummins, J. (2006). Identity texts: The imaginative construction of self through multiliteracies
 463 pedagogy. In O. Garcia, T. Skutnabb-Kangas, & M. Torres-Guzmán (Eds.), *Imagining multi-*
 464 *lingual schools: Languages in education and glocalization* (pp. 51–68). Clevedon: Multilingual
 465 Matters.

466 Dagenais, D., & Toohey, K. (2014, May). *Accounting for materiality in discussions of investment*.
 467 Paper presented at the Dialogues autour de la notion d'investissement dans l'appropriation
 468 langagiere, Lausanne.

- 469 Darvin, R. (2015). Multimodal performance as a tool for critical reflection and pedagogy. *TESOL*
 470 *Quarterly*, 49(3), 590–600.
- 471 Darvin, R. (2016). Language and identity in the digital age. In S. Preece (Ed.), *Routledge handbook*
 472 *of language and identity* (pp. 523–540). Oxon: Routledge.
- 473 Darvin, R., & Norton, B. (2015). Identity and a model of investment in language learning. *Annual*
 474 *Review of Applied Linguistics*, 35, 36–56.
- 475 Darvin, R., & Norton, B. (forthcoming). In Naqvi, R. & Rowsell, J. (Ed.), *Literacy in transcultural,*
 476 *cosmopolitan times: A call for change*. Oxon: Routledge.
- 477 De Costa, P. I. (2010). Language ideologies and standard English language policy in Singapore:
 478 Responses of a ‘designer immigrant’ student. *Language Policy*, 9(3), 217–239.
- 479 De Costa, P. I., & Norton, B. (2016). Identity in language learning and teaching: Research agendas
 480 for the future. In S. Preece (Ed.), *Routledge handbook of language and identity* (pp. 586–601).
 481 London: Routledge.
- 482 De Costa, P.I., & Norton, B. (guest Ed.) (2017, in press). Transdisciplinarity and language teacher
 483 identity. *Modern Language Journal*.
- 484 Duchêne, A. (2014, May). *Towards a political economy of language investment*. Paper presented at
 485 the Dialogues autour de la notion d’investissement dans l’appropriation langagiere, Lausanne,
 486 Switzerland.
- 487 Duchêne, A., & Heller, M. (Eds.). (2012). *Language in late capitalism: Pride and profit* (Vol. 1).
 488 Oxon: Routledge.
- 489 Duchêne, A., Moyer, M., & Roberts, C. (Eds.). (2013). *Language, migration and social inequal-*
 490 *ities: A critical sociolinguistic perspective on institutions and work*. Bristol: Multilingual
 491 Matters.
- 492 Early, M., & Norton, B. (2014). Revisiting English as medium of instruction in rural African
 493 classrooms. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 35(7), 1–18.
- 494 Foucault, M. (2008). *The birth of biopolitics* (G. Burchell, Trans.). London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- 495 Gao, X., Cheng, H., & Kelly, P. (2008). Supplementing an uncertain investment? Mainland Chinese
 496 students practising English together in Hong Kong. *Journal of Asian Pacific Communication*,
 497 18(1), 9–29.
- 498 Gu, M. (2008). Identity construction and investment transformation: College students from
 499 non-urban areas in China. *Journal of Asian Pacific Communication*, 18(1), 49–70.
- 500 Haneda, M. (2005). Investing in foreign-language writing: A study of two multicultural learners.
 501 *Journal of Language, Identity, and Education*, 4(4), 269–290.
- 502 Holborow, M. (2012). What is neoliberalism? Discourse, ideology and the real world. In D. Block,
 503 J. Gray, & M. Holborow (Eds.), *Neoliberalism and applied linguistics* (pp. 14–32). Oxon:
 504 Routledge.
- 505 Jenkins, J. (2007). *English as a lingua franca: Attitude and identity*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University
 506 Press.
- 507 Jones, R. H., & Hafner, C. A. (2012). *Understanding digital literacies: A practical introduction*.
 508 Oxon: Routledge.
- 509 Kramsch, C. J. (2013). Afterword. In B. Norton (Ed.), *Identity and language learning: Extending*
 510 *the conversation* (2nd ed., pp. 192–201). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- 511 Mastrella-de-Andrade, M., & Norton, B. (2011). Querer é poder? Motivação, identidade e
 512 aprendizagem de língua estrangeira. In M. R. Mastrella-De-Andrade (Org.), *Afetividade e*
 513 *Emoções no ensino/aprendizagem de línguas: múltiplos olhares* (pp. 89–114). Campinas:
 514 Pontes Editores.
- 515 McKay, S., & Wong, S. C. (1996). Multiple discourses, multiple identities: Investment and agency
 516 in second language learning among Chinese adolescent immigrant students. *Harvard Educa-*
 517 *tional Review*, 66(3), 577–608.
- 518 Mendoza, A. (2015). *Transnational narratives and imagined futures of international graduate*
 519 *students in Canada*. Unpublished master’s thesis, University of British Columbia, Vancouver.

AUG

- 520 Miller, E., & Kubota, R. (2013). Second language identity construction. In J. Herschensohn &
521 M. Young-Scholten (Eds.), *The Cambridge handbook of second language acquisition*
522 (pp. 230–250). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- 523 Norton, B. (2013). *Identity and language learning: Extending the conversation* (2nd ed.). Bristol:
524 Multilingual Matters.
- 525 Norton, B. (2014). Introduction: The millennium development goals and multilingual literacy in
526 African communities. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 35(7), 633–645.
- 527 Norton, B. (2017, in press). Learner investment and language teacher identity. In G. Barkhuizen
528 (Ed.) *Reflections on language teacher identity research*. New York: Routledge.
- 529 Norton Peirce, B. (1995). Social identity, investment, and language learning. *TESOL Quarterly*, 29
530 (1), 9–31.
- 531 Norton, B., & De Costa, P. (2018, forthcoming). Research tasks on identity in language learning and
532 teaching. *Language Teaching*.
- 533 Norton, B., & Gao, J. (2008). Identity, investment, and Chinese learners of English. *Journal of*
534 *Asian Pacific Communication*, 18(1), 109–120.
- 535 Norton, B., & Williams, C. J. (2012). Digital identities, student investments and eGranary as a
536 placed resource. *Language and Education*, 26(4), 315–329.
- 537 Norton, B., Jones, S., & Ahimbisibwe, D. (2011). Learning about HIV/AIDS in Uganda: Digital
538 resources and language learner identities. *Canadian Modern Language Review/La Revue*
539 *Canadienne des Langues Vivantes*, 67(4), 568–589.
- 540 Ollerhead, S. (2012). “Passivity” or “potential”? Teacher responses to learner identity in the
541 low-level ESL classroom. *Literacy and Numeracy Studies*, 20(1), 1–13.
- 542 Ortega, L. (2009). *Understanding second language acquisition*. Oxford, UK: Routledge.
- 543 Page, R. E. (2012). *Stories and social media: Identities and interaction*. Oxon: Routledge.
- 544 Pittaway, D. (2004). Investment and second language acquisition. *Critical Inquiry in Language*
545 *Studies*, 4(1), 203–218.
- 546 Potowski, K. (2004). Student Spanish use and investment in a dual immersion classroom: Impli-
547 cations for second language acquisition and heritage language maintenance. *The Modern*
548 *Language Journal*, 88(1), 75–101.
- 549 Reeves, J. (2009). Teacher investment in learner identity. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 25(1),
550 34–41.
- 551 Sanches Silva, J. F. (2013). The construction of English teacher identity in Brazil: A study in Mato
552 Grosso do Sul (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from [https://repositorio.ufsc.br/handle/](https://repositorio.ufsc.br/handle/855123456789/105151)
553 [855123456789/105151](https://repositorio.ufsc.br/handle/855123456789/105151)
- 554 Skilton-Sylvester, E. (2002). Should I stay or should I go? Investigating Cambodian women’s
555 participation and investment in adult ESL programs. *Adult Education Quarterly*, 53(1), 9–26.
- 556 Trent, J. (2008). Promoting investment by Chinese learners in classroom discourse integrating
557 content and language in the undergraduate classroom. *Journal of Asian Pacific Communication*,
558 18(1), 30–48.
- 559 Weedon, C. (1997). *Feminist practice and poststructuralist theory* (2nd ed.). Oxford: Blackwell.
- 560 Zeiter, A., & Bemporad, C. (2014, May). *Traduire Bonny Norton en français: comment articuler*
561 *différentes traditions de recherche*. Paper presented at the Dialogues autour de la notion
562 d’investissement dans l’appropriation langagiere, Lausanne.

Index Terms:

Capital 10
Digital age 9
Digital landscape 10
Digital literacies 4
English language learner 9
Identity 5–7, 10
Ideology 6, 9, 11
Investment 3
 and identity 2, 5
 issues 9
 language teachers 5
 Norton's notion 3
Language learning 3, 5–6
Model of investment 6
Nonnative English-speaking (NNES) 3
Transnationality 10

Uncorrected Proof

Author Queries

Query Refs.: 18-1 315624_0_En

Query Refs.	Details Required	Author's response
AU1	Please check if your affiliation(s) and, if applicable, that/those of your co-author(s) are correct and complete.	
AU2	Please provide details of Ryan (2012) in the reference list.	
AU3	Chapter title "Language, Class and Education", "Teaching Language and Power" does not match with Contents list. Please check.	
AU4	Please provide year, volume and page number for Bemporad (in press).	
AU5	Please confirm if inserted year volume and page number for Cohen and Griffiths (2015) is okay.	
AU6	Please provide year for Darwin and Norton (forthcoming).	

Note:

If you are using material from other works please make sure that you have obtained the necessary permission from the copyright holders and that references to the original publications are included.