

This electronic thesis or dissertation has been downloaded from the King's Research Portal at <https://kclpure.kcl.ac.uk/portal/>



## **Lusondoners**

### **An account of Lusophone-inflected superdiversity in a south London school**

Holmes, Samuel Paul

*Awarding institution:*  
King's College London

The copyright of this thesis rests with the author and no quotation from it or information derived from it may be published without proper acknowledgement.

#### **END USER LICENCE AGREEMENT**



**Unless another licence is stated on the immediately following page** this work is licensed

under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International

licence. <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>

You are free to copy, distribute and transmit the work

Under the following conditions:

- Attribution: You must attribute the work in the manner specified by the author (but not in any way that suggests that they endorse you or your use of the work).
- Non Commercial: You may not use this work for commercial purposes.
- No Derivative Works - You may not alter, transform, or build upon this work.

Any of these conditions can be waived if you receive permission from the author. Your fair dealings and other rights are in no way affected by the above.

#### **Take down policy**

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact [librarypure@kcl.ac.uk](mailto:librarypure@kcl.ac.uk) providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

**Lusondoners:  
An account of Lusophone-inflected  
superdiversity in a south London school**

**Sam Holmes**

**A Thesis submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for the  
PhD Degree at King's College London**

**February 2017**

## **Acknowledgements**

First of all, I would like to express my deep gratitude to all my research participants and the staff in the school where I conducted my field work. It was a real privilege to spend so much time amongst such warm and welcoming people. Without their openness this study would not have been possible.

Another big thank you is due to my supervisors, Dr Roxy Harris and Professor Ben Rampton. Their careful guidance over so many years has been invaluable, and I am immensely grateful for all the challenging feedback they have provided.

Finally, I would like to thank my wonderful family for the long years of unfailing support while I completed this process. Without my wife Honey's constant efforts to provide time and space for me to study, none of this would have been possible. Big thanks also go to Hasan, Yousuf and Anaiya for all their patience during the many evenings and weekends when I was shut away with my laptop.

## Abstract

This thesis offers an ethnographic account of how diverse Lusophone ties contribute to shaping ethnic positionings and linguistic practices within the superdiverse context of a south London secondary school in the UK. The term “Lusondoner” is proposed as a way of conceptualising young Londoners who retain transnational family ties to Portuguese-speaking locations as well as a strong grounding in the daily linguistic and cultural practices of their London neighbourhood. Their ethnic affiliations and linguistic practices are not simply inherited from parents but are heavily influenced by locality and peer group. In London this means attending to the hybridity thrown up by contemporary superdiversity. This study adopted a linguistic ethnographic approach, focusing on the often complex and hybrid ethnic affiliations and linguistic practices which emerge through everyday interactions, with a critical perspective on dominant discourses of ethno-linguistic categorisation not previously attempted in research dealing with “Portuguese-speakers” in the UK.

“Lusondoners” fell into three broad ethnic fractions: “White Portuguese” (both “Mainland” and “Madeiran”), “Brazilian”, and “Black Portuguese”. Despite divergent migration patterns and mutual recognition of their distinctiveness, these fractions shared a common Lusondoner discursive space, rooted in their access to the Portuguese language and global Lusophone cultural space, as well as their experience of living together in south London. This discursive space was grounded in a local context characterised by a sense of multiethnic conviviality, within which recognised stereotypical ethno-national representations were traded between individuals of different ethnic affiliations: snatches of Portuguese language were employed by non-Lusondoners within inter-ethnic banter, while different varieties of Portuguese language were drawn on as part of banter between Lusondoners. Within this local peer context, a Local Multiethnic Vernacular (LMEV) form of speech was dominant. Its use emerged as a major strategy for individuals to embed themselves in the local, but only if they were able to establish ethnic positionings which their peers recognised as legitimate for employing LMEV. In doing so, individuals had to negotiate a local ethnic ecology in which the ethnic/racial category “Black” was both hyper-visible and infused with specific locally constructed historical meanings which some Lusondoners found could not accommodate them. These findings highlight how dominant discourses of ethno-linguistic categorisation cannot account for the complex ethnic formations and linguistic practices thrown up by superdiverse conditions. To understand the notion of the ‘Lusondoner’, a consideration of the specificities of locality is vital.

## Table of Contents

<b>Acknowledgements</b> .....	<b>2</b>
<b>Abstract</b> .....	<b>3</b>
<b>Chapter 1 - Introduction: the many faces of “Portuguese”</b> .....	<b>8</b>
1.0 Snapshots from a South London School.....	8
1.1 Introduction .....	9
1.2 Reframing “Portuguese” as “Lusondoner” .....	12
1.3 Research objectives .....	14
1.4 Outline of chapters .....	15
<b>Chapter 2 - Conceptualising Lusondoners: the importance of superdiversity</b> .....	<b>19</b>
2.0 Introduction .....	19
2.1 The essentialised ethnicities and bounded languages of multiculturalism .....	22
2.1.1 Lusondoners and conceptualisations of ethnicity .....	23
2.1.2 Ethnic monitoring and the label “Portuguese” .....	27
2.1.3 “Lusophonia”: Notions of a common Portuguese language .....	29
2.1.4 Linguistic monitoring and “Portuguese” .....	32
2.2 Lusondoners: interplay between different Lusophone groupings within a London context .....	35
2.2.1 Demographic trends amongst Lusondoners.....	35
2.2.2 Contingent ethnicities .....	38
2.2.3 Linguistic practices and language ideologies .....	40
2.3 Superdiversity.....	47
2.3.1 The multiple factors behind superdiversity .....	47
2.3.2 Language and superdiversity .....	49
2.3.3 Superdiversity and Local Multiethnic Vernacular .....	51
2.3.4 Implications for monitoring and researching language and ethnicity .....	56
2.4 Existing UK research using the label “Portuguese” .....	58
2.4.1 Studies using predetermined ethnic and linguistic categorisations.....	59
2.4.2 Ethnographic studies .....	61
2.4.3 Studies of Londoners and Londonness .....	64
2.5 Chapter conclusion .....	68
<b>Chapter 3 - Researching Lusondoners</b> .....	<b>69</b>
3.0 Introduction .....	69
3.1 Ethnography .....	70
3.1.1 Taking an ethnographic approach.....	71
3.1.2 Ethnography in a context of superdiversity .....	72
3.1.3 Ethnography within the school .....	73
3.2 Ethnographic methods .....	74
3.2.1 Broad biographical survey.....	75
3.2.2 Participant observation .....	77
3.2.3 Field Notes .....	81

3.2.4 Recordings of naturally occurring speech .....	83
3.2.5 Follow-up interviews on specific themes arising from speech data .....	86
3.2.6 Linguistic ethnography (LE) – an integrated approach .....	89
3.3 Ethnography, reflexivity and ethics .....	90
3.3.1 Reflexivity .....	90
3.3.2 A reflexive approach to research ethics .....	91
3.3.3 Researcher and field site .....	92
3.3.4 Considerations beyond the field work period .....	95
3.4 Chapter conclusion .....	97
<b>Chapter 4 - A Lusondoner discursive space.....</b>	<b>99</b>
4.0 Introduction .....	99
Part I – The structure of the Lusondoner discursive space .....	102
4.1 A Lusondoner discursive space .....	102
4.1.1 Discursive space .....	102
4.1.2 Lusondoners and the problem of “language” .....	104
4.1.3 Lusondoners and the problem of “nation” .....	108
4.1.4 Lusondoners and the problem of “ethnicity” .....	110
4.2 Empirically grounded groupings within the Lusondoner discursive space .....	112
4.2.1 “White Portuguese” (“Mainland” and “Madeiran”) .....	113
4.2.2 “Brazilians” .....	117
4.2.3 “Black Portuguese” .....	121
4.2.4 Superdiversity and the blurred edges to ethnic fractions .....	124
Part II - The Lusondoner discursive space in interactional practice .....	128
4.3 Interactional examples of Lusondoner fractions.....	128
4.3.1 “White Portuguese” .....	128
4.3.2 “Brazilians” .....	135
4.3.3 “Black Portuguese” .....	136
4.4 Chapter conclusion .....	138
<b>Chapter 5 - Multiethnic conviviality.....</b>	<b>140</b>
5.0 Introduction .....	140
5.1 Local conditions of conviviality .....	143
5.1.1 Conviviality .....	144
5.1.2 Use of emblematic ethnic and linguistic representations .....	148
5.2 Conviviality within the Lusondoner discursive space .....	153
5.2.1 References to emblematic ethnic and linguistic representations .....	155
5.2.2 Adoption of emblematic linguistic features .....	158
5.2.3 Convivial banter and linguistic commentary rooted in nuanced linguistic awareness.....	162
5.3 Lusondoners and outsiders .....	165
5.3.1 Crossing into Portuguese .....	165
5.4 Chapter conclusion .....	171

<b>Chapter 6 - Lusondoners and Local Multiethnic Vernacular .....</b>	<b>174</b>
6.0 Introduction .....	174
6.1 LMEV and the local linguistic ecology .....	176
6.1.1 Use of Local Multiethnic Vernacular in my south London field site .....	176
6.2 Vinício’s use of LMEV as a marker of insidersness .....	182
6.2.1 Vinício and key markers of local insidersness .....	183
6.2.2 Vinício’s use of LMEV to distance himself from “freshies” .....	186
6.2.3 Vinício’s use of LMEV to distance himself from “neeks” .....	191
6.3 Other Lusondoners “stepping around” LMEV .....	196
6.3.1 Danilo and LMEV .....	196
6.3.2 Dara, Márcia and LMEV .....	201
6.3.3 Alícia and LMEV .....	203
6.4 Chapter conclusion .....	206
<b>Chapter 7 - “Blackness”, “Whiteness” and Lusondoners.....</b>	<b>208</b>
7.0 Introduction .....	208
7.1 Lack of space for “Black Portugueseness” within dominant discourses of “Blackness” in south London .....	210
7.1.1 Dara and Márcia’s claims to “Blackness” .....	211
7.1.2 Dara and Márcia’s sense of exclusion from London “Blackness” .....	213
7.1.3 Dominant discourses of “Blackness” in south London.....	218
7.2 Representations of “Jamaicanness” and “Africanness” .....	220
7.2.1 Street-tough “Jamaicanness” in opposition to simple “West Africanness” .....	220
7.2.2 Further connotations to “Africanness”: poverty and a lack of modern urban savvy.....	229
7.3 Gatekeepers to local discourses of “Blackness” .....	234
7.3.1 “Jamaicanness” and gatekeepers .....	234
7.3.2 “Africanness” and gatekeepers .....	236
7.4 Being both “White Portuguese” and “African” in south London .....	239
7.4.1 A “White Portuguese” young person claiming to be “African” .....	240
7.5 Chapter conclusion .....	249
<b>Chapter 8 - Conclusion .....</b>	<b>250</b>
8.0 Introduction .....	250
8.1 Lusondoners and the impact of immediate friendship groups .....	252
8.2.1 Alícia .....	253
8.2.2 Danilo .....	253
8.2.3 Dara and Márcia .....	254
8.2.4 Délia .....	255
8.2.5 Vinício .....	256
8.2 Thesis findings .....	257
8.3 Implications .....	260
8.3.1 Reassessing dominant discourses of ethno-linguistic categorisation.....	261

8.3.2 Explorative approaches to ethnic affiliation and linguistic practices.....	262
<b>Appendices .....</b>	<b>267</b>
Appendix I – Recorded “Home Language” of all students enrolled at the school where I conducted my fieldwork, according to official school data .....	267
Appendix II – Wider peer group interacting with key participants (anonymised list of young people) .....	268
Appendix III – Biographical questionnaire .....	270
Appendix IV – Summary of observations .....	273
Appendix V – Lambeth ethnicity categories and codes .....	276
Appendix VI – Transcription conventions .....	277
Appendix VII – Glossary of LMEV usage .....	278
<b>References .....</b>	<b>280</b>



## Chapter 1

### Introduction: the many faces of “Portuguese”<sup>1</sup>

#### 1.0 Snapshots from a South London School

##### *Jéssica*<sup>2</sup>

*It’s 2007, late November, peak season for mid-term admissions arriving from abroad at the mixed comprehensive secondary school where I work in south London. As a Portuguese speaker I’ve been asked to interpret at an initial interview for Jéssica, a new Year 8<sup>3</sup> student recently arrived from Brazil. There’s a standard format: find out about her previous education; explain how things will work at the school; fill out the necessary official documents. When we come to the ethnic background form required by the Local Education Authority, I am preparing to embark on a long explanation of the 20 or so categories from which the young person or her mother can choose. Pressed for time, the Head of Year intervenes and directs me to tick the ‘Portuguese’ box. The young person concerned was born in Brazil, holds an Italian passport and, as far as I know, has no links to Portugal.*

##### *Jamila*

*Break-time on a rainy morning in October 2010. I’m walking the corridors, holding a list of students identified by the school database as “Portuguese speakers”. I have one more place to allocate on a Portuguese language creative writing course being organised for the following December, and it is proving tricky to fill. Halfway down the Maths corridor I find Jamila waiting outside a classroom. As if reading my mind she greets me with “Olà” (Hi) and proceeds to ask me whether I knew that she spoke Portuguese. I did not. Jamila, as far as school records are concerned, is of Jamaican heritage, and her friendship group consists largely of other “Black Caribbean”<sup>4</sup> girls. Although Jamila lives with her “Jamaican” mother, I discover*

---

<sup>1</sup> Throughout this thesis, I will be placing ethnic labels within inverted commas to highlight how I am treating these notions as provisional.

<sup>2</sup> All names have been changed

<sup>3</sup> In secondary schools in England, the year groups usually correspond to the following ages: Year 7 – age 11/12; Year 8 – age 12/13; Year 9 – age 13/14; Year 10 – age 14/15; Year 11 – age 15/16.

<sup>4</sup> Throughout this thesis, I will be capitalising all ethnic labels for the sake of uniformity in how I treat colour-based, nationality-based and other terms.

*she has learned some Portuguese from her “Angolan” father, and is keen to be recognised as a Portuguese speaker.*

### ***Alícia and Adriana***

*Sports day, July 2011. Two year 9 girls, arms linked, approach me in the playground. Alícia arrived from Brazil eight months ago, while Adriana, born in Madeira, has been in the UK for over five years. The two have become inseparable and, as they begin chatting to me in Portuguese, I notice something new has started to happen with their language. I can remember conversations with Adriana from the previous year when she spoke to me with a strong Madeiran accent, whereas now her vocabulary and pronunciation have a distinct Brazilian twist. When I point this out Alícia beams with pride at the influence she claims to have had on her new friend.*

### ***Moussa***

*December 2011, I’m reading the first draft of a piece of writing Moussa has produced in Portuguese about his journey to the UK. The story begins in Guinea Conakry where Moussa used to attend a French-medium school. His family set out by car, crossing Senegal, Gambia, Mauritania, Morocco and Spain, eventually ending up in Portugal. They settled in Lisbon for several years, gaining Portuguese citizenship, then moved to London. Moussa is fluent in Fula and Portuguese, highly literate in French and was entered early for his GCSE<sup>5</sup> English Language exam after just 2 years in the country, achieving a grade C.*

## **1.1 Introduction**

The vignettes above represent just some of my personal experiences of interacting with young people labelled as “Portuguese” or “Portuguese-speaking” in a south London secondary school. They come from the five years I spent there working as Coordinator for English as an Additional Language (EAL), responsible for both monitoring and meeting the needs of students for whom English was not their only language. Roughly 10% of the school population was recorded as speaking “Portuguese” at home and, as I had lived in Brazil and was a fluent Portuguese

---

<sup>5</sup> General Certificate of Secondary Education – national qualifications usually taken at the age of 16

speaker myself, I was particularly alert to the diversity behind this label. This alertness was not simply about cultural curiosity, but linked to the ever-escalating requirement within the education system in England to use a variety of data on students (not least data about their backgrounds) to map and meet their specific needs. I found the search for straightforward correlations between ethnic or linguistic groups (as defined by school-based monitoring regimes) and particular patterns of need or attainment to be a distinctly flawed approach to catering for diversity within the school. Through my experiences working as an EAL Coordinator, three factors behind this flawed approach became apparent to me, which I believe are well captured by the vignettes above:

- i) the heterogeneity of the origins, trajectories and linguistic resources of young people labelled as “Portuguese” or “Portuguese-speaking”;
- ii) the emergence of specifically London-based and peer-influenced linguistic practices and affiliations often drawing on these trajectories;
- iii) the inadequacy of current ethnic and linguistic monitoring regimes in accounting for this.

This impression was reinforced by my subsequent research, and a central finding to emerge from this study was the phenomenon of a loose and contingent convergence amongst young people bearing the “Portuguese” label. This involves diverse backgrounds contributing to the shaping of London-based but Lusophone-inflected practices amounting not to a fixed, hybrid<sup>6</sup> “ethnicity”, but rather a common discursive space. Adriana’s adoption of elements of Brazilian Portuguese, outlined in the vignette above, is an example of this. Her fluency in Portuguese is rooted in her background of growing up within a “Madeiran” family, but the Brazilian twist reflects the here-and-now circumstances of living in London, mingling and developing a sense of commonality with Portuguese speakers from all over the world. On one level this sense of commonality and the linguistic practices it can prompt appear to align with the school’s use of “Portuguese” as a catch-all term, uniting young people with ties to different Lusophone territories. However, as I will set out in the following chapters, both the labels and the concepts underpinning the labelling are inadequate. Discrete notions of “home language” and “ethnic group” employed within the school’s monitoring regimes do not account for the flexible and contingent ways that linguistic practices and affiliations play out in actual

---

<sup>6</sup> The concept of “hybridity” is a contested one within sociology and cultural studies (see Pieterse: 2001 for a summary) and I address my use of the term in more detail in Chapter 2.

interactions. Ethnic and linguistic labels are not “naturally occurring” phenomena which neatly capture the reality of individuals’ practices and affiliations. Instead they link to dominant discourses which get taken up by individuals from moment to moment in varying ways in the course of their everyday lives. As hinted at in the example of Alícia and Adriana, relating to the background and linguistic repertoire of peers is a crucial dimension within this. With the levels of diversity present in locations like London, this necessitates an entirely different framework for talking about and analysing language and ethnicity to that which underpins institutional monitoring and the local policy discourses<sup>7</sup> it can feed into.

Taking an approach grounded in a ‘superdiversity’ perspective (Vertovec, 2007) responds to the need outlined above and allows for a more coherent account of the practices highlighted in the vignettes. Such an approach has not previously been attempted in relation to Portuguese-speakers in the UK. Instead of treating ethnicity as a stable, inherited attribute which amounts to some kind of inner essence, a superdiversity paradigm allows for ethnic affiliations with multiple threads rooted in complex migration trajectories, family structures and peer networks. In addition, bringing a superdiversity perspective to bear on language involves moving beyond a focus on “named” languages to investigate the specifics of actual linguistic practices (cf. Arnaut & Spotti, 2014; Jørgensen et al., 2011; Rampton, 2013; Rampton et al., 2015). This facilitates an engagement with the kind of diversity, hybridity and innovation hinted at in the vignettes which is not captured by the broad categorisations in linguistic monitoring regimes. A superdiversity approach then is open to complexity and is not restricted to the conceptual framework of existing taxonomies. However, this is not to imply that the labels within dominant taxonomies are irrelevant to understanding ethnic and linguistic practices and affiliations. On the contrary, such categorisations largely underpin popular understandings of language and ethnicity and are vital conceptual tools applied by social actors in everyday interactions. What I will show, though, is that the inadequacy of these categorisations in accounting for the complexity of actual practices leads to tension points and struggles which individuals must negotiate in

---

<sup>7</sup> In the London borough of Lambeth where I carried out my study, the Local Education Authority regularly publishes reports into the educational attainment of particular ethnic groups, including suggestions for best practice in catering to each group’s perceived “needs”. These reports have focused on: “Black Caribbean Pupils” (McKenley et al., 2003); “Mobile Pupils” – typically those from Gypsy/Roma/Traveller backgrounds (Edwards, 2004); “Somali Pupils” (Demie, Lewis, and McLean, 2007); “Portuguese Pupils” (Demie, and Lewis, 2008); “Black African Pupils” (Demie, 2013); “White Working Class Pupils” (Demie and Lewis 2014).

the course of their daily lives. In this thesis I will explore some of the many faces of the labels “Portuguese” and “Portuguese-speaking”, setting out how the struggles alluded to above take different forms depending on the background and resources of those engaged in them. In demonstrating this, I will show that, for young people in a south London school, “Portuguese” manifests neither as a fixed ethnic essence nor as a bounded linguistic variety. However, it does denote a common discursive space to which young people with ties to Lusophone locations across the world have varying levels of access. In this way, examining how “Portuguese”-indexed affiliations and linguistic practices are deployed in the school provides a window on the workings of superdiversity.

## **1.2 Reframing “Portuguese” as “Lusondoner”**

I have suggested that the terms “Portuguese” and “Portuguese-speaking” fall far short of rendering the true complexity of origins, trajectories, linguistic resources and ethnic affiliations amongst the young people they are assigned to. This raises the need to find a more appropriate term with which to refer to the emergent space of commonality described above. The heterogeneity and hybridisation alluded to in the vignettes would suggest that any suitable term would certainly need to eschew reductive and pre-determined linguistic and ethnic categorisations. Ali, Kalra & Sayyid (2006) faced a similar conundrum in describing ‘members of settler communities which articulate a significant part of their identity in terms of South Asian heritage’ (p5). They opted for the term ‘BrAsian’ explaining this as a category which points ‘away from established accounts of national identities and ethnicised minorities’ (p5), (Harris: 2006, employed similar terminology for similar reasons, as will be outlined in Chapter 2). Insisting on ‘the impossibility of a hyphenated identity’ (p7), Ali, Kalra & Sayyid chose a new term which did not automatically imply a composite account of transnational ethnicity, something cobbled together from existing ingredients. However, they refused to be satisfied with any new fixity under this term, bringing in Derrida’s (1976) work to describe ‘BrAsian’ as acting ‘under erasure’ (Ali, Kalra & Sayyid, 2006, p7). Instead of offering a neat account of those it refers to, they state that ‘BrAsian is not the correct answer to the question of British Asian subjectivities, but nor is there a better answer we can turn to’ (p7).

Following this line of argument, I sought an appropriate label for the young people in my study. I wanted to acknowledge the common thread of links to Lusophone

locations, but without reducing this to an automatic and inaccurate connotation to the nation of Portugal. I also wanted to render the specific location of London which is the other thread these individuals have in common. To draw these two threads together into a single, fused (yet provisional) label, I coined the term *Lusondoner* to refer to all London-based young people<sup>8</sup> with links to Lusophone locations. I use this label without assumptions about the ethnic affiliations and linguistic repertoires of those it encompasses. Instead, it is explicitly and self-consciously a catch-all term which, unlike the institutional monitoring label “Portuguese”, allows for:

- i. complex and hybrid Lusophone-inflected family backgrounds and migration trajectories;
- ii. peer-influenced practices and affiliations;
- iii. a distinct grounding in London.

As I show over the following chapters, rather than delineating some kind of wide-bracket ethnicity, *Lusondoner* refers to individuals with access to a particular discursive space<sup>9</sup>, a broad domain of practices and references *recognisable* to young people from across different Lusophone backgrounds but not necessarily equally *affiliated to*. For example, while all *Lusondoners* are likely to have an awareness of Brazilian soap operas and Brazilian pop music not shared by other peers, those with strong ties to Brazil are more likely to view these as elements of “their culture”. A key finding of this thesis is that each individual’s unique circumstances frame how “Portuguese” can be mobilised. This can change from moment to moment and is rooted both in the background and resources individuals bring (their migration trajectory, physical appearance and linguistic repertoire) and their abilities to leverage these in particular ways in the specific context of south London. To understand the ethnic affiliations and linguistic practices of the young people I studied then, it was as important to look at the nature of their friendships and the composition of their wider peer group as it was to investigate their family backgrounds.

---

<sup>8</sup> By ‘young people’ I am referring to those of school age. Whilst my theorisation of ‘*Lusondoners*’ may well have relevance to older individuals, that is beyond the scope of the current study.

<sup>9</sup> This *Lusondoner* discursive space is defined more fully in Chapter 4.

### 1.3 Research objectives

The imprecision with which the terms ‘Portuguese’ and ‘Portuguese-speaking’ are being used to label young people in the London borough of Lambeth where my study took place is particularly significant due to both the large numbers concerned, and the growing discourse of ‘underachievement’ surrounding them. ‘Portuguese’ is spoken or understood at home by 7.7% of schoolchildren in the borough (Lambeth Education, 2015), constituting the largest claimed language group after English, almost double the size of either Somali or Spanish, the next closest contenders. While the last two decades have seen a progressively increasing number of “Portuguese-speaking” students recorded in the borough, the percentage of students categorised as being of “Portuguese” ethnicity has been consistently lower. Portuguese language and ethnicity clearly do not map neatly onto one another, despite their often interchangeable use within a significant volume of literature on “Portuguese underachievement” (see Abreu: 2003, Abreu & Lambert: 2003, Abreu, Cline & Lambert: 2003, Barradas: 2004, Demie & Lewis: 2008, 2010). Lambeth’s appointment of an advisory teacher for ‘Portuguese Pupil Achievement’ in September 2006 (see Ribeiro, 2007) demonstrates an alignment with the discourse of “Portuguese underachievement” at the local policy level. Despite this, it remains far from clear what “Portuguese underachievement” might mean, particularly in light of the kind of ethnic and linguistic heterogeneity presented in the vignettes above. The criteria for membership of this “Portuguese” grouping are ill-defined, and the leap to postulating underachievement, implicit in the need for an advisory teacher, has yet to be convincingly justified. This study questions the neat assumptions about language and ethnicity which underpin current policy and theory on “Portuguese” students, refocusing attention on the specificities of the young people concerned in pursuit of a more nuanced understanding of the factors affecting their experiences of life at school. As such, it seeks to answer the following questions:

- a) What are the biographical-linguistic trajectories and linguistic practices and affiliations of Lusondoners at school?
- b) How far and in what ways do these interact with, ratify and/or challenge the discourses of ethno-linguistic categorisation at school and in policy and public discourse more generally?
- c) What are the implications for the sociolinguistic theorisation of ‘superdiversity’ and for accounts of Lusophone ethnicity in Britain?

This thesis address these questions by employing linguistic ethnographic methods (following Rampton et al. 2004) to examine the *repertoires* of young people labelled as “Portuguese” in one south London school, as ‘a privileged road into understanding Late-Modern, superdiverse subjectivities’ (Blommaert & Backus, 2011, p2). This alertness to potential interactions between ethnic affiliation and linguistic practice is central to the approach, and runs counter to school-based monitoring regimes which categorise language and ethnicity as separate, concrete attributes. In order to refocus attention on the individuals behind the labels, in this thesis I examine five key participants in depth, embedded in their wider friendship and peer groupings (amounting to a further 76 young people<sup>10</sup>), taking an integrated perspective on their linguistic practices and ethnic affiliations.

#### **1.4 Outline of chapters**

In Chapter 2, I set out how this study addresses a gap in existing literature on Portuguese-speaking youth in the UK by focusing on peer interactions, using an ethnographic perspective to examine how diverse Lusophone ties play out in locally grounded ways within conditions of superdiversity. I explain that conceptualisations of language and ethnicity as fixed and inherited attributes underpin the monitoring endeavours characteristic of a multiculturalism paradigm, as well as informing many of the existing studies of Portuguese-speaking youth in the UK which are typically based on survey research methods. Although such conceptualisations dominate popular understandings, they do not account for the role of locality and peer group in shaping individuals’ practices and affiliations which are discernible through empirically informed observation. I explain how the integrated approach to language and ethnicity which I adopt in this thesis accounts for the complex configurations thrown up by contemporary superdiversity, and allows for an understanding of Lusondoners as sharing access to a common discursive space. I give an account of the diverse threads to this Lusondoner discursive space, the various linguistic varieties and migration patterns which contribute to shaping the Lusophone milieu in London. Through this I provide a sketch of the ties and references which are available for Lusondoners to draw on, and in subsequent chapters I set out how they do this in locally grounded ways.

---

<sup>10</sup> See Chapter 3 for an explanation of how these key participants were selected, and Appendix II for a full list of the wider peer group of 76 young people who I observed interacting with these key participants during my research.



In Chapter 3, I set out the methodology adopted in this thesis and explain why the focus on practices outlined in Chapter 2 necessitates a specifically linguistic ethnographic approach. I give an account of the privileged perspective on language and ethnicity afforded by linguistic ethnography, with an emphasis on its particular relevance in contexts of superdiversity. I then link this to an explanation of the research design employed in this study. I set out how starting from school data on “home language” and “ethnic group” allowed me to identify 90 potential Lusondoners, 58 of whom then participated in biographical interviews. I explain that the detailed biographical data I obtained enabled me to discern broad ethnic fractions amongst Lusondoners, which then informed my selection of 5 key participants, who I observed in lessons over the course of an academic year. I outline how I made recordings of the naturally occurring speech of these key participants then used extracts from this audio data to conduct retrospective interviews with the key participants, seeking their perspective on the practices I had observed. Throughout this explanation of my methodology I stress that, although the in-depth focus of an ethnographic approach limits the number of key participants which it is feasible to work with, ethnography facilitates the nuanced account of actual linguistic practices and affiliations which is lacking in existing studies of “Portuguese speakers” in the UK.

In Chapter 4, I set out an empirical basis for a Lusondoner discursive space, and its constitutive ethnic fractions of “White Portuguese”, “Brazilian” and “Black Portuguese”. I explain why current school-based ethnic and linguistic taxonomies fall short of describing the practices and affiliations of participants in my study, outlining why ‘Lusondoner’ provides a more useful term. In Part I, I focus on the structure of the Lusondoner discursive space, bringing in data from the broad biographical survey to sketch out key features of the Lusondoner ethnic fractions. In part II, I set out indicative examples of manifestations of these Lusondoner ethnic fractions. I draw on interactional data to show the common understandings which individuals aligned with these different fractions have in relation to each other, and outline how this shared awareness amounts to a Lusondoner discursive space.

In Chapter 5, I broaden the focus to look at the wider peer group context within which Lusondoners operate, identifying the dominance of a multiethnic conviviality underpinning interactions between young people at the school. I set out how this conviviality draws on overlapping experiences of migration and multilingualism,

and often manifests itself in a trade in ethnic and linguistic “emblems”, in the form of fairly stereotypical ethnic and linguistic representations. However, I show that this is part of everyday amicable “rubbing along” in a superdiverse environment, rather than evidence of serious underlying tension. I detail how these convivial relations also permeate interactions between individuals aligned with the three Lusondoner ethnic fractions. From this I highlight the importance of the specific local peer group context, and how ethnicity is treated within it, in framing the Lusondoner discursive space.

In Chapter 6, I look at how Lusondoners respond to the Local Multiethnic Vernacular (LMEV) which is a bedrock of what it means to be imprinted with Londonness in working class and lower middle class contexts in multiethnic London. I set out some key characteristics of the LMEV and the ways it is drawn on to emphasise insider status in the local peer group context. I look at the varying levels of access which different Lusondoners have to LMEV, as well as the different purposes it serves for them. While for some it is a vital tool in demonstrating they have transitioned from “new arrival” to established Londoner, for others it is either less accessible or less relevant. I explain how the specific dynamics of individual friendship groups are key in framing how Lusondoners respond to LMEV.

In Chapter 7, I explain how dominant discourses within the local ethnic ecology restrict the ethnic positionings which different Lusondoners can easily adopt. I focus on dominant understandings of “Blackness” and “Whiteness” within the local context, and how these impact on Lusondoners. I highlight the predominance of both a working-class, street-tough “Jamaicanness” linked with low academic aspirations but high social status within the peer group, enhanced through its prominence in popular culture, and a more middle-class “West Africanness” with high aspirations but lacking urban savvy and social prestige. I set out how this can lead to tensions for some Lusondoners whose particular affiliations and appearance cross into but do not align with these dominant understandings. In particular, I explain how two “Black Portuguese” participants in my study struggled to assert their claim to “Blackness” in ways which were legitimised by their peers, while one “White Portuguese” participant with Mozambican heritage faced similar difficulties in positioning himself as “African”.

In Chapter 8, I summarise the findings of my study in relation to the Lusondoner discursive space which I am proposing. I emphasise that this is an emergent ethnic

formation which is difficult to conceptualise and to research practically. However, I explain that, by adopting an ethnographic approach, I have been able to identify and describe some of the complex practices and affiliations of my Lusondoner participants. I explain how, through this approach, I have been able to overcome the limited ethnic and linguistic conceptualisations underpinning both institutional monitoring regimes and much of the existing research into Portuguese speakers in the UK, reviewed in Chapter 2. This has facilitated my identification of a Lusondoner formation both constituting, and constituted by, the superdiverse locality in south London in which it is embedded. I set out how, for individual Lusondoners, their engagement with this locally embedded Lusondoner discursive space is also conditioned by their particular friendship groups. I then summarise the five key issues to emerge from my research, highlighting instances where the particular friendships of my key participants impacted on how these issues played out:

- i. the importance of locality in understanding the practices and affiliations of Lusondoners;
- ii. the emergence of a Lusondoner discursive space accessible to individuals with a variety of Lusophone ties;
- iii. a sense of multiethnic conviviality underpinning relations and interactions within the peer group, including amongst Lusondoners of different ethnic fractions;
- iv. the dominance of a Local Multiethnic Vernacular which Lusondoners have varying levels of access to and engagement with; and
- v. the ways different Lusondoners struggle to assert ethnic positionings which are recognisable to peers within the context of the local ethnic ecology.

Finally, I set out some implications of my findings, explaining how the work I have done in this thesis has led me to reconceptualise how people described as “Portuguese-speaking” might be approached with regard to educational initiatives and cultural projects. I give examples of successful projects which take an open approach to linguistic practices and ethnic affiliations, facilitating self-exploration on the part of the young people involved. Rather than focusing on “compensatory” interventions, I advocate a shift towards exploratory initiatives which allow young people to examine their own practices without being restricted to taxonomies of standard languages and reified ethnicities, deepening their own awareness but also forging new practices and understandings around them.

## Chapter 2

# Conceptualising Lusondoners: the importance of superdiversity

*If their parents were brought up in another culture or another tradition, children should be encouraged to respect it, but a national system cannot be expected to perpetuate the different values of immigrant groups*

(Commonwealth Immigrants Advisory Council, 1964, p7)

*No child should be expected to cast off the language and culture of the home as he crosses the school threshold, nor to live and act as though school and home represent two totally separate and different cultures which have to be kept firmly apart.*

(The Bullock Report: A Language for Life, Department of Education and Science, 1975, p286)

*School “celebration of diversity” approaches can seem to minority ethnic pupils like a pageant of some stereotypical ethnicity in which they do not quite feel themselves to participate, however welcome the references to familiar things.*

(Hewitt, 2005, p126)

## 2.0 Introduction

In this thesis I respond to the absence of academic literature which adequately accounts for the ethnic and linguistic complexity of young people labelled as “Portuguese” in a south London school. In Chapter 1 I set out three linked arguments in relation to this complexity:

- i. language and ethnicity are intertwined, so an investigation of young people labelled as “Portuguese” requires an integrated perspective on their ethnic affiliations and linguistic practices;
- ii. superdiversity characterises the south London locale of these young people, and as such, behind the simple label “Portuguese”, they bring a broad range of often multi-layered migration trajectories and linguistic repertoires;
- iii. the ethnic affiliations and linguistic practices of these young people do draw on their family heritage but are also specifically rooted in the London context and as such are particularly influenced by their multiethnic and multilingual peer group.

These arguments run contrary to the dominant multiculturalist paradigm in the English education system which relies on notions of bounded languages and fixed ethnicities. The three epigraphs above chart the development of this thinking over the last 40-50 years, but also highlight an essentialist understanding of ethnicity (or “culture”) which has endured. The first, taken from a government advisory body (CIAC) publication, captures the assimilationist strand within education policy in the 1960s and 1970s. This approach, characterised by Troyna (1985) as aiming to ‘suppress the significance of ethnic and cultural differences’ (p214), preceded the official embracing of multiculturalism. The second epigraph, taken from a government commissioned report into the teaching of English, criticises this assimilationist paradigm. It advocates instead a shift to multiculturalist thinking, an approach which recognises the importance of ‘the different values, beliefs and lifestyles of all people living in the UK’ (Troyna, 1985, p215). The third, taken from Hewitt’s *White Backlash and the Politics of Multiculturalism*, points to limitations in how multicultural education has been implemented, despite the well-intentioned inclusivity which underpins it. Underneath the shift towards celebrating diversity, there is a key continuity between the CIAC’s notion of ‘the different values of immigrant groups’ and the Bullock Report’s conception of ‘the language and culture of the home’. Both postulate a distinct, ‘other’ home culture, and it is the attempt to bring this reified putative ‘home’ element into the school that has spawned the essentialising practices referred to by Hewitt. While rhetoric and political intentions may have shifted considerably, policy and popular understandings are still grounded in reductive accounts of language and ethnicity.

Troyna (1987) foreshadows Hewitt’s warning about the dangers of essentialism, describing how the positive intentions of multiculturalism in representing other cultures ‘could also lead to an emphasis on broadly sketched caricatures’ (p314). This builds on Mullard’s (1986) account of ‘ethnicism’, whereby fixed notions of ethnic groups contribute to shaping policies and practices which end up ‘institutionalising ethnic/cultural differences’ (p11). Reductive depictions of ethnic groups then are not just limited but also *limiting* when taken up at an institutional level. Troyna (1987) outlines how ‘ethnic record keeping’ (p309) carries this potential risk, although he stresses it can be implemented for both ‘benign’ and ‘malevolent’ ends. Institutional monitoring, both ethnic and linguistic, is a key feature of the multiculturalist paradigm as the endeavour to cater to “other” groups necessitates a proliferation of categories in order to pin down ever more specific

“needs”. Demie & Lewis’ (2008) claim below exemplifies this mind-set and its limitations, specifically in relation to “Portuguese” young people:

‘the underachievement levels of many Portuguese pupils in English schools has been masked by government statistics that fail to distinguish between ‘Other White’ or ‘European’ ethnic groups’ (p58)

The assumption here that “Portuguese” equates with “White” does not square with the evidence in the opening vignettes in Chapter 1 of this thesis, highlighting the pitfalls of attempting to delineate and characterise definitive ethnic groups. The vignettes suggest not only that the diversity of young people’s migration trajectories and linguistic repertoires slip beyond current categorisations, but also that the hybrid, contingent and locally grounded nature of ethnic affiliations and linguistic practices require a different theoretical framework to describe them.

In this chapter I set out the flaws of a multiculturalist approach to understanding the Lusondoners I studied, and explain instead why superdiversity provides a more adequate theoretical framework. In section 2.1 I highlight how the notions of fixed ethnic categories and bounded languages do not account for the diverse and hybrid practices and affiliations of Lusondoners. I explain, however, that these categories connect with locally and more widely circulating ethnic and linguistic ideologies, and impact on day-to-day interactions as individuals come up against particular labels and engage in processes of both accommodation and contestation. Having set out the limitations of bounded ethnic and linguistic categorisations underpinning multiculturalist thinking, in section 2.2 I make the case for adopting a superdiversity approach to understanding Lusondoners. Through a more detailed description of demographic trends amongst Lusondoners, as well as the linguistic ideologies circulating in relation to the various varieties of “Portuguese” they bring, I highlight areas of both commonality and contrast within the Lusondoner discursive space. I explain how this co-presence of distinct, but interconnected strands, resists categorisation as either discrete ethnic “communities” or a single, unified Lusophone “community”. Instead, the practices which constitute the Lusondoner discursive space can be understood within the broader context of ethnic identification in superdiverse London, as particular forms of Londonness and, therefore, Britishness. Building on this, in section 2.3 I explain how adopting a superdiversity approach facilitates an understanding of how the simultaneous heterogeneity and interconnectedness of my Lusondoner participants finds a particular space in the complex ethnolinguistic environment of south London. Finally, in section 2.4 I set

out the need for a specifically linguistic ethnographic approach in investigating my Lusondoner participants, highlighting the gap in the literature which my study addresses. Through reviewing existing research studies of “Portuguese speakers” in the UK and Ireland, I show the importance of attending to the specifics of linguistic practices as a way into understanding complex ethnic affiliations. Instead of relying on the fixed ethnicities and bounded languages of multiculturalism, I argue that linguistic ethnography brings a crucial openness to actual practices. This affords a nuanced understanding of multi-layered family migration trajectories and linguistic repertoires, and their interplay with the local, superdiverse ethnolinguistic ecology.

## **2.1 The essentialised ethnicities and bounded languages of multiculturalism**

As the vignettes in Chapter 1 of this thesis show, rigid conceptualisations of language and ethnicity underpin taxonomies employed within schools which do not do justice to the diversity of actual practices and affiliations of my Lusondoner participants. To understand how this situation has come about it is necessary to look back at the genesis of these monitoring regimes and the wider endeavour they contribute to. The impetus for monitoring lies both in attempts to identify and tackle discrimination and a desire to meet the supposed needs of particular groups. As I set out below, the various forces behind these monitoring regimes have affected the form they have taken, and these regimes are both shaped by, and reproduce, discourses of fixed ethnicities and bounded languages. These discourses exist in wider British society beyond the monitoring regimes themselves, and the conceptual framework which runs through them finds significant alignment with how language and ethnicity are imagined and experienced by many social actors on a day-to-day basis. However, London’s deepening diversity and the complexity of individual and family migration trajectories<sup>11</sup> are not accounted for within dominant discourses of fixed ethnicities and bounded languages. The Lusondoners I describe in this thesis often draw on multiple affiliations and diverse linguistic repertoires. The rigid ethnic and linguistic taxonomies underpinning both institutional and popular understandings, then, throw up tension points which young people such as these Lusondoners must negotiate on

---

<sup>11</sup> The Greater London Authority report ‘Diversity in London’ (2013) draws on 2011 census data to show that the proportion of non-UK born residents in London increased by 9.6% between 2001 and 2011 (p5). During this same period the proportion of London residents recorded in the ‘Mixed’ ethnic category increased by 79.2% (p6).

a daily basis. Such tension points provide a window into the localised configurations of superdiversity, and examining these will be the focus of later chapters.

### **2.1.1 Lusondoners and conceptualisations of ethnicity**

The opening vignettes in Chapter 1 highlighted how notions of fixed ethnicities do not account for the multi-layered practices and affiliations of Lusondoners. For example, in Jamila's case, her Angolan heritage and knowledge of Portuguese were eclipsed by her categorisation as "Black Caribbean". The apparent incongruity of her ethnic label and linguistic repertoire highlights how ethnic categorisations come with specific expectations about the appearance, practices and other features of those they are attached to. This understanding of ethnicity dates back to the Enlightenment thinker Johann Gottfried von Herder, with his elaboration of the notion of a *Volk*, a people or nationality. Barnard (1969) describes Herder's idea of a *Volk* as being founded on 'the sharing of a common culture' (p7), or 'an inner consciousness, in terms of which each individual recognizes himself as an integral part of a social whole'. According to Hayes (1927), this essence is drawn from environmental factors but then 'gets into the blood, as it were' (p725), and this blood metaphor has embedded itself in the popular imagination to become a touchstone in "primordial" conceptions of ethnicity up to the present day. Within this paradigm, the net of "ethnicity" not only draws in *all* members of a defined group of people, but draws them in *completely*. In the case of a "Black Caribbean" young person in a south London school for example, their "Black Caribbeanness" would be seen as permeating and defining them comprehensively in some way, and they would share this "Black Caribbeanness" with all other "Black Caribbeans". There is a neat correlation between the individual, the group and an ethnic essence. Although this characterisation is somewhat crude it does paint a broad picture of how "ethnicity" is often experienced by individuals. It also meets the needs of policy makers and institutions which seek a straightforward conceptual framework through which to deal with diversity. This primordial conceptualisation of ethnicity then can contribute to shaping educational interventions, a point evidenced (as stated in Chapter 1) by Lambeth's appointment of an advisory teacher for 'Portuguese Pupil Achievement' (see Ribeiro: 2007).

Within popular discourse then, frequently manifested in public declarations of government and the media, "ethnicity" is often conceived of as "primordial", the



shared essence of a particular group of people<sup>12</sup>. Stemming from a sense of commonality rooted in shared history, territory and ancestry, “ethnicity” appears to have a concrete reality both in terms of this explicit provenance and its manifestation in a defined set of cultural practices related to areas such as language, dress and food. The vignettes in Chapter 1 however, show that young people with links to Portugal, Brazil and Lusophone Africa are often recorded under the same ethnic label “Portuguese”. This is despite the contrasting discourses surrounding the various “ethnicities” linked to these locations. Such discourses provide the foundation for the kinds of popular accounts of ethnic and national groups presented in widely used information sources such as travel guides, openly editable websites and official government tourism propaganda. Analysis of these sources therefore offers a window on the discourses they are rooted in. From such sources, the following depictions of different Lusophone groups can be summarised:

i. *Discourses of “Portugueseness”*

The Portuguese are consistently credited with a voyaging tendency stemming from their maritime past which instils a sense of *saudade* (nostalgic sadness) in the national character (The Rough Guide to Portugal, Brown et al.: 2010; Eyewitness Travel: Portugal, McDonald: 1997/2012; Lonely Planet: Portugal, St Louis, Armstrong et al.: 1997/2011; Turismo de Portugal: 2008). Academic sources also emphasise that pride in Portugal’s maritime and colonial history underpins a lot of what it means to ‘be Portuguese’ (Ribeiro: 2002; Sidaway & Power: 2005) and the global Portuguese diaspora has at times been depicted as a modern-day continuation of the historical legacy of exploration (Almeida: 2010; Feldman-Bianco: 1992). However, such notions of “Portugueseness” do not necessarily circulate widely beyond those with specific Lusophone awareness. Boyle & Monteiro (2005) in their study of British press coverage of the Euro 2004 football championship in Portugal, noted ‘the “invisibility” of Portugal in the tabloid press, other than as a sun-drenched holiday destination or a rather backward economy’ (p240).

---

<sup>12</sup> For two indicative examples see:

- Holehouse, H. (2014) ‘Children should learn British values such as freedom and tolerance, says David Cameron’, *The Telegraph*.
- Hennessy, A. (2016) ‘Amir Khan can only embrace his Pakistani identity because he’s climbed the greasy class pole’, *Independent*.

ii. *Discourses of “Brazilianness”*

Popular depictions of Brazilians do not share this focus on history, but instead emphasise fun, friendliness and informality (Government of Brazil: 2010a; Lonely Planet: Brazil, St Louis et al.: 1989/2010; Wikitravel: 2012b). Ethnic or “racial” diversity is also highlighted (Wikitravel: 2012b; Eyewitness Travel: Brazil, Ghose: 2007/2010) in the ‘melting pot’ of Brazil. ‘Diversity’, broadly speaking, may then be both a general feature of the *Lusondoner* context, but also a particularly Brazilian ingredient of it. From an academic perspective, Cwerner (2001) also points out that, within the UK, Brazilians ‘have to contend with the fragmented Brazil that is represented in the British media’ (p26), alternating between images of ‘poverty and violence’ and ‘the “exotic” features of their identity’.

iii. *Discourses of “Lusophone Africanness”*

Lusophone African ethnicities are notable for their near absence from mainstream media. Travel information on African countries is frequently limited to smaller entries within general guides to the whole continent and both government and open access websites have limited information. From the sources that are available, a general trend emerges of seeing the peoples of Lusophone Africa as both good natured and long suffering (Wikitravel: 2012a; Lonely Planet: Africa, Ham et al.: 1977/2010; Lonely Planet: Mozambique, Fitzpatrick, 2000/2010).

The discrete ethnic categories of multiculturalism have their roots in the kinds of discourses outlined above. The stark contrasts between the three broad descriptions presented above show the limitations of “Portuguese” as an umbrella-label for these groupings, even within the limited terms of the multiculturalist paradigm. However, these descriptions come from widely circulating discourses as opposed to empirical accounts. They represent the ideas many people hold about particular groups, as opposed to systematically observed practices. The relevance of these discourses to my study lies not in how “true” they are, but in the way they provide common reference points for Lusondoners. As I set out in Chapter 4, rather than sharing a common identity, Lusondoners share recognition of, and access to, a common pool of Lusophone-inflected references, constituting a Lusondoner discursive space. The ideas about particular Lusophone groups summarised above form part of this common pool, and I will detail in subsequent chapters how such discourses are

invoked in low-key, often nuanced ways, within everyday interactions by the Lusondoners I studied.

As well as ideas about particular Lusophone groups, discourses about the power relations between these groups, rooted in the interlinking of their histories through overlapping experiences of Portuguese colonialism, form part of the pool of common reference points available to Lusondoners. An example of this is the notion of Portugal as a ‘good coloniser’ and promoter of racial harmony, which is prevalent yet highly contested within accounts of the Portuguese. Skidmore (2003) identifies a strand of thinking within which the Portuguese are credited with ‘a uniquely benevolent system of race relations’ (p1393) and popular manifestations of this discourse are prevalent in Almeida & Corkill’s (2010) study of Portuguese-speakers in Thetford, Norfolk. However, alongside these are assertions of Portuguese racial superiority, and this discourse has also been linked back to official policy during the Fascist regime in Portugal, from 1933 to 1974 (Neves Cardoso: 1998; Ornelas: 2001). Elements of colonial thinking persist, and Mario Soares, a socialist former Prime Minister of Portugal, advocated Cape Verde’s membership of the European Union (see *Diário de Notícias*, 2005) as well as publicly stating his regret at Cape Verdean independence from Portugal (see *Diário de Notícias*, 2010), contrasting the country to the Canary Islands and the Azores which, while geographically fairly distant from Europe, retained their status as European. The fact that Cape Verde was not included in the *Lonely Planet*’s guide to Africa (Ham et al., 1977/2010, cited above), chimes with the perception amongst some that the country does not really belong to the African continent<sup>13</sup>. However, the colonial legacy does not only live on in the minds of the Portuguese, and Seabra & Gorjão (2011) describe the veneration of Portugal by Angolan elites. The more recent reversal of migration flows though, with young Portuguese professionals seeking jobs in Angola and other former colonies (Ash, 2011), provides a counter-narrative to notions of colonial inferiority and dependency.

---

<sup>13</sup> Chabal (1981), however, noted the high representation of Cape Verdeans amongst the founding figures of the PAIGC, the national liberation movement which sought, and achieved, independence from Portugal for Guinea and Cape Verde. Despite this evidence of Cape Verde’s resistance to European colonialism, Batalha (2008) also highlights internal divisions within the Cape Verdean population. He describes the surfacing of “racial” tensions post-independence, writing that ‘[d]arker-skinned Cape Verdeans saw ‘white’ Cape Verdeans as too ‘Portuguese’ to embrace the postcolonial political project’ (p64).

Alongside the discourses about specific Lusophone groups and the relations between them, widely circulating (albeit contested) notions of Lusophonia<sup>14</sup> also circulate within the global Lusophone space and, as such, are also available for Lusondoners to draw on. Aragao's (2013) study of 'Luso London' (explored in more detail in section 2.3.4) suggests that commonality between different Lusophone groups in London does not extend far beyond use of the same shops and services and, similarly, Januario (2003) describes a heterogeneous Lusophone population in Ontario, Canada 'who lead largely separate community lives and seem to have no special regard for Lusophonia as a common rallying concept' (p161). However, this does not mean the *idea* of Lusophonia has no relevance for Lusondoners, especially, as shown by Jéssica's case in the vignettes in Chapter 1, when "outsiders" can conflate different Lusophones under the "Portuguese" label. Indeed, Almeida & Corkill's (2010) study in Thetford, UK, identified 'an ethnically diverse, multinational Lusophone grouping' (p27) which was viewed as an undifferentiated mass by 'the local authorities and the receptor population' (p33). Conflicting discourses of Portuguese superiority, Lusophone harmony, and Portuguese inferiority, tied to reified notions of ethnicity, are thus all jostling within the Lusophone space and available to Lusondoners as common references. As I will show in subsequent chapters, the Lusondoner participants in my study did not subscribe to a common Lusophone identity. However, what they did share was a recognition of the various ethnic discourses related to different Lusophone groups, not readily available to their non-Lusondoner peers. As I describe in more detail in Chapter 4, the reductive nature of these ethnic discourses could lead to moments of tension for individual Lusondoners, but the common understanding of these discourses which Lusondoners shared contributed to a Lusondoner discursive space.

### **2.1.2 Ethnic monitoring and the label "Portuguese"**

The complex and often contrasting ethnic discourses outlined above highlight the problematic nature of "Portuguese" as a common ethnic category for those with different Lusophone ties. Despite this, Jéssica's case in the vignettes in Chapter 1 shows that, in practice, the ethnic label "Portuguese" can be assigned to Portuguese speakers with no obvious ties to the nation of Portugal. This is linked to how practices of institutional ethnic monitoring in Britain have evolved over time in response to various pressures. The requirement for all public bodies to monitor their

---

<sup>14</sup> A sense of shared identity on some level amongst Lusophones from across the world, explored in more detail in section 2.1.3 below.

service provision in relation to different ethnic groups, established by the Race Relations Amendment Act (2000), was a direct response to concerns about institutional racism (Macpherson, 1999; see also Fanshawe & Srisikandarajah, 2010). However, moves towards ethnic monitoring have also been motivated by attempts to deal with what are seen as the ‘different’ needs of minority groups (see Section 11 of the Local Government Act 1966). This journey has been propelled at different times and in different ways by both ethnic minority groups themselves, and by other political groups and individuals (cf. Grosvenor, 1997; Panayi, 2010). This history of responding to multiple and varied influences has contributed to the ad hoc nature of the ethnic categorisations which found their way onto monitoring forms, leading to criticism that they are inadequate (Ratcliffe, 1996). These categories stem from popular conceptualisations of ethnicity grounded in the notion that ‘ethnic’ means ‘other’, both in terms of appearance and cultural practices (cf. Ballard, 1997; Gillborn, 1997). Ethnic minorities are seen as concrete groupings, differing from the “White” mainstream, with specific needs of their own. In accordance with what Spivak terms ‘strategic essentialism’ (1987, 1990), this view has also been embraced by many of the groups thus labelled as a means of securing targeted resources. However, this perspective has also been linked to a tendency for ethnic minority students to be both strongly associated with, and blamed for, underachievement (Tomlinson, 1983; Archer & Francis, 2007) and for a focus on the imperatives of “assimilation” (Ballard, 1997).

The principal deficiency in the conceptualisation of ethnicity which underpins institutional monitoring is the notion that it is a fixed and inherited attribute. Ballard (1997) directs attention to the assumption behind mixed categories (such as ‘Mixed White and Black Caribbean’) that mixed unions lead to mixed-ethnicity children, pointing out that this assumes a spurious and reductive biological basis to ethnicity. Ethnic categories are criticised for failing to account for the socially rooted nature and nuances of ethnicity (Ballard, 1997; Burton, Nandi & Platt, 2010; Nandi & Platt 2012), and the catch-all category “Portuguese” is a clear example of such reductionism. Foucault (1977) explains how the ‘constitution of a field of knowledge’ (p27) is inextricably bound up with power relations and it can be seen that ethnic monitoring practices both reflect dominant discourses about “ethnicity”, but also enforce them. Young people, or their parents, are directed to define themselves according to a constructed ‘field of knowledge’ concerning “ethnicity” and, in the process, reinforce a reductive framework for describing themselves. The ethnic monitoring form used in the school where my study was carried out has a box

for “Portuguese”, but no box for “Brazilian” or any other specified Lusophone nationalities. As described in one of the opening vignettes, this means Portuguese-speaking young people can end up being categorised as having “Portuguese” ethnicity, despite having no links to the country of Portugal. This then reinforces the perception at an institutional level that there is some kind of “ethnic” basis to the grouping of Portuguese-speaking young people within the school, reaffirming a sense of validity in the categories as they stand, and providing a basis for both explicit initiatives and unconscious assumptions on the part of teachers. These essentialising monitoring practices can also lead to a normative framework being internalised by those they categorise, as established ‘knowledge’ is generated about them which it then becomes difficult for them to disavow. Foucault (1988) states that Science is ‘a power that forces you to say certain things’ (p107). It is a bounded discourse which rules out what it defines as ‘unscientific’. Young people may claim the labels assigned to them, particularly within a field populated by a range of other essentialised ethnic categorisations inhabited by their peers. The need to say “I am Portuguese” becomes more apparent when surrounded by classmates busy claiming “I am Jamaican” or “I am Somali”. Ethnic monitoring is thus bound up with a discourse of reified ethnicities which regulates how young people conceptualise ethnic identification. The single ethnic category of “White Portuguese” has little relation to the background and affiliations of many of the Lusondoners it is applied to, but it is part of a particular discourse of “Portugueseness” which these Lusondoners must negotiate on a daily basis

### **2.1.3 “Lusofonia”<sup>15</sup>: Notions of a common Portuguese language**

The competing discourses and complex affiliations beneath the ethnic label “Portuguese” described above, are mirrored by the diversity of practices encompassed within the term “Portuguese language”. Portuguese linguistic practices are framed by a complex global and historical context, where different varieties of Portuguese carry different connotations in terms of prestige, “correctness” and role. Although Portuguese is the seventh most spoken language globally, with an estimated 178 million native speakers spread across 37 countries (Lewis, 2009), there is no straightforward correlation between such headline figures and recognition or prestige as a global language. French, for example, has approximately one third the number of native speakers, ranking sixteenth globally, and yet enjoys a privileged

---

<sup>15</sup> “Lusofonia” (“Lusophonia” in English”) is a collective term for Portuguese speakers, or those with ties to the Portuguese language, around the world. It can also refer to the group of countries where Portuguese is spoken.

position as one of the 6 official languages of the UN. This issue of the international significance of Portuguese has underpinned a protracted debate surrounding the attempt by Lusophone states to establish a common orthographic convention. The terms of this debate have ranged from the historical roots of Portuguese and its links with a colonial history, to the more recent factors of the rise of Brazil, the position of Portugal within the EU and the linguistic priorities of the now independent Lusophone African nations. As such, the controversy surrounding this orthographic convention shines a spotlight on the historical factors shaping the global context of Portuguese today, and the language ideologies which are associated with it. As with discourses relating to different Lusophone “ethnicities”, these language ideologies relating to Portuguese contribute to the common pool of reference which Lusophonians can draw on.

*AO90: the 1990 Portuguese Language Orthographic Agreement*

The Acordo Ortográfico da Língua Portuguesa de 1990 (AO90; the 1990 Portuguese Language Orthographic Agreement) was originally signed<sup>16</sup> by representatives from Angola, Brazil, Cape Verde, Guinea-Bissau, Mozambique, Portugal and São Tomé and Príncipe. It defines a set of common orthographic conventions which err more towards Brazilian than the European Portuguese norms. The debate which surrounded the agreement highlights two complex, interrelated concerns: the desire for Portuguese to be, or be seen as, a powerful global language, and, to this end, the necessity of presenting it as a standardised language to the rest of the world. Running against these aspirations are a range of objections rooted in feelings of threatened national identity. The varying tone of debate across the different Lusophone nations exemplifies how the history of contact between them still underpins perceptions of the Portuguese language today. Zúquete (2008) provides a detailed account of this debate, identifying the crux of the controversy in the predominance of Brazilian spellings over European Portuguese ones in the new convention. Despite its historical role as the colonial master, the shift in the balance of power from Portugal to Brazil has been continuing for centuries and the AO90 is seen by its opponents in Portugal as an ‘outrageous act of submission—not only linguistic but also cultural, economic and geopolitical submission—to Brazil’ (p499). Supporters of the convention have countered these arguments by recasting the identity debate within a broader conception of ‘Lusophonia’, a common identity under which the rising status

---

<sup>16</sup> Actual implementation of the agreement has been delayed by processes of ratification in signatory states and is still not fully complete.

of Brazil brings benefits to the whole Lusophone community (Zúquete, 2008). The AO90 therefore highlights the preoccupation with national prestige underpinning debate within Portugal. In Brazil the context is almost the exact opposite. With far fewer changes proposed to Brazilian Portuguese orthography, rising global status and the apparent ‘falling into line’ of the former colonial power, the AO90 does not represent the same threat to national identity.

The situation in Lusophone Africa is different again. Although numbers of actual Portuguese speakers in these more multi-lingual settings are harder to estimate, Zúquete quotes UN predictions that ‘by 2050 Portuguese-speaking African countries will have a total population of 90 million (United Nations Population Fund, 2008, pp. 90–91)’ (p497). This equates to about half the population of Brazil but nine times that of Portugal. Garcez (1995) outlines the very different perspective of these countries to that of Portugal and Brazil, preoccupied much more with the status of Portuguese in relation to other local languages than the specifics of orthography. Garcez stresses that it was the advantages of being a standardised language which led to the official adoption of Portuguese in these African states in the first place. This adds a more practical element to the debate, and Garcez cites this ambivalence between romantic unity and logistical realism as central to the nature of any imagined global Lusophone community. Crystallised within these attitudes to the AO90 then, are key factors in the history of these nations and peoples. Instead of a coherent and unproblematic global Lusophone community, what emerges is a contested space utilised in different ways and to different ends by various interest groups.

#### *‘Lusofonia’*

The promotion of Lusophonia then carries different objectives for different parties, and two distinct interpretations of the term can be discerned:

- i. a contemporary reimagining of the Portuguese colonial empire, now embodied via Portuguese migrant communities across the globe;
- ii. a less Portugal-centric notion of the coming together of various Lusophone citizens with shared interests from across the world.

In 1996 the Lusophone states of Angola, Brazil, Cape Verde, Guinea-Bissau, Mozambique, Portugal and São Tomé and Príncipe came together to form the *Comunidade dos Países da Língua Portuguesa (CPLP)* [Community of Countries of the Portuguese Language], with East Timor joining in 2002 after gaining independence and Equatorial Guinea joining in 2014. The organisation’s website lists three main objectives: diplomatic alignment for a stronger presence on the



international stage; cooperation in national policy areas; and the promotion of the Portuguese language (CPLP, 2010). Martins (2010) exemplifies the first interpretation of Lusophonia outlined above, advocating a preeminent role for Portugal in the CPLP due to its status ‘as a historical leader and western country’ (p12). Klimt (2000) has identified a similar ideology underpinning cultural projects promoted in Germany by the Portuguese Government. She describes how these projects focused on the ‘transnational nature of “Portugueseness”’ (p541) so that ‘the image of an extensive transnational Portuguese-speaking world effectively countered the liminality and insignificance of any single Portuguese outpost’ (p543). Similarly, Feldman-Bianco (2007) writes that ‘the Portuguese diaspora seems to have replaced the former overseas colonies in the spatial (re)imagining of the Empire’ (p44). Lemos Martins (2004) is describing the second interpretation of Lusophonia when he writes that ‘o espaço cultural da lusofonia é um espaço necessariamente fragmentado’ (p5) [*the cultural space of lusofonia is a necessarily fragmented space* – my translation]. Instead of the lusotropicalist<sup>17</sup> discourse first popularised by Gilberto Freyre, Lemos Martins describes today’s Lusophonia as being about ‘multiculturalismos com o denominador comum de uma mesma língua’ (p12) [*multiculturalisms with the common denominator of the same language* – my translation]. In the following section I set out how the first, Portugal-centric, notion of Lusophonia coincides with how the term “Portuguese” is used as a catch-all category for linguistic monitoring in my field site. Despite this, the emergence of a broader Lusondoner discursive space I identified in my study suggests the second interpretation of Lusophonia outlined above also has local relevance for my research participants.

#### **2.1.4 Linguistic monitoring and “Portuguese”**

While ethnic monitoring has been tied to meeting the perceived needs of specific ethnic groups and redressing discriminatory processes, linguistic monitoring in schools has focused principally on the extent to which students lack fluency in Standard English. Currently in secondary schools in England all students must be recorded as being either “first language” speakers of English, or as having EAL<sup>18</sup>. This duty dates back to the 1996 Education Act (s537) which led to the establishment of the Pupil Level Annual School Census (PLASC). This became the School Census

---

<sup>17</sup> Lusotropicalism refers to a perspective on Portuguese imperialism which conceptualises it as distinctly benign. It is rooted in the notion that the warm climate in Portugal and history of inhabitation by various peoples have contributed to a Portuguese national character which is particularly open, humane and adaptable. See Freyre (1933; 1946).

<sup>18</sup> English as an Additional Language

in 2007 which includes a wider range of data categories and is collected every term. Under the terms of the School Census (but at the school's discretion), students with EAL may have their 'first language' specified. This is done using a list agreed by the Local Education Authority, which is adapted from a directory of over 300 languages provided by the Department for Education (see DfE, 2012, p79). However, as I will show in the following chapters, national priorities and policies can have unexpected consequences at the local level. In Lambeth, official guidance on working with 'Portuguese' students (Demie & Lewis: 2008) stresses that the local authority has 'a strong tradition in identifying Portuguese as an ethnic group' (p4), yet the vignettes in the introduction to this thesis expose the potential for this category to be used in schools as a linguistic marker: despite her Brazilian origins, Jéssica was recorded as being of 'Portuguese' ethnicity because of the language she spoke. This has also been mirrored at an academic level with Barradas' (2004) Lambeth-based study using the terms 'Portuguese' and 'Portuguese-speaking' interchangeably. Alongside this conflation there is also a lack of recognition that the Portuguese language encompasses significant linguistic diversity (explored in section 2.2.2 below). This is partly acknowledged in government guidelines on school-based linguistic monitoring (DfE, 2012) which recognise four separate categories: 'Portuguese' (p81), 'Portuguese (Any Other)' (p82), 'Portuguese (Brazil)', and 'West African Creole Portuguese'. However, Lambeth databases make use of only the first of these. This suggests that, while recording "first languages" is a step forward from the simple English/EAL binary, current monitoring practices fall far short of adequately mapping the linguistic diversity within schools, including amongst Lusondoners.

Institutional and academic monitoring endeavours have long struggled with the difficulty of framing appropriate linguistic categories, and early attempts to map linguistic diversity, beginning in the late 1970s (Inner London Education Authority: 1979; Rosen & Burgess: 1980) have been criticised on methodological grounds (Nicholas, 1994). The Linguistic Minorities Project (1985) conducted a more methodologically rigorous study but still came to the conclusion that the notion of a 'linguistic minority' (p25) was often more of 'convenient heuristic device' than a reflection of 'the subjective reality of the individuals concerned'. Harris' (1997) writing on 'Romantic Bilingualism' supports this, describing the tendency for schools to assume homogeneity within linguistic and cultural groupings and overlook the '[s]ignificant level of claimed use of local vernacular English or

multiethnic vernacular' (p20), as well as lack of expertise in, and often ambivalence or resistance to the 'putative community language' (p21).

Linguistic monitoring, then, has developed within a contested space where linguistic diversity has been both problematized (Local Government Act 1966) and celebrated (Department of Education and Science [DES], 1981). The Swann Report (DES, 1985) on the education of children from ethnic minority groups, recognised linguistic minorities as legitimate pieces of the British mosaic, yet explicitly rejected bilingual provision in state schools. The Education Reform Act which followed in 1988 led to less accommodation of linguistic diversity, devolving responsibility for budgets to schools and enabling non-mandatory provision for students with EAL to be given a low priority (Rampton, Harris & Leung, 2007). The role of linguistic monitoring in this climate then, was more about identifying "deficiencies", or developing specific classroom practices to "deal with" bilingualism and multilingualism, than celebrating diversity. A certain change in rhetoric can be discerned in education policy post-1997. While QCA (2000) guidance on assessment for EAL was criticised for failing to recognise existing skills in other languages (Leung, 2001), other guidance from the Department for Education and Skills (DfES, 2003) explicitly acknowledged the often higher attainment of learners with EAL, recognising that skills in languages other than English, and their continued promotion, were valuable not only in their own right, but also in supporting 'the learning of English and wider cognitive development' (p30). This perspective was then reflected in government advice from 2007 that all schools record the 'first language' of each pupil (see National Association for Language Development in the Curriculum, 2011). After 2010, the Coalition Government's inclusion of a GCSE<sup>19</sup> in any language (including "community languages") within the English Baccalaureate performance measure (see Department for Education, 2013) gave a new incentive to schools to explore more carefully the linguistic skill sets of their students. This became a priority at the school where my research was carried out, as I will set out in more detail in Chapter 4. For my Lusondoner research participants then, being labelled as "Portuguese speaking" could carry contrasting institutional connotations. On the one hand it could imply deficiency in terms of their potential lack of fluency in English, while on the other, it could signal the capacity to achieve a coveted Modern Foreign Language GCSE. In this section I have set out how both ethnic and linguistic categorisations in institutional monitoring regimes fail to account for the complex

---

<sup>19</sup> General Certificate in Secondary Education; qualification usually taken at age 16.

affiliations and practices of Lusondoners. However, I have also stressed that Lusondoners frequently come up against the discourses tied to these categorisations within day-to-day interactions, and such encounters will be explored in detail in subsequent chapters.

## **2.2 Lusondoners: interplay between different Lusophone groupings within a London context**

As set out in section 2.1, rigid ethnic and linguistic taxonomies are problematic in light of the heterogeneity and hybridity suggested by the vignettes in Chapter 1 and prevalent elsewhere in my data. The Lusondoners I studied neither fall into a homogenous ethnolinguistic bloc, nor a set of discrete ethnic groups. Instead, there are areas of divergence but also commonality in their migration trajectories and linguistic repertoires which the compartmentalising approach of a multiculturalist paradigm does not accommodate. In this section I offer a more nuanced description of Lusondoners which eschews reductive conceptualisations of language and ethnicity, acknowledging transnational<sup>20</sup> links but focusing as well on their situation as Londoners. I start by detailing demographic trends amongst different Lusondoner groupings, highlighting key characteristics of day-to-day life in London such as employment patterns and service use. I then outline more open theoretical approaches to ethnicity and language in order to explain how these Londoners can accommodate multiple and flexible affiliations, tied to diverse and sometimes complex linguistic practices.

### **2.2.1 Demographic trends amongst Lusondoners**

The difficulty of establishing reliable figures for the size of different Lusophone groups in the UK is linked to key features of their migration trajectories. For the Portuguese community, Almeida (2010) presents estimates which vary from around 125,000 to over 700,000, and highlights the significant numbers within this of individuals born outside Portugal (p220). For the Brazilian community, Evans et al. (2007) present estimates of around 200,000, but point out that large numbers go undocumented for visa reasons. For example, their estimate of 130,000 to 160,000 Brazilians in London, dwarfs Office for National Statistics (ONS, 2012) figures of 33,000 London residents of Brazilian birth and 25,000 of Brazilian nationality.

---

<sup>20</sup> Transnationalism is explored in section 2.3 below.

Cwerner (2001) emphasises that the Brazilian presence is characterised by an assumption of transience linked to a fear of deportation, although Brazilian immigrants often change their expectations about the duration of their stay. For communities from other Lusophone states, very little has been written, but the case of Mozambicans highlights a potentially significant phenomenon. The Mozambican High Commissioner estimates a total of between 400 and 500 Mozambican nationals in the UK, mostly students or refugees (International Organisation for Migration, 2006b, p3), but ONS estimates (2012) place 5,000 people of Mozambican birth in London alone. One explanation for this discrepancy might be the presence of a larger number of people born in Mozambique who have gained citizenship of other countries, most notably Portugal, through the course of their migration trajectories. The same ONS data gives estimates of 1,000 London residents born in São Tomé and Príncipe, and 3,000 born in Guinea-Bissau. Many of these residents are also likely to have come via Portugal, potentially gaining Portuguese citizenship. The vignettes on page 4 also reinforce this impression of the potential for masked hybridity amongst Lusondoners and, viewed alongside these figures, suggest that a discrepancy between country of birth and declared nationality may be a feature prevalent in all strands of the Lusondoner formation, albeit for different reasons.

As suggested above, London is the principal UK location for Brazilians and Mozambicans, and this is also the case for Angolans (IOM: 2006a; Piggott: 2006) and the Portuguese (BBC News: 2009; Piggott: 2006), although significant numbers of Portuguese can also be found in the Channel Islands. Cwerner (2001) estimates London to have ‘arguably, the largest Brazilian community in Europe’ (p16) but, as Souza (2006) points out, it is particularly dispersed in nature and therefore ‘exists in the mind of its members instead of depending on geographic boundaries’ (p8). Despite this, Evans et al. (2007) highlight a few key areas with significant Brazilian communities including the Stockwell area in Lambeth, and this is supported by ONS (2012) figures which estimate 2000 residents of Brazilian birth in the borough. Similarly, Angolans are clustered in several boroughs, with Lambeth featuring amongst these (International Organisation for Migration: 2006a; ONS: 2012). The Portuguese, on the other hand, are more specifically concentrated in Lambeth (BBC News: 2009; ONS: 2012; Lambeth Education: 2015). Nogueira & Porteous (2003) in their study of Stockwell build on Figueroa (2000) to identify five specific strands within the local Lusophone population:

‘long term Portuguese residents; transient migrant workers from mainland Portugal; longer term manual workers from Madeira; migrants from Brazil; émigrés and refugees from ex-Portuguese colonies’ (p56).

They are skeptical of the notion that Stockwell constitutes a cohesive “Portuguese community”. Instead, they emphasise internal differences which they describe as being:

‘institutionalised in the various Portuguese Associations (usually identified with football clubs) and in the separate representatives for the Madeiran and for the Portuguese Communities’ (p57).

They also emphasise the fact that the “Portuguese” are still a minority group in the area. However, in a more recent Lambeth-based study, Nogueira, Porteous & Guerreiro (2015) describe the various Lusophone groups as a ‘community of communities’ (p4) which is ‘heterogeneous and diverse whilst remaining distinctive as a whole’, united by ‘one language’ and ‘love of food, music, dance and conviviality in general’. In particular, they cite these ‘communities’ coming together in their thousands to attend an annual Lusophone festival<sup>21</sup>. The co-presence of these “Portuguese speakers” then does not constitute an identity in and of itself. Rather it provides potential points of commonality which young Lusondoners may take up in different ways, as I will show in subsequent chapters.

Sources on the education and employment profiles of different Lusophone groups in London are fairly limited, but suggest a certain convergence, as I outline here. Characterisations of the Portuguese in London generally highlight low socio-economic status (Nogueira & Porteous: 2003; Ribeiro: 2007; Almeida: 2010). However, Santarita & Martin-Jones’ (1991) study, while based on older data, distinguishes between higher skilled migrants from continental Portugal and lower skilled ones from rural Madeira. Nogueira, Porteous & Guerreiro (2015) highlight a change in migration from Portugal since the economic downturn of 2008. They write that more recent migrants:

‘speak English well, have jobs across the London area, have a much looser affinity with longer standing Portuguese-speaking residents and tend to be more integrated within London’s multicultural scene’ (p6).

---

<sup>21</sup> Nogueira, Porteous and Guerreiro (2015) write that a “Day of Portugal” festival has been held in the borough over many years and now attracts around 40,000 visitors’ (pi)

While a general trend for low-skilled service sector employment is shared by both the Portuguese and Brazilians, Evans et al. (2007) emphasise that for Brazilians this often marks a contrast to the jobs they did “back home” where many had experience of higher education. They stress the key motivation behind Brazilian migration to the UK as being a desire to send money home, or invest back in Brazil. This supports the impression outlined above of a degree of transience to their position, and an ability to adopt a utilitarian approach towards their situation in London. It is the London context then which has spurred this Portuguese/Brazilian convergence in employment patterns.

Another commonality which can be linked to the London context is the importance of community settings and services where Portuguese is spoken. The Brazilian community in London organises a vast range of services in Portuguese (Evans et al., 2007), making it possible to conduct most daily activities in the language (Souza, 2006). Similarly, the Portuguese have their own churches, shops and community centres where Portuguese is spoken which perform both a social function as well as accommodating a widespread lack of fluency in English amongst Portuguese adults (Nogueira & Porteous, 2003). A certain level of community crossover in the use of these Portuguese and Brazilian shops and services has also been identified (BBC: 2009; Aragao: 2013). In this section then I have shown how Lusondoners hold a diverse range of transnational ties, yet there is also a bedrock of commonality in their experiences as Londoners in areas such as employment, and in generally rubbing along together through use of similar shops, services and festivals. As I outlined above, this more nuanced picture of affiliations rooted both in diverse ethnic backgrounds and local points of commonality cannot be understood within a multiculturalism paradigm. Instead, more flexible theorisations of ethnic affiliations and linguistic practices are needed, as I explain in the following sections.

### **2.2.2 Contingent ethnicities**

The vignettes in the introduction alert us to the emergence of ethnic affiliations and practices which do not fit with the traditional “primordial” account outlined in section 2.1, or with the monitoring regimes it has spawned. Complex individual biographies, as well as the juxtaposition of different groupings in diverse contexts such as London, necessitate more nuanced conceptualisations of ethnicity. Ordinary social actors in their everyday lives may well use ethnically essentialist language to refer to themselves, feeling that they have a “fixed” ethnicity. However, this conceptualisation may not be reflected in the actual practices observable from an

analytic perspective (Brubaker, 2004). Hall (1992) describes the emergence of ‘new ethnicities’, particularly in such contexts. These are ‘predicated on difference and diversity’ (p258), as opposed to the marginalisation inherent in exclusive categories, and are produced through the interaction of various influences (c.f. Back: 1996; Bhabha: 1990; Hewitt: 2003). This is radically different to the neatly differentiated ethnicities of multiculturalism. It involves new patterns of identification which, although building on existing threads, lead off in new directions, unconstrained by the authority of traditional forms. Harris’ (2006) identification of ‘Brasians’, the adolescents of mainly South Asian descent he studied in West London, is an example of this. Harris rejects binary expressions, such as “British Asian”, as being rooted in notions of individuals ‘caught between two cultures’, instead of simultaneously incorporating elements of both. This hybridity is evident in Jamila, documented in the opening vignettes, who connects with her “British Jamaican” identity, whilst simultaneously incorporating affiliation to her “Angolan”/Lusophone heritage. Hall (1992) stresses that this question of new ethnicities is not simply about diaspora but involves ‘contestation over what it means to be ‘British’’ (p258). The hybrid practices and affiliations found amongst Lusondoners can therefore be categorised as particular forms of Britishness.

Hall (1996) advocates a focus on *identification* as opposed to identity, describing this as ‘a construction, a process never completed – always ‘in process’’ (p2). Although the subject is not abandoned, it occupies a ‘new, displaced or decentered position within the paradigm’. Hewitt (2003) writes of the need in research into language and ethnicity for ‘an apprehension of culture not as “tradition” but rather, as the bricoleur’s bag’ (p197). This chimes with Street’s (1993) account of “culture” as a *verb*, as signifying process – the active construction of meaning’ (p23, original emphasis), as opposed to a stable idea in and of itself. New ethnicities are not just about a greater number of “types” living side by side. They involve the coexistence of diverse influences within the same individual, and the formation of new affiliations spun from the threads of various cultural traditions. Pieterse (2001) points out that this conceptualisation of hybridity has been criticised as a form of ‘multiculturalism lite’ (p221) which ‘does not reflect social realities on the ground’. However, Pieterse maintains that ‘the real problem is not hybridity – which is common throughout history – but boundaries and the social proclivity to boundary fetishism’ (p220). This fits with the argument I have been setting out in this chapter: conceptualisations of fixed ethnicities and bounded languages may not account for the actual day-to-day practices of individuals, but they do largely underpin popular



understandings. As such, these conceptualisations have a real impact on how language and ethnicity are experienced. While hybrid practices and affiliations on the part of my Lusondoner participants are discernible in my data, this does not mean that notions of reified “Portuguese” or “Brazilian” ethnicities play no part in how they see themselves.

Harris (2006) builds on Lave & Wenger (1991), arguing that ‘communities of practice’ provide a way into conceptualising the hybridity outlined above. Practices both reflect and create a social reality, binding participants as a community through a common set of experiences and interpretations. Instead of ethnicity being rooted in some primordial essence, it can be approached as a phenomenon of shared practices, both in terms of behaviours and the framework of common understandings within which these behaviours are ascribed meaning. Harris notes that the hybridisation they encompass ‘is all accomplished in low-key ways with little or no overt sign of crisis or serious discomfort’ (p118), and that his participants ‘experience mostly comfortable everyday membership of a variety of communities’. The kind of hybridity he identifies is then mundane, not spectacular. It emerges from existing practices and is characterised by innovation but also by accommodation. Ethnicities then are better understood as sensibilities emerging from contemporary routine practices linked to specific histories and biographical trajectories. However, communities of practice do not fit neatly into the grand, over-arching role vacated by “primordial” ethnicities. The heterogeneity alluded to in the opening vignettes, whilst implying the emergence of new affiliations and practices, definitely does not paint the picture of a stable “Lusondoner identity”. Instead, it is a domain within which various (often contrasting) features are recognised. The question then is not “*What are the core characteristics of Lusondoners?*”, but “*How can various practices and affiliations be taken up in different ways amongst Lusondoners?*”. As I have emphasised, ethnic affiliation and linguistic practices are interlinked, and to answer this question requires a theoretical approach which is not restricted to notions of bounded languages. In the following section I set out how an understanding of language as practices and an apprehension of language ideologies facilitates such an approach.

### **2.2.3 Linguistic practices and language ideologies**

In the opening vignettes in Chapter 1, I outlined Adriana’s hybrid linguistic practices. Adriana generally spoke a Madeiran variety of Portuguese with her family, yet she adopted elements of Brazilian pronunciation and vocabulary when

interacting with her “Brazilian” friend Alicia. The fact that I was able to discuss this as noteworthy with Adriana and Alícia shows that all three of us shared a recognition of distinct varieties of Portuguese, as well as the types of speakers we normally expected to be associated with these. Although Adriana’s hybrid use of Portuguese varieties defied these expectations, it did not represent a radical or unusual linguistic practice (as I outline in more detail in Chapter 4). It was an example of how notions of bounded languages tied to fixed ethnicities do circulate in the Lusondoner discursive space, but individual Lusondoners can actually draw on these in hybrid ways as part of locally rooted practices. As I have argued above, Lusondoners display complex, hybrid ethnic affiliations, and this is bound up with complex, hybrid language use. In this section I explain how conceptions of particular languages are shaped by, and contribute to the shaping of, notions of related “ethnicities” or nationalities. I give details of the various varieties of Portuguese associated with different groupings of Lusondoners, as well as the language ideologies circulating in relation to these varieties. Through this I set out the context for understanding how Lusondoners employ different linguistic resources in day-to-day interactions, drawing on wider discourses for specific, local purposes.

Billig (1995) explains how the naming of national languages bestows ‘an invented permanency’ (p30) upon them, a sense that they spring naturally from the nation that hosts them (cf. Bokhorst-Heng: 1999; Blommaert: 2008; Blommaert & Rampton: 2011). Linguistic labels then are rooted more in the broader historical and political context than in the actual practices of those they are assigned to. Despite this, as Blommaert & Rampton (2011) point out, ‘the factuality of named languages continues to be taken for granted in a great deal of contemporary institutional policy and practice’ (p5). Joseph (2004) describes languages themselves as ‘imagined communities’ (p359, citing Anderson: 1991). He writes that ‘[l]anguage and nation are myths that construct each other reciprocally, rather than one constructing the other’ (p359). The idea of a national language then plays an integral part in constructing the notion of a nation in the first place. This ‘imagined community’ can be identified in the denial of linguistic diversity in Brazil, as well as the choice of Portuguese as a language of national unity in Lusophone Africa (both explained in the following section). Linked to the notion of a “national” language is that of a “standard” or “correct” variety. Although Trudgill (1994) insists that there is no one “correct” form of a language, Bourdieu (1991) describes how, nevertheless, a national ‘state’ language ‘becomes the theoretical norm against which all linguistic practices are objectively measured’ (p45). Billig (1995) describes how the ‘common

grammar' (p31) underpinning 'official ways of speaking and writing' (p32) is in fact that of the 'middle class of the metropolitan areas', so that the official language, generally taken for granted as a superior form, is in fact nothing more than the dialect of a specific, powerful section of society. The pre-eminence of this notion of a "standard" national language can be discerned in the fact that Cape Verde and São Tomé and Príncipe signed up to the AO90 despite the complete lack of recognition for the Portuguese-based Creoles which dominate the everyday speech of people in these countries.

Gal & Irvine (1995) state that 'speakers have, and act in relation to, ideologically-constructed representations of linguistic practices' (p973). Through these representations, or 'language ideologies' (cf. Kroskrity, 2004) linguistic practices act to index those who employ them, adding levels of meaning, intended or perceived, to their language choices. One phenomenon Gal & Irvine (1995) identify which is relevant to the linguistic practices of my Lusondoner participants is 'erasure', the large scale brushing-under-the-carpet of anything which contradicts the language ideology. A clear example of this is the linguistic diversity, in terms of regional varieties of Portuguese, in both Portugal and Brazil. As will be outlined in the next section, in order to fit with the dominant ideology of a 'national language', this untidy reality is largely ignored both in approaches to the teaching of Portuguese in schools, as well as in the media. This 'one-language/one-culture assumption' (Gal & Irvine, 1995, p994) underpins conceptualisations of "Portuguese" across large parts of the Lusophone world. Moita-Lopes (2014a) describes Portuguese as 'a saturated ideological phenomenon, discursively constructed in varied ways at different social scale levels' (p8), and below I set out some of the most dominant ideologies circulating in relation to "Portuguese" in different parts of the world.

#### *a) Portugal and language ideologies*

A range of varieties of Portuguese are spoken in Portugal and a series of language ideologies circulate in relation to these. The prestige dialect is the Lisbon/Coimbra variety (Campbell, 1995) from which literary Portuguese has developed. Pinto (2008) identifies a strong standard language ideology associated with this variety, despite the presence of six regional varieties, as well as Brazilian and African ones, and that spoken by Portuguese gypsies, alongside the return of Portuguese migrants whose main language is often French. A preoccupation with the global prestige of Portuguese as representative of the status of Portugal more generally, has led to a tendency for erasure of heterogeneity, even though the history of the language

involves substantial borrowing from Arabic as well as the languages of other peninsular Muslims such as Berber (Piel, 1989). Garcez (1995) explains the perception that Portuguese became a literary language with the publication of Camões' *Os Lusíadas* (an epic account of Portuguese exploration) in 1572, and this captures the widespread and iconic association of Portuguese national and literary greatness. This is echoed in Rodríguez de Laguna's (2001) assertion that Saramago's winning of the Nobel Prize in 1998 represented the tide turning to the 'recovery of a literature of a country politically marginalized to the periphery of the West for too long' (pxiii). Macedo (2001) explains this widespread preoccupation with the global marginalisation of Portugal, suggesting that Portugal has internalised the low status ascribed to it (and its language) by other global powers. Discourses of greatness and marginalisation then interact within national narratives of the Portuguese language in Portugal, coupled with the erasure of "foreign" linguistic influences.

*b) Brazil and language ideologies*

Like in Portugal, the dominant ideology surrounding Portuguese in Brazil is that of a "national, standard" language (Cintra Martins, 2008). However, this idealised Portuguese is often starkly at odds with the linguistic practices of much of the population. Bartlett (2007) writes that this notion of a "correct" Portuguese in fact equates to 'the linguistic varieties used by wealthier, whiter, urban Brazilians' (p560), with grammatical differences functioning to mark out and stigmatise those with less education. Despite the strength of this belief in a "standard" Brazilian Portuguese, it is a relatively recent notion. Rodrigues (1996) describes how the dominant form of communication in Brazilian households during the first centuries of Portuguese colonisation was *Língua Geral*, a language resulting from the contact between Portuguese and Tupi-Guaraní<sup>22</sup>. Portugal eventually outlawed the learning of languages other than Portuguese in 1757 (see Government of Brazil, 2010b) in order to cement its own political presence in the country. It was therefore the European Portuguese norm which dominated in "standard" ideologies. Rubinstein-Avila (2002) pinpoints a change in orientation during the early 1920s with a modernist drive for 'a Brazilian linguistic norm—O Brasileirismo [Brazilianism]—that would reflect a pan-racial and pan-ethnic Brazilian identity distinct from Portugal' (p68). Although Brazilian Portuguese is now recognised as a distinct form of the language, Massini-Cagliari (2004) describes how European norms are still venerated by many Brazilians. Rubinstein-Avila (2002) outlines how this belief is

---

<sup>22</sup> The largest family of languages spoken by Brazil's indigenous population

mirrored on the other side of the Atlantic, with Portuguese publishers often editing the work of Brazilian authors to bring it into line with European Portuguese norms, whereas the reverse is unthinkable. This inequality suggests that the historical colonial relationship between Portugal and Brazil is projected onto current ideologies concerning national linguistic norms.

The erasure of diversity is another commonality between language ideologies in Portugal and Brazil. In Portugal, Bartlett (2007) identifies several regional varieties of Portuguese which lack official recognition. In Brazil, Massini-Cagliari cites the preference of the main national TV network (Globo) for the dominant Rio and São Paulo accents on news broadcasts, and caricatured presentations of any regional dialects in soap operas, as evidence of ‘a general and somehow official disbelief in the heterogeneity of the language in the country’ (p6). She adds that this silencing of linguistic variation in the official media leads many ordinary Brazilians to believe ‘they do not speak Portuguese, but an incorrect form that does not deserve the name of Portuguese’ (p6). This has a strong class dimension as the Portuguese spoken by the poorest groups in society is often associated with cognitive deficits, leading to the popular assumption that ‘those who do not “speak correctly”, do not “think properly”’ (p17). As well as this privileging of a “standard” variety of Portuguese in Brazil, the country’s multilingualism is also downplayed in popular accounts and political discourse. Müller de Oliveira (2014) describes how the Campaign for the Nationalization of Education (1937–1945) was central in enforcing Portuguese monolingualism within Brazil, and Massini-Cagliari (2004) describes a lack of recognition for the ‘200 different languages that are spoken within the Brazilian territory, of which approximately 170 are indigenous languages’ (p4). Within this landscape of unacknowledged multilingualism, Dalby (1998) also identifies creole forms of Portuguese, while Moita-Lopes (2014a) describes border languages and ‘processes of hybridization and mixture’ (p8). So, just as Mattos e Silva (1988) described the expansion of the Portuguese language in Brazil as ‘uma história de natureza glotocida’ (p19 – a history of ‘glotocide’), current discourses surrounding Portuguese still act to silence or delegitimise variation and diversity.

### *c) Lusophone Africa and language ideologies*

The notion of Portuguese as a ‘national’ language in Lusophone Africa is a different ideological construction to those rooted in Portugal and Brazil. While the specific contexts differ in each of the African Lusophone states, Portuguese lacks the kind of hegemonic status it enjoys in Portugal and Brazil. Although Portuguese is an official

language in Angola, Mozambique, Cape Verde, São Tomé and Príncipe and Guinea-Bissau, it is mostly spoken as a second language. Yorke (1999, p134) provides the following breakdown of the Lusophone African states which, although now over 15 years old, does give an indication of the different patterns of language use across “Lusophone Africa”:

<b>COUNTRY</b>	<b>PERCENTAGE WITH PORTUGUESE AS L1</b>
Angola	1% (57000 out of a population of approximately 11,500,000)
Cape Verde	37% (but since independence in 1975, the domains of spoken Portuguese have receded in favour of Creole)
Guinea Bissau	approx. 6%
Mozambique	<2% (with <25% having it as L2)
São Tomé and Príncipe	2%

Bacelar do Nascimento et al. (2009) distinguish between two main groupings in relation to use of Portuguese:

- i) Cape Verde, São Tomé and Príncipe and Guinea-Bissau where there is widespread use of Portuguese-based Creoles;
- ii) Angola and Mozambique where varieties of Bantu languages are spoken but Creoles are absent so ‘Portuguese has come to establish itself as an agent of national unity’ (p43).

They go on to stress that ‘the massive use of Portuguese in African countries occurred only after their independence’ (p44), making its spoken use relatively unstable and often restricted to ‘formal and institutional situations’ (p44). It is clear then that Portuguese does not have a uniform status across the Lusophone African states, but instead forms part of a different linguistic ecology in each context.

Hamilton (1991) explains that the establishment of assimilation as official Portuguese policy in 1926 entrenched a dependency on fluency in Portuguese. This was then reacted against from the 1950s onwards in contexts of growing nationalism. In urban areas of Angola and Mozambique, where take-up of Portuguese post-independence was greatest, the indigenous working classes ‘spoke a kind of “black Portuguese,” often ridiculed as *pretoguês*<sup>23</sup> by settlers and members of the African and *mestiço* middle classes’ (Hamilton, 1991, p610, original emphases). Language ideologies rooted in colonial thinking thus persisted post-independence. Alongside this, however, the idea of Portuguese as a tool of resistance during colonialism allowed Lusophone African authors to embrace the influences of the Portuguese literary canon, claiming ‘co-ownership’ (p613) of the language. Stroud (2007)

<sup>23</sup> An amalgamation of *preto* (black) and *português* (Portuguese)

explores the competing representations of Portuguese in Mozambique in detail, outlining how the language went from a tool of “civilisation” under the Portuguese, to an agent of unification under the post-independence FRELIMO<sup>24</sup> Government. Initially a distinctly Mozambican variety was emphasised but within a few years ‘the pendulum swung back in favour of European Portuguese as the national norm’ (Stroud, 2007, p39) and ‘[h]ybridity in language became equated with contamination and ignorance’ (p40). During the civil war<sup>25</sup>, Portuguese speakers were specifically targeted by RENAMO<sup>26</sup> (the armed opposition movement) for representing FRELIMO’s vision of the modern state. Stroud (2007) identifies echoes of this history in current day code-switching practices in Mozambique.

Portuguese has also played a role in a number of smaller territories as well as forming a lingua franca in use since the Fifteenth Century (Dalby, 1998). In Goa, since reintegration into India in 1961, there has been an almost complete language shift from Portuguese to Konkani (Wherritt, 1989). Similarly, in Macau the Portuguese language has become more of a historical curiosity than any integral element of Macau’s culture (Edmonds & Yee, 1999). In East Timor however, the 25 years of Indonesian occupation lent Portuguese the status of a language of resistance (Feijó, 2008) as evidenced in the increased use of Portuguese names. Within the global Lusophone space<sup>27</sup> then, Portuguese can carry any, or all, of the following connotations:

- i) an autochthonous language with a proud literary tradition;
- ii) a colonial language;
- iii) a coloniser’s language turned tool of resistance;
- iv) a former colonial language now co-owned and turned language of national unity;
- v) a previous coloniser’s language turned site of resistance to a new coloniser;
- vi) a former coloniser’s language now withering away as other languages reassert themselves.

---

<sup>24</sup> Frente de Libertação de Moçambique (Mozambique Liberation Front)

<sup>25</sup> In 1977, two years after Mozambique achieved independence from Portugal, civil war broke out, with fighting continuing until 1992.

<sup>26</sup> Resistência Nacional Moçambicana (Mozambican National Resistance)

<sup>27</sup> Due to migration flows, a great number of Lusophone spaces exist across the world outside of Lusophone states, including in France, the UK, Canada and the USA, amongst others.

This picture gives a sense of the wider discourses circulating in relation to different varieties of Portuguese. As I explained at the start of this section, these varieties are drawn on by Lusondoners, often in nuanced and hybrid ways, within locally situated interactions, and I present detailed analysis of examples of this in subsequent chapters. These locally situated interactions take place within a context of superdiversity, and in section 2.3 below I set out the implications of this for how Lusondoners, and the discursive space they operate in, can be understood.

## **2.3 Superdiversity**

In this chapter I have explained how school-based ethnic and linguistic monitoring uses inadequate categories based on “primordial” conceptions of ethnicity and national standard languages. These fail to account for the heterogeneity within assumed groupings as well as the complex and often hybrid practices and affiliations of individuals which connect as much with the locality of London as to their family migration trajectories. I have argued that the shared ethnic and linguistic points of reference amongst Lusondoners amounts to a Lusondoner discursive space which does not fit within the multicultural paradigm described above. Instead, in this section I set out why a superdiversity approach is necessary to account for Lusondoners and the discursive space they have access to. A superdiversity approach entails a critical perspective towards the established ethnic and linguistic categorisations of multiculturalism, and as such is open to the unpredictability and complexity of actual practices and affiliations. Writing on language and superdiversity provides a useful theoretical framework both for appreciating the intricacies of the ethnolinguistic context of London within which Lusondoners operate, as well as understanding how interconnected linguistic practices and ethnic affiliations are shaped by this context. In this section I explain how a superdiversity approach accounts for multiple factors behind processes of identification and how these are tied up with linguistic practices, as well as setting out why this therefore necessitates a linguistic ethnographic approach to researching Lusondoners.

### **2.3.1 The multiple factors behind superdiversity**

Wessendorf's (2013) study in a computer club for the elderly in London found that ‘diversity is so normal among the students that it has become somewhat banal’ (p411). However, this banal diversity is not just about a proliferation of fixed ethnicities. Vertovec (2007) describes a new diversity in the UK, and particularly in



London, which encompasses an array of other factors such as ‘country of origin [...], migration channel [...], legal status [...], migrants’ human capital [...], access to employment [...], locality [...], transnationalism’ (p1050). Even if it were possible to taxonomise this complexity, such an endeavour would miss the point that individuals’ affiliations and practices cannot simply be inferred from their placement in particular categories. Instead, as Meissner & Vertovec (2014) point out:

‘the social scientific challenge of a superdiversity approach is to rethink emergent social configurations and to recognize the processual and necessarily multi-layered nature of them’ (p550).

This equates to moving ‘from analysing diversity to analysing diversifications’ (p550), and entails moving beyond a narrow focus on ethnicity. The ‘emergent social configurations’ referred to by Meissner & Vertovec are not restricted to bounded ethnicities then but instead encompass hybridisation and span multiple factors. Gilroy (2004), writing about London, describes ‘convivial metropolitan cultures of the country’s young people’ (p232) rooted in ‘factors of identity and solidarity that derive from class, gender, sexuality and region’. He points to second and third generation immigrants whose ‘local sense of entitlement leaves them reluctant to make common cause against racism and xenophobia with more recently arrived refugees and asylum seekers’ (p238). The local embeddedness of these second and third generation immigrants can be a stronger tie than any shared sense of “ethnic minority” status. However, Vertovec (2010) highlights the role of more established ethnic minority communities in acting as a bridge for newly arrived groups, suggesting that the local embeddedness of these established groups does not necessarily close them off from new arrivals, and can actually provide a catalyst for integration. The multiculturalist understanding of distinct groupings formed along “ethnic” lines fails to account for these more complex affiliations and practices which are grounded in locality and peer group.

Superdiversity is not just about a greater number of factors involved in processes of identification, but also a more open understanding of how such factors connect with actual practices and affiliations. For example, Vertovec (1999) highlights the importance of ‘transnationalism’ within superdiverse contexts, describing this as ‘multiple ties and interactions linking people or institutions across the borders of nation-states’ (p447). However, instead of direct affiliations to monolithic identities, transnationalism represents ‘a refusal of fixity often serving as a valuable resource for resisting repressive local or global situations’ (p451). Similarly, Brubaker (2005)

advocates a move away from speaking of “diaspora” as a concrete entity and instead suggests ‘it may be more fruitful, and certainly more precise, to speak of diasporic stances, projects, claims, idioms, practices, and so on’ (p13). From this perspective, individuals are not simply bound to fixed national, ethnic, diasporic or other identities. Instead, they can engage with particular ethnic or national discourses in different, locally relevant ways. Demographic trends can help to construct the notion of particular ethnic “communities”, for example, significant immigration from Portugal to Lambeth has formed the basis for the recognition of a local “Portuguese community”. This “community” can then carry a social reality for a local “Portuguese” resident in the way it is experienced, but membership is not an inherent characteristic of an individual. Rather, membership is something enacted through the particular practices of individuals. This is not to suggest that affiliation to an ethnic community is a purely individual phenomenon, as individuals do organise themselves into collectivities with shared practices. However, these collectivities are socially constructed and individuals slip across their boundaries with the day-to-day push and pull of multiple identifications within superdiverse contexts such as London.

### **2.3.2 Language and superdiversity**

Language is the preeminent medium through which the kinds of affiliations described above are manifested. What the multiculturalism paradigm misses is the extent to which linguistic practices index locality as well as factors such as ethnic background. Language is not just about where individuals have come from, but also where they are now, what they are doing, who they are becoming and, crucially, who they interact with and are affiliated to. Language is also particularly relevant for investigating the Lusondoner discursive space as it is principally their access to the Portuguese language that Lusondoners share, as opposed to a common ethnic heritage or migration trajectory. However, just as the “primordial” conceptualisations of ethnicity are inadequate within a superdiversity framework, so notions of language as stable and static entities need reforming. Jørgensen’s (2008) use of the term ‘polylingual languaging’ attends to this need. ‘Languaging’ captures how ‘language users employ whatever linguistic features are at their disposal with the intention of achieving their communicative aims’ (p169). This behaviour is described as ‘polylingual’ as the ‘combinations of features’ (p169) it employs stray beyond the traditional boundaries of individual languages. This model then focuses on practices without simply categorising them in relation to established named languages. From this perspective, “correctness” is about ‘social convention’

(Jørgensen et al., 2011, p30), something ‘ascribed to the features by (some) speakers’, as opposed to an inherent characteristic. The relationship between individuals and “languages” is also reframed, as Blommaert (2013b) notes, ‘[p]eople do not use “Languages”, they use *resources* for communication’ (p4, original emphasis). An individual’s combined resources comprise their ‘repertoire’, and this ‘interweaves social/interactive elements with historical/political and personal/biographical ones’ (Busch, 2015, p13). This necessitates a move away from terms such as ‘bilingualism’, which Heller (2007) notes have accumulated ‘too much detritus of unexplained phenomena’ (p6). Instead of talking about levels of “fluency”, Blommaert (2013b) refers to ‘truncated repertoires’, emphasising that ‘no single person could ever be qualified as the ‘perfect’ speaker of anything’ (p5). It is also perfectly possible to *not* know “your” language (the language associated with your ethnic background), as ‘the relationship between an individual and a language is a sociocultural construction’ (Jørgensen et al., 2011, p32). Jørgensen and Blommaert’s theorisations on language and superdiversity are rooted in empirical, ethnically informed studies in urban, multiethnic, multilingual cities in northern Europe. Their work is particularly relevant to London where conditions are even more superdiverse, as I outline in relation to my own research participants in Chapter 4.

Approaching language within a framework of superdiversity means taking into account both the biographically indexed repertoires of individuals, and the often highly complex nature of the communities of practice or speech communities they operate within. Blommaert (2013b) writes that ‘[s]peech communities emerge whenever people recognize each other’s deployed communicative resources as meaningful’ (p6) and this common understanding is rooted in ‘shared specific and functionally organized sets of resources (registers, genres, styles)’. Busch (2015) emphasises the patchwork of linguistic spaces in which speakers participate in the course of their daily lives, each with ‘its own set of rules, orders of discourse, and language ideologies’ (p4). This patchwork does not imply bounded contexts however, with specific linguistic resources rigidly restricted to certain interactions. Arnaut & Spotti (2014) describe ‘simultaneity’, involving ‘superimposition, nesting, and palimpsest’ (p3) whereby different groups or generations of migrants are juxtaposed, as well as ‘intersection and entanglement’ whereby linguistic practices associated with particular social or ethnic groups begin to mingle. This can lead to what Rampton (1995a) terms ‘crossing’, linguistic borrowings which carry a ‘sense of social or ethnic boundary transgression’ (Rampton, 2009, p149) where ‘the

variants being used are more likely to be seen as anomalously “other” for the speaker’, as well as contributing to emergent hybrid codes, such as the ‘multi-racial local dialect’ highlighted by Hewitt (1986). Although a superdiversity framework is particularly alert to fluidity and hybridisation, Otsuji & Pennycook (2010) also emphasise the need to ‘avoid turning hybridity into a fixed category of pluralisation, and to find ways to acknowledge that fixed categories are also mobilised as an aspect of hybridity’ (p244). Despite the contemporary focus of superdiversity research, Otsuji & Pennycook also stress the precedents for the kinds of linguistic hybridity discussed above, particularly in pre-colonial societies before the imperative of categorisation. Silverstein (2013) goes further, writing that “English” has ‘existed under conditions we might well term “superdiversity” since the end of the 8th century C.E.’ (p7). A superdiversity approach then is about moving beyond notions of fixed ethnicities and bounded languages, not because they have suddenly become unworkable, but because they have always obscured more complex, often hybrid, linguistic practices and ethnic affiliations.

In the following section, I look more specifically at the superdiverse context of the south London school where I carried out my research and explain the dominance of a Local Multiethnic Vernacular (Hewitt: 1986; 2003) which my Lusondoner participants had to negotiate. There were 31 “home languages” recorded in the school (see Appendix I), and for 40.6% of the young people this was a language other than “English”. Of these, 38 young people (4.6% of the student body) were recorded as “classification pending”, and this label was generally used as a default when a student’s stated “language” was not included within the linguistic taxonomy employed by the school. Lambeth Education data (2015) shows that, across the borough, 51.3% of young people ‘spoke or understood a language other than English at home’ (p5), amounting to ‘150 identified languages’ being spoken, of which ‘47 languages had 20 or more speakers’. This gives an indication of the high level of linguistic diversity present both in the school and the wider area, and I outline below how the superdiverse local linguistic environment was characterised not only by this multilingualism, but also by the dominance of a Local Multiethnic Vernacular.

### **2.3.3 Superdiversity and Local Multiethnic Vernacular**

In the previous section I emphasised the importance of attending to the often complex and hybrid linguistic practices which emerge in superdiverse contexts. The dominant linguistic variety amongst young people in the south London school where I carried out my research was an English vernacular rooted specifically in the local

ethnic ecology. In this section I explain this in detail, highlighting its significance for Lusondoners and setting out why I am using the term Local Multiethnic Vernacular (LMEV) to refer to it. In Hewitt's (1986) study of interactions between "Black" and "White" young people in south London, he identified a 'multi-racial local dialect' (p135) shared by individuals of different ethnic backgrounds. Hewitt outlined how use of this linguistic variety by young people was linked to questions of status within the peer group, explaining that 'youth languages' manage to establish themselves as prestige varieties in generationally specific social contexts' (p102). In later work, Hewitt (2003) uses the term 'Local multi-ethnic vernacular' (p192), describing this as 'the primary medium of communication in the adolescent peer group in multi-ethnic areas [in London]' (p193), and emphasising the primacy of traditional London working class speech within this. He links this to a particular capacity for hybridity amongst young people, identifying 'a cultural strangeness, an interactively awry state of affairs that, if not exclusive to youth, is especially privileged in the liminality adolescence often assumes' (p194). Harris (2006) builds on this notion in his study of adolescents of mainly South Asian descent in West London, noting 'a kind of fragmentary multilingualism' (p132) amongst his participants. Harris explains this in detail:

'a bedrock of English language use founded on a London English, underpins the interplay of interjections from South Asian languages like Panjabi, Gujarati, Hindi or Urdu, sprinkled with dashes of London Jamaican and African American Vernacular English' (p132).

In this depiction, it can be seen how the linguistic repertoire these young people make use of is both grounded in a locally dominant working class variety of English, but also draws on linguistic sources associated with a range of different "ethnicities". While Harris' study particularly focuses on adolescents of South Asian descent, in later work Harris (2008) goes on to outline a broader notion of 'Urban Multilingual Youth', for which he gives the following definition:

'the term Urban Multilingual Youth (UMY) is intended to refer to young people who are in their teens, and perhaps their early twenties, who are from migrant families and who are predominantly working class or lower middle class, and is also intended to include their friends and close acquaintances who are not from migrant families' (p1)

Harris stresses that, although these young people maintain transnational ties, they see themselves very much as insiders within their 'specific urban locality' (p2). Both Hewitt and Harris then highlight the phenomenon of a shared linguistic hybridity

amongst young people of various ethnic backgrounds, grounded in a local working class variety of English but including linguistic features associated with different ethnic minority groups, and linked to a sense of local belonging. As I show in Chapter 6, use of LMEV amongst the participants in my study was tightly bound up with claims of local insiderness.

Cheshire et al.'s (2008b) study of language use amongst young Londoners, more focused on categorising lexical items and pronunciation than analysing situated interactions, includes the following finding:

‘Multiethnic friendship groups encouraged the use of innovative forms and their members used linguistic features drawn from all components of language (including <kissing teeth>) that cannot be linked to specific ethnic groups.’  
(p3)

Cheshire et al. (2008a) in a related paper highlight how the term ‘Jafaikan’ has been used in media reports to label such language use, but set out their own preference for ‘the more neutral ‘Multicultural London English’’ (p2). In a later paper, Cheshire et al. (2011) define this as ‘the overall range of distinctive language features used in multiethnic areas of London’ (p154), specifying that they conceptualise Multicultural London English ‘as a repertoire of features’. Cheshire et al. explain that ‘[i]ndividual speakers use these features variably’ (p190), and that ‘the features are only loosely associated with specific ethnicities or language backgrounds’. While my data echo the findings of a ‘repertoire of features’ which are employed ‘variably’, my interactional analysis shows that more can usefully be said about how use of such features relates to ‘specific ethnicities or language backgrounds’. As I show in Chapter 6, the ethnolinguistic backgrounds of individual Londoners, as well as the specific contexts they operate in, have discernible impacts on the ways in which they position themselves in relation to LMEV. Integral to this is the dominance of “Black”-indexed linguistic features, particularly Jamaican Creole, within LMEV, which I set out later in this section.

Rampton (2011b) has suggested the term ‘contemporary urban vernaculars’ to account for the kinds of linguistic practices outlined above, describing these as:

*‘sets of linguistic forms and enregistering practices (including commentary, crossing and stylisation) that*

- *have emerged, are sustained and are felt to be distinctive in ethnically mixed urban neighbourhoods shaped by immigration and class stratification,*

- *that are seen as connected-but-distinct from the locality's migrant languages, its traditional non-standard dialect, its national standard and its adult second language speaker styles, as well as from the prestige counter-standard styles circulating in (sometimes global) popular culture, and*
- *that are often widely noted and enregistered beyond their localities of origin, represented in media and popular culture as well as in the informal speech of people outside.'* (p291, original emphasis)

While this definition is a very useful articulation of the practices I observed amongst my participants, there are several reasons why I find Local Multiethnic Vernacular a more appropriate term to encapsulate these practices. Firstly, Rampton rejects the term 'local' on the grounds that this 'risks excluding important elements of diasporic and global popular culture that circulate in the urban linguascape' (p290), but I see no reason why 'local' cannot include these elements. If 'local' carried associations of "White", monolingual and English-speaking, then it would be inappropriate, but this is not generally the case in the kinds of locations where the linguistic practices under discussion are being observed, and certainly is not so in south London. Secondly, Rampton justifies his use of 'urban' on the reasoning that 'in the UK 'multi-ethnic' is now already implied by 'urban'' (p290). However, this appears to overlook the potential for hybrid linguistic practices rooted in rural multi-ethnic communities. As Bowling (2004) points out, 'while the ethnic minority population of Britain is concentrated in the urban sphere, people of colour can be found living in almost all parts of England, Scotland and Wales' (p.ix), and numbers are growing. Alongside this, rural areas have also experienced immigration from the European Union accession countries post 2004, which has significantly influenced the ethnic makeup of particular areas<sup>28</sup>. Thirdly, while 'contemporary' is a relevant description of the linguistic practices under discussion, it could also be applied to any linguistic variety in current use. Although LMEV may be particularly characterised by innovation, in areas such as south London it is a longstanding element of the linguistic ecology grounded in local working class speech with particular features (such as 'innit'<sup>29</sup>) which have been in use for over a generation. For these reasons then, I see 'Local Multiethnic Vernacular' as a more appropriate term for certain of the linguistic practices I observed amongst my participants.

---

<sup>28</sup> See for example Stenning et al. (2006) on East European migration to rural Cambridgeshire.

<sup>29</sup> An LMEV term used to express or seek agreement (derived from "isn't it"). Harris (2006) writes that the version of "innit" which is a contraction of "isn't it" has been an extremely longstanding aspect of traditional London working class speech, and that over the past few decades migrant communities have transformed "innit" into an invariant tag (p99-101).

As I stated above, “Black”-indexed linguistic features, particularly Jamaican Creole, are dominant within LMEV. Harris (2006) identified both ‘London Jamaican and African American Vernacular English’ (p132) as constitutive elements of the ‘fragmentary multilingualism’ shared by his research participants. Similarly, Rampton (2011b), in his research in the South Midlands in the 1980s, identified a particular preference for Creole over other available linguistic varieties amongst his participants, writing that ‘Creole was clearly the most attractive to youngsters of all ethnic backgrounds, and it was often reported as part of the general local linguistic inheritance’ (p278). As I suggested above, this dominance of “Black”-indexed linguistic features in multiethnic vernaculars echoes the cultural dominance of “Blackness” amongst multiethnic youth (which I explain in detail in Chapter 7). Data that I set out in Chapter 6 shows that, as well as drawing heavily on these “Black”-indexed linguistic features, LMEV is also often employed by individuals in similar situations to those which have been associated with use of Creole where toughness, prestige or resistance are at issue. Hewitt (1986) noted ‘[t]he equation of danger and toughness with the creole speech of youth’ (p109), and cited Creole being used ‘to signal toughness, superiority or annoyance’ (p111). He explained that ‘creole is treated as standing in a metonymic relation to a concept of black cultural/political identity’ (p109), and Brandt (2000) echoes this, writing that ‘the most important function of the use of Creole by Black young people is that of resistance, both symbolic and interactive’ (p235). However, as I cited above, Rampton (2011b) found Creole use was common for ‘youngsters of all ethnic backgrounds’ and he linked this to participants ‘displaying qualities like assertiveness, verbal resourcefulness, and opposition to authority’ (p278). Similarly, Hewitt (1986) cited Creole being used for ‘anything which embraces questions of prestige and personal excellence – either by way of a celebration or a lament’ (p111). This suggests significant overlap in the ways Creole can be used by both “Black” and non-“Black” youth as part of LMEV.

Another feature of Creole use which contributes to its prominence within LMEV is its accessibility to individuals with fairly limited competency. Hewitt (1986) found that:

‘because claims to creole language use can be indicated at one level merely by a few token lexical items, and even by phonological means alone, as a political strategy it is open to any black youngster, and not simply to those whose facility with creole is well developed’ (p110)



While Hewitt noted that ‘any black youngster’ could show an affiliation to “Blackness” on the strength of ‘a few token lexical items’, participants in my study from a range of ethnic backgrounds could employ “Black”-indexed LMEV features, such as teeth kissing (as I outline in Chapter 6) to establish positionings of local insiderness. LMEV then was tightly bound up with “Blackness”, both in terms of specific linguistic features and the kinds of positionings they were used to support. As I explain in Chapter 7, this is linked to the particular dominance of “Blackness” in the south London locale, rooted in ultra-visible Caribbean (and less visible West African) immigration to the area, as well as the ways “Blackness” has been taken up in popular culture. Hewitt (1986) wrote:

‘the living vernacular is something of a forest floor, on which may be traced the spoor left behind after the obscure drama of conflicts and couplings between social groups and classes has passed by in the dark’ (p126)

Examining language in interaction then provides a privileged perspective on these ‘conflicts and couplings between social groups and classes’. As I set out in the following section, these interconnections between linguistic practices and complex affiliations raise several implications for researching and describing individuals in superdiverse contexts, such as Lusondoners.

### **2.3.4 Implications for monitoring and researching language and ethnicity**

The complexity of practices and affiliations outlined above poses a challenge for researchers and institutions attempting to monitor or investigate diversity. Vertovec (2010) explains that government engagement with ethnic minority organisations has ‘for decades formed the backbone of the British model of multiculturalism’ (p89). However, this model runs the risk of what Silverstein (2013) terms ‘seeing like a state’, and which he defines as expecting that ‘immigrants will be oriented to their former national standard on arrival, and gradually become oriented to the new environment’s standard’ (p20). This perspective ‘essentializes and naturalizes each denotational norm, each “language,” as a kind of psychic patrimony of ethnolinguistic identity’ (p22). It misses the possibility that ““mixed,” i.e., denotationally hybrid registers become positive indexical signs of belonging’ (p21) and the more general trend that members of ethnic minority communities ‘are no longer buying in to the zero-sum ideologies of linguistic and cultural assimilation’ (p30). The kinds of tick-box taxonomies outlined in section 2.1 are not only inadequate in capturing the range of ethnic and linguistic practices and affiliations

in superdiverse contexts such as London, they also miss the interplay between language and ethnicity and their context-specific complexities.

The complexity of ethnic and linguistic practices and affiliations outlined above necessitates a critical approach towards ethnic and linguistic categorisations. Rattansi & Phoenix (2005) point out the danger of relying on self-ascriptions when investigating 'race'/ethnic identity, as 'knowing how young people label themselves does not indicate how they live their lives or what are their cultural practices' (p107). The tendency for any students of Lusophone descent in Lambeth to end up under a "Portuguese" classification reinforces this point. Rattansi & Phoenix go on to stress the inadequacy of simple survey approaches and highlight instead 'the ethnographic necessity of close or 'thick' description of the myriad ways in which actual identities are constructed and reworked in different social contexts' (p107). Back (1996) also highlights this need for 'empirically situated accounts of vernacular culture' (p5) as a way into 'the cultural dynamics of post-imperial London' (p6). While traditional "ethnicities" may still figure as central ideas in how young people experience their everyday lives, the notion that "ethnicity" per se has a defined essence which is passively inherited does not account for the heterogeneity observable in actual practices. Back writes that '[i]f multiculturalism is to be politically re-configured, the strange comforts of cultural absolutism must be abandoned' (p251). A more theoretically sound approach to "ethnicity" is therefore to start from the linguistic and other practices of individuals, examining how group affiliations are enacted through them. As stated earlier, linguistic repertoires can provide 'a privileged road into understanding Late-Modern, superdiverse subjectivities' (Blommaert & Backus, 2011, p2), hence my decision to employ linguistic ethnographic methods (following Rampton et al. 2004) in my examination of the interrelation between ethnic and linguistic affiliations. The survey stage of my field work provides a sketch of the individual biographies and migration trajectories of my participants, enabling a contextualisation of these practices, and I return to this when I outline my methodology, in the next chapter. In the following section, I set out the gap in existing literature which my study addresses by adopting a linguistic ethnographic approach in order to investigate the interlinked linguistic practices and ethnic affiliations of Lusondoners, maintaining a critical perspective towards fixed ethnic and linguistic categorisations.

## 2.4 Existing UK research using the label “Portuguese”

In this chapter I have posited the emergence of a Lusondoner discursive space linked to specific affiliations and practices. Behind this idea is an explicit theorisation (outlined in the previous sections) of language and ethnicity as complex phenomena not captured by tick-box categorisations. Academic approaches to language and ethnicity vary widely with regard to those labelled “Portuguese speakers”, and an examination of existing studies highlights the need for further work which problematises simplistic accounts of ethnicity, language and nationality. Reid’s (1984) survey of ‘newer minorities’ was one of the earliest academic texts to directly mention Portuguese speakers in the UK and specifically pointed out the lack of reliable quantitative and qualitative data on Portuguese immigration in the latter half of the twentieth century. Reid did cite an Inner London Education Authority (1979) survey which included data on Portuguese speakers but warned of problems with participant responses due to differences in ‘individual pupils’ perceptions of the meaning and motivation of the questions’ (p416) and ‘teachers’ attitudes to such surveys’. In light of this, he called for ‘[d]etailed, smaller-scale sociolinguistic studies [...], in which more reliable information on actual language use can be assembled and analysed’. Instead of simple counting exercises which rely on prescribed categories, Reid suggested ‘it may be worth watching out for further linguistic reflections of changing ethnicities’ (p423). Thirty years later, Moita-Lopes (2014b) has advocated a similar approach in relation to Portuguese language, emphasising the need for ‘theory-building that starts from detailed description and analysis of what writers and speakers actually do’ (p100). Pinto (2014) echoes this, calling for studies with methodologies not tied to fixed identity categorisations which can reveal ‘the transfiguration of the Portuguese myth in recombinant communicative phenomena of multiple identities’ (p121). Pinto adds that these should be open to ‘linguistic practices woven by speakers in the contradictions and surprises of the world, linguistic acts of submission, domination and resistance’ (p121). A comprehensive application of this approach has yet to be adopted with regard to Portuguese speakers in the UK, and my study makes an original contribution by responding to this gap in the literature in three key ways:

- i. by adopting a linguistic ethnographic approach (explained in Chapter 3) I am able to focus on actual practices, analysing the day-to-day interactions through which the nuanced interconnections between language and ethnicity can be discerned;

- ii. by bringing to bear a superdiversity perspective I can account for the multi-layered migration trajectories and linguistic repertoires of participants;
- iii. and finally, by maintaining a sharp focus on the locality of my participants, I can explain how the hybrid practices and affiliations I observed amongst Lusondoners are also related to specific features of the local ethnolinguistic ecology in south London.

In this section I survey existing literature on Portuguese speakers in the UK in order to set out how my approach, as outlined above, makes a new contribution to understanding Lusondoners.

#### **2.4.1 Studies using predetermined ethnic and linguistic categorisations**

As I have emphasised in this chapter, rather than relying on pre-established ethnic and linguistic categorisations, a linguistic ethnographic approach involves fine-tuned alertness to the actual practices of participants, facilitating a more nuanced understanding of their affiliations. Studies based on survey data, case studies or less in-depth ethnographic methods however, tend to produce more general descriptions and analyses of linguistic practices. Santarita & Martin-Jones' (1991) study of 'The Portuguese Speech Community' drew on the Adult Language Use Survey (ALUS), carried out by the Linguistic Minorities Project 1985, to highlight broad linguistic trends. For example, they outlined a 'non-reciprocal pattern of language choice in some households' (p234), with parents speaking in Portuguese and children answering in English, as well as frequent 'code-switching', especially 'when the topic of the conversation is related to the experience of life in Britain' (p235). This practice was described as particularly prevalent amongst the younger generation as a way to 'give symbolic expression to their bilingual and bicultural identity' (p235). Santarita & Martin-Jones, then, drew explicit links between linguistic practices and processes of identification, albeit through fairly broad-brush descriptions. Abreu & Lambert's (2003) investigation of Portuguese students in England and the Channel Islands takes a case study approach involving questionnaires, visits and interviews. Again, general descriptions of linguistic practices are given, and Abreu & Lambert refer to 'many variants of bilingualism and multilingualism' (p171), but stop short of describing or theorising these in depth. They, too, draw a direct link between language and identity, describing how children's roles as language mediators 'had implications for the development of new identities for both students and parents and for a shift of status differentials between them' (p1). Like Santarita & Martin-Jones (1991) earlier work then, Abreu & Lambert (2003) identify diverse linguistic practices and link these with processes of identification, but without the explicit,

nuanced description and theorisation of the linguistic practices and ethnic affiliations which a linguistic ethnographic approach facilitates in my study.

Abreu (2003) and Barradas (2004) both situate their studies as ‘ethnographic’ to some degree, but rely fairly heavily on pre-determined ethnic and linguistic categorisations. Abreu’s (2003) approach to ‘Portuguese students’ is directly concerned with identity, and as such problematises prescribed categories to some extent. In describing the pressure on children to act as interpreters for their parents, she writes that they have to develop ‘bicultural identities’ (p215). Although this is a step towards recognising ethnic and linguistic complexity, Abreu tends more towards the discourse of being “caught between two cultures”. She writes of children who ‘live between two worlds’ (p216), experiencing conflict between the expectations of home and school. Abreu’s account of her process of participant selection reveals an attempt to avoid a deeper investigation of the actual complexity of the young people she came across. Abreu writes:

‘A total of seven students were interviewed in the secondary school. One was excluded from this analysis because of her very distinct background. Though she was Portuguese and lived in Portugal till the age of eleven her mother is English. Her upbringing was bilingual in contrast to the other six girls, who have Portuguese as their first language.’ (Abreu, 2003, p213)

This description of a student’s more complex migration trajectory and linguistic repertoire not fitting pre-established categorisations mirrors the accounts I presented in the vignettes in Chapter 1, and is exactly what my study seeks to problematise. In Abreu’s study, however, this complexity is not addressed. Similarly, Barradas’ (2004) investigation of ‘Portuguese’ students in London schools has a focus on educational outcomes and as such mirrors dominant approaches to ethnic and linguistic monitoring in education. Barradas often uses the terms ‘Portuguese’ and ‘Portuguese-speaking’ interchangeably, as opposed to investigating the heterogeneity within these categories. Within her analysis, she paraphrases a colleague’s description of Portuguese/English bilingual students who ‘completely mixed the two languages’ (p14), but stops short of theorising this behaviour as a complex linguistic phenomenon. Her study settles for broad labels without investigating the nuances they could potentially conceal. What is lacking in both these accounts is the grounded perspective which a more in-depth linguistic ethnographic approach brings to my study, taking practices as a starting point, instead of institutional ascriptions.

### 2.4.2 Ethnographic studies

A number of studies (Beswick: 2005; Mar-Molinero: 2010; Beswick & Pozo-Gutiérrez: 2010; Sheringham: 2010) are based on in-depth ethnographic work and, although not all explicitly *linguistic* ethnographies, they provide detailed and nuanced descriptions and analyses of particular Lusophone groupings in specific UK and Irish contexts. What my study adds, however, is an account of how individuals with diverse Lusophone ties share points of connection within the superdiverse context of south London. Beswick's (2005) study with Portuguese origin university students in Jersey directly problematises the assumed links between family background, language practices and ethnic identity. She finds that place of birth has a stronger influence on the young people than their parents' nationality (p99), citing 'the ethnic, cultural and social background fashioned in their formative childhood years' (p99) as the key factor in identity formation. The Portuguese language has a role as 'an emblematic reinforcing and unifying symbol of group identity by the diaspora' (p103), but this occurs alongside the acquisition, through schooling, of English and 'a notion of Britishness' (p103). "Portugueseness" in this context is not simply about the country itself, and for these young people 'their sense of belonging encompasses a greater definition of ethnicity than that of their homelands' (p103), with language playing a greater role in the absence of a more direct territorial experience. However, it is the refusal of neat correlations which makes Beswick's account particularly convincing. She emphasises the contingent nature of identification, observing that 'you can feel a group member in certain situations but not others' (p104). Similarly, she stresses that language choice doesn't map neatly onto identity, observing that 'language preference and mother tongue are not necessarily contiguous' (p104) and that 'respondents' perception of their group membership is not totally reliant on them employing Portuguese in every situation' (p104). This approach therefore privileges practices and affiliations over pre-existing labels, albeit within a far less diverse context than that of a south London secondary school.

Mar-Molinero's (2010) study of Madeirans on the island of Jersey also offers a nuanced description of affiliations and practices. She takes account of the specifics of migration trajectories, writing of the 'one-point-five generation' (p94), which she defines as 'those migrants who were born in Madeira and brought over to Jersey to join their parents' (p94). She also analyses official statistics to show that some residents of Portuguese extraction do not self-identify as "Portuguese", and many have English as a first language. Instead of glossing over the passing on of ethnic

identity, she likens it to Billig's (1995) concept of 'banal nationalism', describing how the transmission of collective memory is 'extremely familiar and ordinary' (p96), occurring without conscious appreciation of the process. Mar-Molinero's identification of the 'one-point-five generation' engages with the complexity of her participants' migration trajectories and affiliations, but without settling for the simplistic discourse of individuals "caught between two cultures". Instead, she describes ambivalent identification as a distinct phenomenon. Writing of the younger generations, she states:

'The concept of "not being from anywhere" highlights not only the element of rootless nostalgia for Madeira created through the inheritance of their family's collective memory, but also the insecurity that they feel towards any form of identification with the Jersey people.' (p110).

While the labels "Madeiran" or "Jerseyan" are insufficient to render her participants' affiliations, that does not mean they lack any sense of "identity". Mar-Molinero attempts to describe the ambivalence and complexity which characterise her participants' struggle with identification, rather simply noting the lack of alignment with dominant ethnic understandings which they experience. In this way, Mar-Molinero begins to elaborate a language for describing emerging phenomena in relation to Portuguese speakers in the UK, as opposed to relying on unproblematised labels.

Beswick & Pozo-Gutiérrez (2010) also focus on practices in their study of Portuguese and Spanish migrations to the south coast of England. They explain how, for these groups, the maintenance of 'customs and activities commonly practised in the home nation, may serve as a way to reinforce a sense of community and ethnic affiliation' (p45). However, they also outline a more utilitarian and contingent element to identification (in line with Spivak's (1987; 1990) notion of 'strategic essentialism' outlined in section 2.1), writing:

'The malleability of identity becomes evident, for example, when migrant groups emphasize the social and political usefulness of a collective ethnic identity and its instrumental mobilization to particular ends.' (p44)

In this way, Beswick & Pozo-Gutiérrez highlight the potential for ethnic identity to take on the status of an interest group. In the case of the Portuguese, this 'is articulated in a "problematic" way – as migrants who struggle to integrate, who need resources, and who do not speak the language' (p57), although they add that this

situation is starting to change. This is an important dimension, largely unexplored in other studies of Lusophone groups<sup>30</sup>. The fact that institutional monitoring of language and ethnicity can be tightly bound up with allocation of resources, reinforces the importance of this “interest group” dimension.

Sheringham’s (2010) study of Brazilians in Gort, Ireland, focuses on the surfacing of transnational identities. She rejects discourses of “in-betweeness” – being ‘neither here nor there’ (p73), describing instead how “Brazilianization’ and creation of certain transnational spaces by Brazilians in Gort enables a positive engagement with both Irish and Brazilian identities and places’ (p61). She goes further than this, stating:

‘Transnational practices can in fact *enable* a sense of local attachment and, rather than challenging the integrity of the nation state, they form part of the process of its inevitable renegotiation and transformation.’ (p78, original emphasis)

Sheringham’s theorisation moves beyond the use of ‘Brazilian’ and ‘Irish’ as adequate terms to describe individuals’ affiliations. Instead, these terms refer to wider discourses against which the practices of individuals signify. Sheringham advocates in-depth research into migrants’ practices at a local level, arguing that understanding micro-level features of transnationality is an essential prerequisite to forming adequate macro-level policies. Beswick & Dinneen (2010) also stress that it is now the transnational dimension of diaspora, ‘in terms of linkages, practices and experience’ (p7), which takes precedence, as opposed to a focus on ‘subgroups of the national population – Portuguese, Brazilian, and Angolan’. By focusing on practices then, a more nuanced perspective on the lives of migrant groups is facilitated, one that takes account of the implications of transnationalism. Where my study adds a further dimension to those outlined above is in examining the practices of a range of individuals with varying, and often multi-layered, migration trajectories and linguistic repertoires. This allows me to describe the interconnections between the kind of Lusophone groupings explored in other studies, and set out how such interconnections are grounded within the specifics of the local ethnolinguistic ecology, as I explain in more detail below.

---

<sup>30</sup> For notable exceptions see da Silva (2011) and Moita-Lopes (2014a).



### 2.4.3 Studies of Londoners and Londonness

Throughout this chapter and the thesis so far I have emphasised the importance of attending to the specifics of the local ethnolinguistic ecology in examining the interrelated linguistic practices and ethnic affiliations of particular groupings. In London this means attending to the prevailing conditions of superdiversity, and the intermingling of individuals of hugely varied linguistic repertoires, ethnic backgrounds and migration trajectories. It also means accounting for how individuals respond to locally dominant linguistic varieties and ethnic discourses. The ethnographic studies reviewed in section 2.4.2 above focused on named Lusophone groupings, specifically Portuguese origin university students in Jersey (Beswick, 2005), Madeirans on the island of Jersey (Mar-Molinero, 2010), Portuguese migrations to the south coast of England (Beswick & Pozo-Gutiérrez, 2010) and Brazilians in Gort, Ireland (Sheringham, 2010). However, as outlined in section 2.1.1, Almeida & Corkill's (2010) study in Thetford, UK, identified 'an ethnically diverse, multinational Lusophone grouping' (p27), albeit through interviews and focus groups as opposed to ethnography. While this kind of diversity may have been absent in the localities investigated in the studies above, it is certainly a feature of the London context (see Nogueira, Porteous & Guerreiro: 2015; Aragao 2010). Studies which attempt to sidestep this complexity (see Abreu: 2003; explored above) miss the intrinsic superdiversity of London and the unpredictable nuances and interconnections it results in. For example, Keating et al.'s (2014) study of 'migration, multilingualism and language policy' deals with research sites in London and the authors explain how the city's distinct 'intersection of histories and geopolitical networks' meant they could have focused on 'English, creoles, other Lusophone varieties in London' (p148). Despite recognising the linguistic diversity of London, Keating et al. choose to focus solely on Portuguese and therefore exclude a key dimension of what characterises language use in London. In the following paragraphs I review three studies of differently defined London-based Lusophone groups (Keating: 2005; Souza: 2006 and Aragao: 2010), emphasising the importance for my own study of engaging with London's superdiverse complexity in order to give an adequate account of the affiliations and practices of my Lusondoner participants.

Keating's (2005) linguistic ethnographic study of the "Portuguese" in London engages with the diversity behind this label, taking specific practices as the basis for theorising a "Portuguese" community. Keating builds on Lave & Wenger's (1991) more localised and contingent notion of a 'community of practice', to postulate

‘political, historical and discursive configurations’ (p108) associated as ‘Portuguese in London’ that persist despite the mobility of individuals. These ‘discursive configurations’ are shaped by Portugal’s position as both a receiver of immigrants and an exporter of emigrants, lending the country ‘a unique profile, of being both a ‘centre’ and a ‘periphery’” (p106, footnote). From this, Keating argues that a particular perspective emerges, allowing for ‘hybridity as a starting assumption for social research’. This hybridity is also rooted in the transition which occurred when the Portuguese gained European citizenship rights in 1986. The earlier migration pattern based around low-paid work in the service sector could now exist alongside business and education opportunities across the social spectrum. Keating describes how, in this climate, ‘[s]ocial transition opened space for conflicting, ambiguous and hybrid ways of doing that overlapped the old and the new’ (p106). Keating thus locates hybridity as a central feature of a Portuguese community of practice in London. While Keating gives a convincing account of the participants she studied, with an explicit theorisation of how they relate to their London location, her specific focus on those with ties to Portugal does not fully explore the potential for interconnections with other Lusophones and the implications of London’s wider superdiversity. My study addresses this gap by taking a broader approach, investigating individuals with various Lusophone ties with an open mind to their affiliations and the potential for interconnections between different groupings.

Souza’s (2006) study of mixed-heritage Brazilian/British children at home and in a community language school in London also focuses on a particular Lusophone-linked grouping. Although studying mixed-heritage children suggests a specific openness to hybridity, within this Souza works from the following definition of “Brazilian”:

‘for the purposes of this study, a Brazilian person would be anyone born in Brazil who speaks Portuguese and who believes that their emotional and family links to Brazil are important to their ethnic identity’ (p28).

This definition has a rigidity which does not account for some of the less straightforward ties to Brazil which my study uncovered amongst some Lusondoners (explored in detail in Chapter 4). It excludes those of Brazilian descent born outside of Brazil and, as highlighted earlier, Portuguese is not the only language of Brazil. When it comes to describing identities in terms of levels of assimilation or integration, Souza depicts a series of ‘types’, but characterises these as points along a continuum, as opposed to discrete, coherent categories, stressing that these are

descriptions of behaviours, not neat labels for individuals. The potential for flux and diversity within individuals is highlighted by Souza's description of the 'multiplicity of identity' (p25) which 'refers to both "hybridity", the creation of a new identity which results from the mix of other identities, as much as a variety of social roles an individual may have' (p25). In this attention to multiple factors behind processes of identification, Souza's study shares some common ground with the superdiversity perspective which my study adopts. Coupled with this, Souza states that knowledge of participants' beliefs and values is necessary in order to make judgements about their 'assumptions of the influence of their language choices on their interactive goals' (p52). She avoids overemphasising ethnicity in this and, in subsequent papers, stresses that 'ethnic identity is only one aspect of social identity' (2008, p38), and that choice of one language does not simply equate to embodiment of one corresponding ethnicity (2010). While Souza's work highlights how the hybridity, fluidity and complexity of identities necessitate an ethnographic approach to linguistic practices, her rigid definition of "Brazilian" cited above signals a prescriptive treatment of "ethnicity". My study avoids this through a linguistic ethnographic approach which maintains a critical perspective on ethnic and linguistic categorisations. This approach also facilitates a broader perspective on the local context, examining the role of interconnections with other Lusophone and non-Lusophone peers.

One study which specifically focuses on potential interconnections between different Lusophone groups in London is Arago's (2013) ethnography of 'Luso-London'. Arago carried out ethnographic observation in 'workplaces, bars, cafes, and shops owned, operated, and patronized by Lusophones' (p1), as well as conducting interviews with various participants. Although Arago notes she was initially 'impressed with what seemed like a unified collective of people' (p3), she fails to find convincing evidence of 'meaningful connections being made between Lusophones in order to progress a multi-racial, diverse and unified politics between individuals from the Portuguese speaking world living in London' (p32). This is despite identifying the ubiquitous use of the 'Luso' prefix to label Portuguese language businesses and services, and noting superficially good relations amongst service users. Instead, Arago emphasises tensions amongst 'Luso Londoners', linked to a discourse of superiority amongst the "Portuguese" partly articulated through negative stereotypes of "Brazilians". She describes the "Luso African" community as 'fretfully simplified, neutralized, negatively associated or completely absent' (p34) in accounts from both "Portuguese" and "Brazilian" participants, and

describes this group as expressing ‘more affinity with migrants from other African points of origin than fellow Lusophones’ (p1). According to Aragao, while there is an element of commonality between “Portuguese”, “Brazilian”, and “Luso African” Londoners in that they occupy ‘economically and culturally marginal positions as “outsiders”’ (p13), this is juxtaposed with the fact that they ‘navigat[e] cultural life in radically different ways based on different claims to citizenship and widely varying experiences of ethno/racial privilege’. Added to this, the ‘tensions of the past’ (p34), the legacy of Portuguese colonial history, are ever present in the interrelations between different Luso Londoners.

Aragao stresses the complexity of Luso Londoners, building on Werbner (2010) to label this group a ‘complex diaspora’. Werbner (2004) defines ‘complex diasporas’ emerging ‘where vast cultural regions of consumption do not simply coincide with either religion or national homelands’ (p900) and describes these as ‘segmented, because members of such diasporas may unite together in some contexts and oppose each other in other contexts’. Giralt (2013) touches on a similar phenomenon in her study of ‘Latin Americans’ in the North of England. She builds on Okamoto (2003) to describe ‘soft pan-ethnic identifications’ (p1911) amongst her participants, defining pan-ethnicity as ‘the consolidation of a collective identity category incorporating a range of ethnic, ‘racial’ or national groups which have historically considered themselves to be distinct’ (p1916). Giralt reports that this ‘pan-ethnicity’ was particularly salient for younger generations as, according to her participants, ‘they were not so set in their own national histories and traditions, and were more flexible when establishing social bonds’ (p1919). This notion is supported by Gilroy’s (2004) observation that, for young people, ‘factors of identity and solidarity that derive from class, gender, sexuality and region have made a strong sense of racial difference unthinkable to the point of absurdity’ (p232). The forging of London- or British-based collective youth identities amongst groupings with geographically diverse origins has already been described in reference to “Black” youngsters (Alexander, 1996), as well as Turkish speakers (Lytra & Baraç et al.: 2008; Lytra & Baraç: 2009; İssa: 2008; Çavuşoğlu: 2010), Chinese speakers (Li & Zhu: 2013) and those of South Asian origin (Harris: 2006; Ali, Kalra & Sayyid: 2006).

Unlike Aragao’s study, my work also looks at the younger generation, and this potentially accounts for the lower tensions and greater commonalities I identify amongst Lusondoners. Where my findings differ from the studies outlined above is

in my explicit theorisation of a ‘discursive space’, and the notion of ‘Lusondoners’ who can access it. Lusondoner is a term of my own invention, not an identity claimed by my participants. The Lusondoner discursive space refers to a common space where practices associated with different Lusophone locations are mutually recognised. Although this can include elements of hybridisation, it does not amount to a defined hybrid identity in and of itself. The Lusondoner discursive space is an emergent formation grounded in the specifics of the superdiverse London context. In an environment where complex Lusophone-inflected biographies, both overlapping and divergent, are juxtaposed, the Lusondoner space provides a framework which facilitates and legitimises the ethnolinguistic bricolage which young people engage in.

## **2.5 Chapter conclusion**

Existing research on ‘Portuguese speakers’ in the UK and Ireland tends either to focus on specific sections of the ‘Portuguese-speaking’ population (Santarita & Martin-Jones: 1991, Abreu & Lambert: 2003, Beswick: 2005, Keating: 2005, Souza: 2008; 2010, Beswick & Pozo-Gutiérrez: 2010, Mar-Molinero: 2010), or assume that all ‘Portuguese speakers’ share a common language and “ethnicity” (Barradas: 2004, Demie & Lewis: 2008; 2010). However, as suggested by the vignettes in Chapter 1, young people labelled as “Portuguese” or “Portuguese-speaking” can encompass significant heterogeneity, both in terms of migration trajectories and demographic profiles. This is partly related to the global spread of Portuguese and therefore the diverse heritages of “Portuguese speakers” in London. On top of this, I am arguing in this thesis that there is evidence of an emergent Lusondoner discursive space, in which practices and affiliations tied to various Lusophone states are recognised. In order to investigate this, an approach is required which takes in the full range of Lusondoners, whilst treating both named languages and named ethnicities with suspicion. In the next chapter I set out how my study addresses this need by investigating young people labelled as “Portuguese-speaking” through examining their actual practices, as opposed to relying on an analytical framework based on established linguistic and ethnic categories.

## Chapter 3

### Researching Lusondoners

*“Is there something we can do about White working-class Portuguese achievement?”*

Head teacher (field notes 26/3/13)

*‘The general mission of anthropology in part can be said to be to help overcome the limitations of the categories and understandings of human life that are part of a single civilization’s partial view.’*

(Hymes, 1996, p7)

#### 3.0 Introduction

This first epigraph presents a question which was put to me by the head teacher of the school where I conducted my field work. She had heard about a project in another secondary school apparently aimed at this specific group whilst at a meeting of local head teachers and wanted to know if something similar could be arranged at her school. What struck me was how naturally this notion of “White working-class Portuguese achievement” was taken up and used as the basis for a potential intervention. In Chapter 2 I explained the ethnic and linguistic monitoring regimes which have become embedded in schools and the limited conceptualisations of language and ethnicity on which they are based. The question above exemplifies this: not only do the words “White working-class Portuguese” conjure up a hazy conflation of racial, ethnic, social, national and linguistic categorisations, but there is also a claim that this particular combination of categories manifests in a discernible pattern of “achievement”. The implicit suggestion is that there is something about being “White working-class Portuguese” which is generally common to those captured by this label and results in dispositions or behaviours which impact (negatively) on achievement.

The second epigraph represents a very different approach, emphasising the limitations of established ‘categories and understandings’. In this chapter I will take up Hymes’ guidance, setting out a more appropriate approach which moves beyond the ‘partial view’ he identified, in order to examine the complexities of ethnic affiliations and linguistic practices in a context of superdiversity. Firstly, I will explain why I see ethnography as fulfilling the requirement for a research approach to Lusondoners which treats established labels with radical scepticism, and is open

to the diversity and nuances of actual affiliations and practices. This responds to the call outlined in Chapter 2 for such a research approach in relation to Portuguese speakers in the UK. I will then outline the basic principles of an ethnographic perspective and the advantages and limitations of applying such a perspective in my study. Secondly, I will describe and evaluate the methods involved, explaining how they meet the requirements outlined above. In this section I will cover: ethnographic participant observation and field notes; recordings of naturally occurring speech; and follow-up interviews to explore features of the data emerging from previous stages. Finally, I will discuss the importance of reflexivity and research ethics within this study, and how consideration of both has been incorporated into my research design.

### **3.1 Ethnography**

In the opening to Chapter 1 I critiqued the quantitative approach adopted by Demie & Lewis (2008) in their account of the schooling of ‘Portuguese pupils’ in Lambeth. Their reliance on fixed ethnic and linguistic categorisations is undermined by the heterogeneity outlined in the vignettes which open Chapter 1. Nuance can be lost, as demonstrated by Moussa and Jéssica’s migration trajectories being clumsily bracketed by the inappropriate ethnic category of ‘Portuguese’, while other elements, such as Jamila’s skills in, and affiliation to, the Portuguese language, go completely undocumented. Instead of young people “belonging” to “Portuguese” linguistic and ethnic categories, these labels refer to notions which weave into young people’s lived experiences in specific and nuanced ways. An appreciation of this is fundamental to any research with the young people I have tentatively labelled as Lusondoners. Instead of a quantitative approach which seeks to measure phenomena according to pre-existing frameworks then, the investigation of Lusondoners calls for qualitative inquiry focused on actual practices. Kamberelis & Dimitriadis (2005) define this as the attempt ‘to understand, interpret, and explain complex and highly contextualised social phenomena’ (p17) with a commitment to demonstrating ‘the complexity, texture, and nuance involved in how individuals and groups experience themselves and their worlds’ (p17). At the heart of this kind of ethnographically informed qualitative research then is the notion of taking the experiences of participants as a starting point, as opposed to entering the field with an analytic framework already established. I will now set out how ethnography, with its focus on the empirical observation of actual practices, fits into this broader picture.

### 3.1.1 Taking an ethnographic approach

Ethnography is an approach which seeks to distance itself from preconceived categorisations. Behind this though, Atkinson & Hammersley (1994) identify a spectrum of theoretical stances, with conceptualisations of ethnography ranging from ‘a philosophical paradigm’ (p248) to ‘a method that one uses as and when appropriate’. My own position is closer to the first of these characterisations as I will now outline. Ethnography rejects the positivist notion that the social world can be explained, as in the natural sciences, by logically deducible universal laws. Atkinson & Hammersley (1994) clarify that this is not so much a rejection of quantitative methods per se, but of the ‘idea that these methods are the only legitimate, or even the most important, ones’ (p251). Instead, ethnography is rooted in a particular epistemology which stresses the situated nature of knowledge. This is captured by Green, Skukauskaite & Baker’s (2012) summary that ‘ethnographers share a *common goal*: to learn from the people (the insiders) *what counts as cultural knowledge* (insider meanings)’ (p309, original emphases). This epistemological underpinning then manifests in a number of general characteristics of ethnography. Atkinson & Hammersley (1994) summarise these as follows: being exploratory, as opposed to testing hypotheses; using coding which is not fixed prior to data collection; focusing on detail as opposed to providing a broad survey; and undertaking ‘explicit interpretation of the meanings and functions of human actions’ (p248). Ethnography is not defined as the sum of these parts however. Rather, it is its fundamental epistemology, the treatment of knowledge as a situated phenomenon, which leads to the characteristics outlined above.

An ethnographic approach then is one in which knowledge is fundamentally grounded in context. Woods (1986) sums this up in his account of ethnographic work in schools, writing that instead of seeking to investigate specific groups or phenomena, he would simply start by asking: ‘What is going on here?’ (p18). This chimes with Hammersley & Atkinson’s (1983) observation that most ethnographic work is ‘concerned with producing descriptions and explanations of particular phenomena, or with developing theories rather than with testing existing hypotheses’ (p25). In Chapter 2 I detailed at length the inadequacies of the categories “Portuguese” and “Portuguese-speaking”. The suspension of belief in established categorisations which ethnography rests upon thus makes it ideally suited as an approach to looking beneath ethnic and linguistic monitoring regimes to the practices of the individuals they label. This aligns with what Hammersley (2007) characterises as a ‘constructionist’ approach, viewing social phenomena as ‘part of a world that is



constituted through sense-making practices’ (p691). In suspending preconceived frameworks then, the purpose of ethnography is not simply to describe “how things are” at a more local level, but to explain how they are constructed as being so through sense-making practices. In Chapter 2 I explained how multiple levels of complexity discernible in superdiverse contexts render predetermined ethnic and linguistic categorisations particularly problematic. In the following section, I outline the specific implications raised by superdiversity for the kind of investigation of sense-making practices referred to above.

### **3.1.2 Ethnography in a context of superdiversity**

Superdiversity is not simply a descriptive term; it is also a theoretical position, which, according to Van der Aa & Blommaert (2015), holds that ‘the effects of globalization are visible in the contact between languages and cultures’ (p2). This contact is played out in complex ways which are not decipherable within a paradigm of bounded languages and fixed ethnicities. This is why the ethnic and linguistic taxonomies I critiqued in Chapter 2 are inadequate for rendering an account of the complex practices and affiliations of Lusondoners which I detail in subsequent chapters. Instead, investigating this complexity requires an approach which adopts a critical perspective on conventional ethnic and linguistic categorisations. Responding to this need, Rampton et al. (2015) write: ‘if superdiversity announces the collapse of traditional classificatory frameworks, then ethnography is a vital resource’ (p1). Ethnography facilitates a focus on practices, as well as the perspectives which contextualise them. Rosen & Burgess (1980), in concluding their survey of linguistic practices amongst London schoolchildren, wrote that ‘[a] form of language which has low status to the outsider may be seen quite differently from the inside’ (p30). It is not simply the practices themselves which must be examined then, but also how they can signify within the context in which they are used (see also Cekaite & Evaldsson: 2008; Blommaert & Backus: 2011).

However, close attention to linguistic practices and their specific context is unlikely to yield neat patterns from which clear and generalisable correlations between particular linguistic features and distinct “meanings” can be extrapolated. Rampton (2011a) warns of the ‘risk of over-schematisation, building elegant analytic models for processes that are actually rather indeterminate’ (p1237). Rampton (2014) cautions against an overemphasis on language, writing that ‘although it is a very valuable part of the puzzle, you can never get at what people mean through language alone’ (p5). The immediate context and wider discourses must always be

investigated and, although hybrid language practices may appear to indicate a certain commonality amongst speakers, Rampton stresses that ‘there is nothing intrinsically convivial about ‘polylinguaging’’. Blommaert (2014) echoes this emphasis on complexity which extends beyond languages, writing that ‘[a] sociolinguistic system is always a ‘system of systems’, characterized by different scale levels – the individual is a system, his/her peer group is one, his/her age category another, and so on’ (p8). Superdiversity is about the interaction of multiple phenomena, not the pinpointing of discrete blocks within a larger mosaic. In order to appreciate this, ethnography rests upon a fundamental suspension of preconceived frameworks for categorising social behaviour, and focuses instead on the fine-tuned analysis of actual practices. It is this approach which enabled me identify both the distinct ethnic fractions amongst Lusondoners, and their shared access to a common discursive space, as I explain in detail in Chapter 4.

### **3.1.3 Ethnography within the school**

The suspension of preconceived frameworks described above can be particularly difficult to achieve within the school setting. As schooling tends to be a common (and often formative) experience for most people, Gordon, Holland & Lahelma (2001) warn that ‘the task of a school ethnographer is to make the familiar strange’ (p188, see also Delamont & Atkinson: 1995; Spindler & Spindler: 1982). This is especially important within a school with which the researcher is familiar, as in my own case. The layers of ethnic, linguistic, academic and social labels attached to young people at an institutional level seep into the assumptions which underpin everyday interactions, and focusing on linguistic practices can provide a way to cut through this as I outline in more detail in section 3.2.5. An ethnographic approach enables young people to be seen as more than simply embodiments of wider social structures. Blommaert & Rampton (2011) write that ‘it is worth turning to language and discourse to understand how categories and identities get circulated, taken up and reproduced in textual representations and communicative encounters’ (p12). This supports my explanation in Chapter 2 of the functioning of ‘ethnicity’ not as an intrinsic essence but rather as socially constructed. Investigating processes of social construction then means gaining an *ethnographic* understanding of how values and meanings are ascribed within the particular contexts in question. However, the suspension of preconceived frameworks is not simply a temporary measure while new grand narratives are formulated, as Harris & Rampton (2009) remind us:

‘Holding closely to the contexts of everyday life, linguistic ethnography helps get ethnicity and race *into perspective*, as significant but by no means all-encompassing processes, intricate but much more ordinary and liveable than anything one might infer from the high octane, headline representations of the political and media arena.’ (p115, original emphasis)

This is why an ethnographic approach is so fundamental: instead of simply sharpening awareness of the alignments within existing categories such as ‘race’, ‘ethnicity’ and ‘language’, ethnography facilitates a re-evaluation of their workings. Rather than asking “What constitutes Portuguese ethnicity?”, ethnography enables an investigation into what ethnicity itself might (and might not) mean amongst London schoolchildren of Lusophone descent. It attends to the ‘when’, ‘where’ and ‘how’, focusing on the ways “Portugueseness” is constructed or invoked through particular practices, rather than seeking out some kind of essential ethnic core. This alertness to the localised nature of sense-making practices is thus fundamental to an ethnographic approach. Having explained why such an approach is intrinsic to my research, in the following section I set out the methods I employed and how they aligned with this ethnographic approach.

### 3.2 Ethnographic methods

In Chapter 2 I highlighted the limitations of fixed ethnic and linguistic labels, and in section 3.1 above I set out how an ethnographic approach involves the suspension of such predetermined categorisations. Instead, ethnography rests on the observation of actual practices and a commitment to understanding how these are interpreted by those involved. This was the underlying rationale behind the methods I employed. My field work was divided into the following three stages (explored in more detail in the subsections below):

- i. **Broad biographical survey:** this entailed short interviews covering family migration trajectories and linguistic practices with 58 young people identified as having “Portuguese” as their “home language” and/or “ethnicity” according to official school records<sup>31</sup>.
- ii. **Participant observation, field notes and recordings of naturally occurring speech:** from the broad biographical survey I identified five<sup>32</sup> key

---

<sup>31</sup> I also included 3 other pupils not recorded under these labels, as explained in section 3.2.1.

<sup>32</sup> I initially selected 6 key participants, but one withdrew as he was not confident to be recorded.

participants and spent eight months observing them across a range of different lessons, recording my observations in field notes. I also used a lapel microphone to record the naturally occurring speech of each key participant for two full school days.

- iii. **Retrospective interviews:** I conducted an in-depth interview with each key participant which involved playing back extracts from the recordings of their naturally occurring speech and discussing what was going on.

I now discuss these methods involved in more detail, setting out the rationale behind each one.

### 3.2.1 Broad biographical survey

In section 3.1 I emphasised the need for more nuanced accounts of young people than are provided by the reductive ethnic and linguistic taxonomies used in school. As a first step towards this, I carried out a broad biographical survey amongst the cohort which I have described as Lusondoners, which allowed a more detailed picture of respondents' family migration trajectories and linguistic practices to emerge (as I will set out in Chapter 4). In order to find potential participants for the survey interviews<sup>33</sup>, I first used official school data to identify any young people recorded as having "Portuguese" as their "ethnic group" or "home language". I then added to this list, two young people not recorded as "Portuguese" in either of these categories, but whom I knew to have Lusophone links as a result of interactions with them in my role as EAL coordinator at the school<sup>34</sup>. I also read through the list of all students on roll to identify any other Portuguese-sounding names, and discovered a girl of Portuguese descent whose ethnicity had been recorded as "White Other", although her brother's was recorded as "Portuguese" (this case is explored in more detail in Chapter 4). In total there were 91 young people at the school with some form of tie to a Lusophone location, and of these 58 participated in the biographical survey, representing roughly two thirds of the cohort. It may seem counterintuitive to employ a survey within an ethnographic approach as it appears to mirror the monitoring regimes which I am critiquing. Indeed, Arksey & Knight (1999) directly contrast the purpose of 'survey' and 'qualitative' interviews, describing the former as seeking to establish 'to what extent a hypothesis or view can be sustained' (p7), and defining the latter as aiming 'to find out about people's perspectives, beliefs,

---

<sup>33</sup> These were semi-structured interviews based around the completion of a biographical questionnaire (Appendix III), explained in more detail later in this section.

<sup>34</sup> One of these was Jamila, described in the vignettes in Chapter 1. The other was a girl of Angolan heritage who I noticed speaking Portuguese to her mother at a parents' evening.

attitudes etc' (p7). However, within my study the survey interviews represent a step towards this qualitative awareness, providing broader contextual detail on participants as a bridge to other ethnographic methods.

In order to set up the interviews, I approached the young people individually during the school day and asked if they would like to participate, explaining that this would entail a 15-20 minute discussion during which we could converse in English and Portuguese, according to their choice. I described my interest in finding out more about young people who might speak or understand Portuguese, or hear family members speaking it, and left them with a consent form to get signed by their parent or guardian. The young people did not express surprise or confusion about what I was doing when I approached them, and this is likely to be linked to the existing awareness many had of my previous role as EAL coordinator at the school, which often entailed organising initiatives aimed at particular ethnic or linguistic groupings. As outlined above, 58 of the 91 young people I approached participated, and of those who did not, in the majority of cases this was because they repeatedly forgot to get the consent form signed. Only a handful explicitly stated they actively did not want to participate, and I did not press them for a reason for this as I did not want to make them feel pressured to agree (I discuss this further in section 3.3 when I set out my approach to research ethics). Most were very keen to be involved, usually saying they were pleased to be allowed to miss part of one of their lessons, especially as they were able to select the time to ensure it did not clash with a subject they particularly enjoyed. In this way, I arranged time slots with individual young people, and would collect them from their lesson, taking them to an available empty space, such as a classroom or the dining hall, to conduct the interview. Each interview lasted a maximum of 20 minutes, after which the young person would return to their lesson.

On a spectrum from 'structured' and 'semi-structured' to 'unstructured' (Arksey & Knight, 1999) my survey interviews fell somewhere between 'structured' and 'semi-structured'. They focused on the completion of a questionnaire (see Appendix III), employing specific but open questions and allowing for unanticipated lines of inquiry which emerged from the process. The interviews covered the migration trajectories and linguistic habits of the young people and their family members, and went into some detail on the young people's language practices in school, at home and in other contexts. The purpose of this stage was twofold:

- i) to identify broad trends to be used as a basis for selecting key informants; and
- ii) to establish a broad database of information against which to check and compare the ethnographic data collected in participant observations and audio recordings.

In light of this, I did not audio-record the interviews for any kind of interactional analysis. Instead, I completed a written questionnaire during each interview to record each young person's responses in note form. I chose to carry this out as an interview, rather than handing out a questionnaire for participants to complete, for three reasons. Firstly, being face-to-face allowed me to explain questions and explore any avenues which emerged from the answers given. Secondly, my existing knowledge of the participants suggested that a short opportunity to talk about themselves would be far preferable for them than the completion of a lengthy written document. This was therefore likely to make data collection more fruitful, but also to be more respectful of their wishes. Thirdly, I conducted the interviews in English or Portuguese, depending on the stated preference of each participant, but also used the other language at some point in order to gauge participants' general competency and reaction to using it with me. These survey interviews then provided useful contextual information about participants' linguistic repertoires which illuminated data from other stages of the ethnographic process. They also deepened my awareness of the range of individuals within the cohort labelled as "Portuguese" and it was from this that I began to form an apprehension of the three broad ethnic fractions amongst Lusondoners (explained in detail in Chapter 4).

### **3.2.2 Participant observation**

While the survey stage gave a broad contextual backdrop, participant observation provided a way into the actual nuance of linguistic practices and insider meanings of Lusondoners. I carried out observations over a period of eight months and this included visiting 97 lessons, covering 17 different subjects and spanning 3 year groups (Appendix IV). I used the data from the survey to select six key informants<sup>35</sup> who became the focus of this observation (participants were also recorded and the treatment of audio data is discussed below). In addition, in capturing the practices of the key informants, I also captured a further 76 young people with whom they habitually interacted (see Appendix II), 33 of whom could be classified as Lusondoners. In line with the reflexive approach to field work outlined above, the

---

<sup>35</sup> Reduced to 5 when one chose not to wear the lapel microphone.

criteria for selecting key informants emerged from the data themselves. During the survey I asked participants who they “hang around with” in lessons and during break times, then clustered young people into 21 friendship groups according to their responses. I then looked for any trends in migration trajectories amongst members of these groupings within the other data I had gathered. From this, I selected key informants who between them covered 9 of the friendship groups identified, as well as the dominant trends in migration trajectory.

In selecting participants, I prioritised individuals who would be likely to interact with a large range of Lusondoners, according to their responses to the broad biographical survey. I initially selected 2 young people born in Brazil, 1 born in Portugal, and 3 born in Madeira. Within this selection then, Madeiran-born Lusondoners were over-represented, and this was exacerbated when one of the Brazilian-born young people opted not to participate in the observations and audio recording. However, there were also some mitigating factors to this Madeiran over-representation. Firstly, as I outline in Chapter 4, 24 of the 58 Lusondoners I surveyed had significant ties to Madeira, making this the largest subgroup within the Lusondoner cohort and therefore suggesting it merited significant attention. Secondly, within interactional data presented in subsequent chapters “Madeiranness” features fairly prominently, including in references made by young people with ties to the other ethnic fractions within the Lusondoner discursive space (described in Chapter 4). Thirdly, the three Madeiran-born key informants were selected partly due to their friendship groups, which happened to include a wide range of Lusondoners and non-Lusondoners and my observations and audio recordings involving these key informants proved a rich and varied source of data covering a great number of young people. While I was aware of the over-representation of Madeiran-born Lusondoners amongst my key participants, my whole ethnographic approach sought to critically examine the relevance of predetermined categorisations by focusing in detail on actual practices, rather than seeing key participants as in some way representative of all Lusondoners who shared certain of their characteristics, such as country of birth.

The table below summarises these participants and the major characteristics of their migration trajectories:

*Table 1: Background information on key informants*

Name	Gender	Year	Migration trajectory
Alícia	F	11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ born Goiânia, Brazil</li> <li>▪ all family Brazilian</li> <li>▪ came to the UK age 13, spending 1 month in Italy on the way</li> </ul>
Danilo	M	11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ born in Madeira</li> <li>▪ wider family have lived in several Lusophone and non-Lusophone countries</li> <li>▪ resided in London aged 8-9, then moved back to Madeira</li> <li>▪ returned to London age 10</li> </ul>
Dara <sup>36</sup>	F	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ born in Lisbon, Portugal</li> <li>▪ Lusophone African descent</li> <li>▪ moved to London aged 11</li> </ul>
Vinício	M	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ born in Madeira</li> <li>▪ family have lived in South Africa and Zimbabwe</li> <li>▪ moved to London aged 10</li> </ul>
Délia	F	8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ born in Madeira</li> <li>▪ wider family have lived in several Lusophone and non-Lusophone countries</li> <li>▪ moved to London aged 5</li> </ul>

The survey stage did not provide a simple matrix with which to approach participant observation. Hymes (1996) states that ‘[t]he more the ethnographer knows on entering the field, the better the result is likely to be’ (p7). However, he also warns that this must also be balanced against the danger of conceptualising people ‘as the intersection of vectors of age, sex, race, class, income, and occupation alone’ (p9), and the need to be alert to the local and temporal specificity of meanings. A useful strategy in this respect was the avoidance of immediate coding of observations based

---

<sup>36</sup> Although I initially selected Dara as a key participant, her close friend Márcia also ended up taking on this status as the two regularly spent almost their entire school day together. They also had significant commonalities in their migration trajectories, as I outline in Chapter 7.



on any pre-determined framework (Hammersley & Atkinson: 1983; Hymes: 1996). Instead, as Blommaert & Jie (2010) note, ‘you start by observing *everything* and gradually start focusing on *specific targets*’ (p29, original emphases). I therefore started by observing participants in each of their lessons, then began to select the most salient parts of their timetable to focus on. Again, the criteria for this emerged from the data. As I picked up on phenomena that appeared to require deeper understanding and explanation, I focused in on both the lessons where these phenomena were particularly evident, and those lessons where they seemed to be absent. For example, it quickly became apparent that Vinício’s Portuguese lessons involved frequent discussion and contestation of representations of “Portugueseness” (as I will explain in detail in subsequent chapters). I therefore prioritised attending these lessons, but also balanced this by attending contrasting lessons such as Sport and Leisure where such practices did not occur. This was far from an exact science, and carried a substantial risk of privileging the extraordinary over the mundane. A central part of the ethnographic endeavour, then, is ascertaining how widespread particular phenomena are, and what their significance is to participants themselves. Blommaert & Jie (2010) write that the piecing together of observations into a more systematised perspective requires both ‘*observation at various levels, different times and places*’ (p30 original emphasis) and ‘*contextualisation*’. Survey data proved extremely valuable as I undertook these processes, as were the audio recordings outlined below. For example, through observing Alícia I noticed that she communicated with friends almost exclusively in Portuguese. I was able to cross-reference this with the survey data to find that there was a strong tendency for young people born in Brazil to arrive in the UK at an older age than those born in other Lusophone countries, and therefore be generally less fluent in English and make greater use of Portuguese (as outlined in Chapter 4). Alícia also stated in a follow-up interview I conducted with her that she avoided speaking English around her more fluent Lusondoner peers for fear of being judged (audio recording 13/5/13). In this way, the potential for triangulating data collected through different methods deepened the description and analysis of practices I was able to undertake.

When observing, Duranti (1997) advises researchers find a ‘blind spot’ (p101) to occupy, taking up a position close to that of ‘a marginal participant’ (p102). As each classroom at my field site had an interactive whiteboard to which students’ desks were oriented, I could minimise attention by situating myself towards the back. However, this still entailed alternating ‘between moments of high involvement and

moments of low involvement' (Duranti, 1997, p102). Although I was used to maintaining a low-key presence in classrooms from my previous role at the school, this role also meant students were used to calling on me for support, and I therefore got drawn into a certain amount of interaction of this kind. I made it clear that I was officially there as a researcher, but did also act as an adult helper in the room at times, when I judged it necessary for maintaining a role which was recognisable to the young people. On some occasions this was taken out of my hands, such as a lesson when the teacher did not arrive and I had to take charge until a supply teacher could be found. Lareau (1996) writes that both a 'passive role' (p208) or more explicit engagement in behaviour management can be appropriate depending on the specific culture and layout in the classroom. The researcher's level of participation then is very much dependent on their reading of the context, and how they feel they can best "fit in". This involvement does not imply some kind of "contamination" but is instead a necessary prerequisite to effective observation. Oakley (1991) writes against the 'mythology of "hygienic" research' (p266), stressing instead that involvement is 'the condition under which people come to know each other and to admit others into their lives'. I did not attempt to become invisible in the class. Rather, I focused on my own note-taking and responded to interaction amongst young people in low-key ways. I was a part of what was going on and therefore maintained a focus on myself as a specific element within the context being observed. This approach of being in situ during everyday activities was particularly important in my study considering the lack of existing research where young people in UK schools labelled as "Portuguese" are actually observed (as I outlined in section 2.4). Participant observation then was central to my approach of focusing on actual practices, as opposed to buying in uncritically to the categorisations offered by ethnic and linguistic monitoring regimes.

### **3.2.3 Field Notes**

The reflexive stance essential to participant observation also underpinned my taking of field notes. As outlined above, these notes should not attempt a systematic analysis of the context, but nor are they an entirely impartial account. Duranti (1997) describes them as linking to 'an experiential, subjective dimension of "having been there" that is not quite visible or audible on tape' (p115). While it was not possible to 'capture' the field site comprehensively, this does not undermine the ethnographic endeavour. As Duranti writes, '[t]he fact that we will not be able to know *everything* is not a reason to know *nothing*' (p115, original emphases). The taking of field notes was thus grounded in pragmatism. Following Hymes (1996) I was open to 'meanings

and patterns of behaviour not foreseen' (p14), but did not seek to lock these down into entirely comprehensive and definitive accounts. I made notes whilst observing but, as outlined above, I also engaged in a certain amount of interaction which limited the time I had for writing things down. I therefore ensured I went over any notes and added further thoughts between sessions and at the end of each day of observation. These field notes, then, provided a near contemporaneous record of incidents, puzzling moments and routine behaviour, and amounted to 10,927 words in total. As with the participant observation outlined above, this was particularly important as other studies of "Portuguese" labelled adolescents do not capture everyday life in this way. The vignettes I used in my introduction, and to which I have referred throughout these three chapters, exemplify the utility of such descriptions in grounding more theoretical accounts. Field notes, then, provided a vital complement to the actual work of participant observation, offering a written record which supported the process of data analysis that took place months later.

Agar (1980) states a major focus of field notes as being 'suggestions for future information to be gathered' (p161), highlighting their role within a wider process of learning about the field site and participants. For example, during a Performing Arts lesson when I was observing Dara, one of her classmates expressed surprise when she found out Dara spoke Portuguese (field notes 10/6/13). I therefore made a note to find out more about when and with whom Dara habitually used Portuguese at school, and how she felt about the way her peers reacted to her using it. This later became a key topic in a retrospective interview I carried out with Dara (28/6/13). Blommaert & Jie (2010) emphasise the importance of how field notes 'tell us a story about *an epistemic process*: the way in which we tried to make new information understandable for ourselves' (p34 original emphasis). My notes on Vinício's behaviour in his Portuguese GCSE class provide an example of this, as I moved from focusing on his apparent confidence and expertise (field notes 15/3/13) to identifying a deep underlying tension in his positioning as a student of Portuguese (field notes 23/4/13).

Fundamental to the process of taking field notes is the need to guard against what Stronach & Maclure (1997) describe as the 'self-effacing aspirations of the researcher/writer within qualitative research' (p35). They stress that observations always come from a particular perspective, stating that 'the writer is never more present in the text than when she seems to be absent, and the subject seldom less audible than when he seems to be speaking for himself' (p35). This was reinforced

for me when I was observing Dara and Márcia in a French lesson and the two began play-fighting. Márcia instructed me to “write that down” (field notes 26/03/2013) when Dara hit her, directly raising my note-taking as part of the focus of those I was observing. My presence as a researcher was part of what was going on as there was a strong element of performance in the girls’ behaviour. Field notes, and the narrative accounts which draw on them, grow out of the researcher’s interaction with a particular context. They are not simply “impressions”, but nor are they purely objective renderings of “reality”. An appreciation of their situated nature was integral to the process of analysis. My field notes thus provided data which was analysed both in terms of the practices I observed, but also in terms of the record they provided of my own development as an ethnographer, as I deepened my awareness and understanding of the participants and field site.

### **3.2.4 Recordings of naturally occurring speech**

As Blommaert & Jie (2010) note, the tendency for recordings to become increasingly focused as an ethnographic study progresses documents the researcher’s journey ‘from an innocent outsider to a knowledgeable member of the field’ (p32). In my study, each participant wore a lapel-microphone for two full, consecutive school days (including registration, lessons and break times). This equated to approximately 12 hours of audio data for each participant, 60 hours in total. I selected these days to coincide with the most interesting lessons, as noted during my participant observations. Blommaert & Jie point out the ‘*polycentric*’ (p34, original emphasis) nature of classrooms, and using lapel microphones avoided the pitfall of focusing solely on the teacher during the lessons which constituted the bulk of these recordings. Also, Blommaert & Jie alert researchers to the need to ‘fill important blanks’ (p36) when it comes to analysis by noting observations alongside the recordings, and I carried out further participant observation (as outlined above) during recorded sessions. I had planned to get participants themselves to make recordings out of school in significant home or peer group contexts in order to meet the need for ‘*observation at various levels, different times and places*’ (Blommaert & Jie, 2010, p30, original emphasis) mentioned above. However, this proved impractical both in terms of the logistics of consent and the amount of data being gathered. Hewitt (1986, p10) and Rampton (1991, p393) point out the danger that the novelty of using microphones can affect the nature of what is said. Rampton (1991) outlines two strategies for mitigating this effect: i) recording over a number of consecutive days to allow the novelty ‘time to wear off’ (p393), and ii) playing episodes back to informants to help ‘decide whether or not they gave a fair picture

of normal practice' (p393). Both of these strategies were employed in my study. Additionally, my wider participant observations helped to contextualise the audio recordings, further supporting me in judging how representative they were. The fact that all key participants continued either to discuss sensitive topics (such as romantic pursuits) or to engage in swearing and other vulgar language at some point whilst wearing the microphone suggests that self-censorship was not an overwhelming issue.

Capturing naturally occurring speech provided a vital complement to observation and field notes in my research. The close study of linguistic practices has been cited as affording a particularly useful perspective on a range of phenomena: 'social and cultural processes' (Wortham, 2008, p38); 'biographies' (Blommaert & Backus, 2011, p2); '*social plurality* and contradiction' (Hewitt, 2003, p196, original emphasis); 'ideological values' (Maybin & Tusting, 2011, p516); and the enactment of 'cultures and ethnicities' (Harris, 2006, p90). Language is not just used to refer to the social world then but is heavily implicated in our experience of it, and a speaker's linguistic repertoire will reflect their various experiences and the factors which have influenced and shaped them. In light of this, naturally occurring speech provided an ideal source of data for investigating the affiliations of Lusondoners and their interconnection with linguistic practices.

This combining of linguistic data with other ethnographic sources fits under the broad umbrella of 'Linguistic Ethnography' in the UK (see Rampton: 2007), linked to 'Linguistic Anthropology' in the USA (see Wortham: 2008), and carries a double benefit (explored in more detail in section 3.2.6 below). As Rampton (2007) states, on the one hand '*ethnography opens linguistics up*' (p596, original emphasis), problematising reductive categories and prompting a more critical approach to data and how it is treated. On the other hand '*linguistics (and linguistically sensitive discourse analysis) ties ethnography down*' (p596, original emphasis), insisting on a rigorous, nuanced and systematic approach to data analysis which allows researchers to pin down insights linguistically, substantiating claims with linguistic evidence. Instead of importing context from a bank of established dominant discourses (as in Critical Discourse Analysis), or limiting the account of context to only what is explicitly referenced in linguistic data (as in Conversation Analysis), Linguistic Ethnography (LE) investigates context and practices simultaneously, viewing them as essentially interrelated. This kind of analysis of practices had to be undertaken within a broader ethnographic investigation of contexts, thus attending to their

interrelated nature. Awareness of contexts emerges from both ethnographic observation *and* analysis of linguistic data. Similarly, analysis of linguistic data is underpinned by awareness of contexts.

Consent remained a major concern during the gathering of audio data, and both reflexivity and flexibility were required in thinking about this. Other young people and teachers were always warned about the presence of the microphone to ensure covert recording did not take place. As the field work took several months some circumstances inevitably changed during that time. Heath et al. (2007) describe 'process consent' (p409) as an ongoing relationship, and not just about an initial agreement to participate. They acknowledge that this is problematic in practice due to 'power inequalities between researchers and respondents' (p409), but this did not mean that the principle could not be used as a guide. My participants were given the right to withdraw at any point during the field work, and I used my own judgement, based on growing ethnographic awareness, to strive to understand their specific needs. An example of this was my decision to continue observing Danilo as a key participant, even though he was not sure he wanted to be recorded. My sense was that he did not want to feel pressured to do so, and for this reason I said it could be optional. Danilo was happy to proceed on this basis and later on in the year actually came to me and requested to wear the microphone. Although this attention to participants' individual needs was vitally important, Hammersley & Traianou (2012) also highlight the over-dramatisation of ethical considerations, writing that 'much of the time this research has relatively little significance for the people being studied, compared with all the other things going on in their lives'. My research was certainly very far down the list of my participants' interests and concerns, judging by the minimal references made to it during my observations and audio recordings. When Alícia was wearing the microphone, by far the most extensive and animated conversation she engaged in revolved around the fact that Vinício had posted on her Facebook wall, confessing romantic interest in her, and Alícia was worried about her ex-boyfriend's response. This highlighted how my young participants operated in an environment where sensitive personal information relating to them could be posted online, often against their will. In contrast, my audio recording appeared much less intrusive as it had to meet stringent ethical guidelines and required explicit approval of the participants. As I will explain in more detail in section 3.3, my approach was to actively investigate ethical considerations, using basic principles as a starting point but remaining alert to the emergence of particular exigencies through deepening ethnographic awareness. As mentioned above, the fact that one participant

did feel able to withdraw from the audio recording suggests I had some success in empowering participants to make active choices.

### **3.2.5 Follow-up interviews on specific themes arising from speech data**

Conducting follow-up interviews with participants complemented the cross-referencing which ran through my linguistic ethnographic approach, enabling specific practices to be reflected upon by those actually involved in them. These informal open-ended discussions were structured around listening to and discussing audio extracts from the recordings of participants' own naturally occurring speech. Through this I sought to gain more information on the perspectives of participants on their own practices and on my preliminary observations. I conducted and recorded interviews ranging between 30 and 75 minutes with each key informant, generating approximately three and a half hours of audio data in total. Hey (1997) states that '[t]he ability to tell another's story is a concrete social practice of power' (p89) and, although I interpreted young people's responses, the endeavour to seek their perspective on my own observations, in relation to the earlier recordings of naturally occurring speech, added some accountability to this power. In accordance with the approach to field work I have been outlining in this chapter, the topics for discussion in these interviews, as well as whether participants were interviewed alone or in particular groupings, emerged from consideration of the previous stages of data collection. Almost all participants were interviewed alone, the only exceptions being Dara and Márcia who expressed a strong preference to be interviewed together. In general, my sense was that individual interviews gave a chance for participants to provide particular perspectives which may have been inhibited in group settings.

I have termed these interviews as broadly 'informal', (following Agar, 1980) as although I drew up lists of topics to broach, and examples of linguistic practices to discuss, I also sought to prompt participants into leading the conversation into areas they saw as relevant. Blommaert & Jie (2010) emphasise that the researcher is an active participant, rather than 'the natural extension of the tape recorder' (p49) but should also let participants lead off in new directions. In the interviews I conducted, discussion started from my own observations stemming from previous stages of the research, but the interview format specifically encouraged participants to range freely in their responses. In my interview with Dara and Márcia, for example, I asked Dara about an incident I had observed where a "Black Caribbean" classmate had expressed surprise on learning that Dara spoke Portuguese (field notes 10/06/13). Dara then launched into a series of complaints about this classmate, focussed on her

“Jamaicanness”, which led into wider discussion of both Dara and Márcia’s sense of exclusion from what they described as the “Black” group at school. In analysis, each interview was treated critically, as a ‘communicative event’ (Briggs, 1986, p4) situated in a local context as opposed to simply embodying a universally understood format. Speech data from research interviews cannot be treated as naturally occurring speech (Goodwin & Heritage, 1990) as communicating with a researcher, as opposed to with peers, can prompt a shift in the kinds of repertoires which participants employ. Equally, this ‘may allow us to understand how participants would behave in other circumstances, for example when they move out of a setting or when the setting changes’ (Hammersley & Atkinson, 1983, p140). In the interview with Dara and Márcia mentioned above, the vehement resentment both girls expressed about their “Black” peers was not something I had observed in their classroom interactions. My sense was that it was only in the more private setting of the interview that these girls felt able to voice these thoughts. This highlights how interviews can draw out useful perspectives which are not explicit in day-to-day interactions, as well as exposing some of the unspoken restrictions under which participants can operate.

The example in the previous paragraph shows the extra layers of detail which interviews can provide, but this is not always the case. While Dara and Márcia were keen to lead the conversation onto a range of topics in an interview which lasted 75 minutes, both Danilo and Víncio were less forthcoming in responses. Their interviews lasted only 30 minutes each and at times I had to rephrase questions in order to try to elicit fuller response. For example, when I asked Danilo who his main friends were beyond the “Portuguese speaking” group, he simply replied “todos” (*everyone*), and did not elaborate further when I asked for examples. This is despite my sense from observing him over eight months that he had a particular group of female non-Lusondoner friends (as I will explain in Chapter 6). Holloway & Jefferson (2000) question how able participants are both to analyse themselves and articulate this analysis to the researcher. Uncritical content analysis of interview data is thus problematic. On the other hand, Lewis & Lindsay (2000) highlight the dangers of ‘misinterpreting or overinterpreting’ (p193) when making inferences from interviews with children. I sought to avoid this by maintaining an awareness of the interview as a ‘communicative event’ (Briggs, 1986, p4) and so placing participants’ responses within a wider context. In the example involving Danilo outlined above, I was very aware that his initial excitement at being interviewed had worn off and his level of focus had diminished. My sense was that it was this, rather



than an explicit reticence to name particular friends, which lay behind his vague answer. Despite these issues, interviews can still play a useful role, particularly ‘as occasions for eliciting native interpretations of speech already collected in other situations’ (Duranti, 1997, p107, see also Hammersley & Atkinson, 1983). In my study, interviews thus formed part of a wider process and provided useful data for cross-referencing.

Talmy (2010) stresses the need to acknowledge ‘the role of the researcher/interviewer in co-constructing interview data—*whatever* their relationship to the interviewee’ (p137, original emphasis). This acknowledgement includes looking at power relations, both in local interaction, but also linked to wider roles and status. Echoing a scepticism expressed by Lewis & Lindsay (2000), Talmy writes that the notion of giving voice to participants is problematic as it ‘suggests the existence of a unitary, coherent, and essential self’ (p138). These considerations were particularly relevant during my follow-up interview with Danilo. At one point he referred to a “Brazilian” peer who he claimed to find annoying because she over-reacted to him teasing her about being from a “favela” (*shanty town*). This account was not supported by my own observations as I had frequently witnessed Danilo engaging in such teasing of this peer and appearing to revel in the protestations and play-fighting this provoked. Also, as I outline in Chapter 4, Danilo had a particular fascination with Brazil, and would often ask me questions about Brazilian culture as he knew I had spent time there. Our interaction on this topic in the interview was part of a longer pattern of exchanges where Danilo would outline stereotypes related to Brazil and ask me if these were “true”. Awareness both of this broader pattern, and of Danilo’s apparent enjoyment in teasing this particular “Brazilian” peer, were important in interpreting our exchanges in the interview. As with observation then, ethnographic interviews do not involve the straightforward eliciting of “facts” about participants and their perspectives. Rather they provide data which needs to be analysed critically and in a nuanced manner, as well as cross-referenced with other sources within the wider linguistic ethnographic endeavour. All these data sources contribute to a growing awareness of contexts, which then feeds back into analysis of the data themselves.

In Chapter 2 I set out the entrenched nature of both language ideologies and dominant discourses of essentialised ethnicities. Such notions would therefore have been likely to permeate any responses to straightforward interview questions about language and ethnicity. As I was seeking to get at the actual practices of

Lusondoners, the use of stand-alone interviews subjected to simple content analysis would have been an inadequate approach. Instead, the follow-up interviews I undertook, focused on reviewing short recordings of naturally occurring speech, had to be approached critically and theorised as communicative events in themselves. On top of this, they had to be cross-referenced with other sources of data which captured naturally-occurring practices. I will now set out more explicitly how these various methods were drawn together within a *linguistic* ethnographic approach.

### **3.2.6 Linguistic ethnography (LE) – an integrated approach**

In Chapter 1 I explained that current ethnic and linguistic monitoring regimes are unsatisfactory precisely because they do not account for the complexity of the micro level practices of Lusondoners beneath the macro level labels which are assigned to them. A linguistic ethnographic approach was therefore ideally suited to my study as it sought to investigate the relationship between broader categorisations and everyday practices. As I have stated above, an ethnographic perspective and close analysis of linguistic data are both part of one integrated approach within LE. Harris & Rampton (2009) summarise the importance of this, stating that ‘for a fuller -or indeed maybe for even only an *adequate* understanding of what people mean when they speak, the combination of linguistics, interaction analysis and ethnography provides valuable support’ (p109, original emphasis). Blommaert & Rampton (2011) are explicit about the reasons behind this:

‘In a multi-scalar view of context, features that used to be treated separately as macro – social class, ethnicity, gender, generation etc – can now be seen operating at the most micro-level of interactional process, as resources that participants can draw upon when making sense of what’s going on in a communicative event’ (p11).

Close linguistic analysis then operates at one end of the spectrum within a ‘multi-scalar view of context’. Indeed, Harris & Rampton (2009) stress that ‘in the process of abstracting and simplifying, it is vital to refer back continuously to what’s “lived” in the everyday’ (p116), reinforcing the importance of this ‘multi-scalar view of context’ at every stage of the research process. Hymes (1964), one of the earliest figures in this tradition, outlines a key characteristic of ethnographies of communication as being concerned with new data which reveal:

‘patterns which escape separate studies of grammar, of personality, of religion, of kinship and the like, each abstracting from the patterning of speech activity as such into some other frame of reference’ (p3).

An integrated approach is thus fundamental in the linguistic ethnographic study of social phenomena. In light of this, Blommaert (2014) emphasises the need to triangulate data, writing that '[t]he complexity of communicative events needs to be reflected in the data artefacts we employ to study them' (p12). This concern informed my decision to combine a broad biographical survey with participant observation, recordings of naturally occurring speech and follow-up interviews in my study.

Hammersley & Atkinson, (1983) point out that 'research design should be a reflexive process which operates throughout every stage of a project' (p24). The structure I set out here then is not a guide I followed blindly, but a framework which I actively engaged with throughout the research process. Hammersley & Traianou (2012) state that 'research is a form of praxis; in other words, it is an activity in which there must be continual attention to methodological, ethical, and prudential principles', highlighting the necessity for sustained reflexivity. In the following section, I set out more specifically how this reflexivity underpinned my approach to research ethics.

### **3.3 Ethnography, reflexivity and ethics**

Although I have touched upon some considerations related to reflexivity and ethics within my discussion of particular research methods, in this section I will outline the broader principles which guided my approach. I will also set out why I see reflexivity and ethics as intrinsically linked within the kind of ethnographic study I undertook.

#### **3.3.1 Reflexivity**

The endeavour to unravel sense-making practices necessitates a particularly integrated approach to ethics and reflexivity. Insider meanings cannot be adequately appreciated from the outside, thus a deep level of engagement with the local context is required on the part of the researcher. Understanding of context comes through experience of it, and this has fundamental implications for the role and status of the researcher. Hymes (1996) writes:

'The conditions of trust and confidence that good ethnography requires (if it is to gain access to valid knowledge of meanings) make it impossible to take as a goal the role of impartial observer.' (p13)

If the researcher is involved in the context they are researching then they necessarily become part of the analytical focus. This is what makes reflexivity so central to an

ethnographic approach. Potter & Wetherell (1987) define reflexivity as taking ‘social research, and its discourse, as a topic of study in its own right’ (p183), leading to a need to ‘construct analyses with a self-referential quality’ (p183). This is not simply about looking back on the field work and acknowledging moments where the researcher may have influenced participants, nor can it be reduced to setting a few ground rules on avoiding leading questions. Instead, reflexivity needs to be part of the researcher’s stance. When asking ‘What is going on here?’, the researcher must always be accounted for, both as physically present within the ‘here’ in question, but also as an agent constructing their own analysis from a particular perspective. One of the occasions when this seemed particularly relevant was during the retrospective interview that I carried out with Dara and Márcia (28/6/13). Both girls talked enthusiastically about their resentment at “Jamaicans” in the school (mentioned in section 3.2.5 above, and explored in detail in Chapter 7) a theme which also came up in other interactions within my data set involving these two girls. However, my sense was that their particularly animated exchanges on this occasion were partly a response to the opportunity to talk freely on a fairly taboo topic, with my status as a former teacher at the school adding to the novelty for them of this interaction. Just as ethnography eschews predetermined analytical frameworks, then, so the specific implications of the researcher’s position within the research cannot be pinned down in advance. Reflexivity must be a constant throughout the research process.

### **3.3.2 A reflexive approach to research ethics**

This need for a sustained ethnographic alertness is equally applicable to considerations of research ethics. While codes of practice abound in all areas of research, Hammersley & Traianou (2012) stress that ‘there is no way of eliminating all error, for example by applying some code, set of rules, or all-purpose tool’. Ethics are not universal, hygienic considerations which can be dealt with in preparation to entering the field site. Rather, like all knowledge and values, they are situated and thus require contextualisation. Hammersley & Traianou (2012) highlight the need to attend to the particular ethical values and priorities of participants:

‘Cultures differ in the priority they give to particular ethical principles and issues; for example in the weight they assign to individual autonomy as against loyalty to the group or respect for authority. At the same time, there can also be considerable variation in weight given to particular ethical principles *within* any particular culture.’

This suggests that an ethnographic perspective is key in contextualising ethical considerations. One example of how I employed such a perspective in my field work

was in my engagement with participants' preferences when it came to carrying out the short interviews for the broad biographical survey. While I was alert to the need to make these interviews as unobtrusive as possible on participants' lesson time so as not to disrupt their learning, I also suspected that most would be very keen to have an excuse to miss part of a lesson. I found almost every participant extremely eager to be interviewed and they appeared to enjoy both the chance to talk about their family and background, but also the brief respite from class time. There were some participants who voiced preferences not to miss a particular lesson though, and I always accommodated these requests. Murphy & Dingwall's (2001) description of the limitations of codes of practice supports this approach. They write that the uncritical adoption of ethical codes can 'actually increase the risk of harm by blunting ethnographers' sensitivities to the method-specific issues which do arise' (p340). Had I insisted on carrying out these interviews outside of lesson time, or stuck to strict timings, this would have been insensitive to the wishes of many of my participants. As with reflexivity more generally, consideration of ethics is not carried out externally to ethnographic fieldwork. On the contrary, the position of the researcher is part of the context under study, and it is within this context that ethical considerations must be situated. An ethnographic approach then entails sustained alertness both to the role of the researcher, and situated ethical considerations. With this in mind, I turn now to an account of my existing contextual awareness and positioning in relation to it.

### **3.3.3 Researcher and field site**

I stated above that ethnography seeks to understand 'insider' perspectives, so it is vital to emphasise my existing familiarity before entering the research site. Having been employed for five years as a teacher at the school prior to conducting my research there, my position demands acute reflexivity. I already had a particular perspective on what was going on in the school, grounded in extensive personal experience, and it was unrealistic to imagine that this could be easily suspended. In fact, this would not necessarily have been desirable, even if it were possible, as my existing familiarity provided useful data and strengthened my ethnographic warrant, providing it was treated critically. Woods (1986) writes that, in conducting ethnographic work in schools, the researcher will find that 'social reality' is 'composed of layers' and 'in flux' (p5), suggesting there is far more complexity to be grasped than my awareness at that time accounted for. Instead of attempting to scrap my existing impressions of the field site to make way for more 'objective' ones, a reflexive perspective acknowledges that all impressions are subjective, and

provide useful data if analysed as such. Crudely put, my knowledge of the field site was that of an insider in the staffroom, more of an outsider in the playground, and something in between in the contested space of the classroom. My responsibility for English as an Additional Language (EAL) at the school gave me a central role in the ethnic and linguistic monitoring regimes which formed part of my focus for investigation. I outlined in the introduction how my suspicions about the validity of these monitoring regimes stemmed directly from this experience. Some very specific pressures impacted on my stance as a practitioner, namely the regular demands placed on me to use ethnic and linguistic data to frame educational interventions. My own circumstances then also had to be accounted for as factors in my perspective, and I had to recognise that this was one particular insider perspective which could contribute to a wider range of data to be analysed.

This reflexivity also had to be applied to my interactions with participants. In an account of ethnographic work in school, Epstein (1998) describes how, despite her best attempts, she was ‘constantly re-inscribed within the discourse of adult-in-school, which is, primarily, that of teacher’ (p31). This was even more pertinent in my case as, although officially no longer a member of staff, I was inevitably still perceived as one by young people at the school. More specifically, due to my role as a language teacher, organiser of linguistic and cultural initiatives and occasional interpreter in the school, I was also viewed as a general advocate of languages and particularly associated with Portuguese. This profile, and the relationships I had built up with young people and parents, had to be treated with caution for two main reasons. Firstly, they could influence the ways in which participants engaged in the research. School-based initiatives tend to have an explicit purpose, some kind of educational goal, and young people can be very tuned into producing (or not) what they see as being “required”. This did not make data invalid, but it did further highlight why a critical perspective on my interactions with participants was essential. Secondly, my existing status in the school often meant that participants felt more comfortable about engaging with the research process, as it appeared as an understandable extension of my previous interaction with them. Conversely, it could also inadvertently place undue pressure on potential participants when seeking their consent to participate in the research. This is a complex area which, as I explain below, required careful theoretical consideration combined with a sensitive approach to individual participants.

Hammersley & Traianou (2012) point out that the concept of ‘consent’ is contingent on power relations bound up in the various roles we play, and Heath et al. (2007) stress this is a particular issue when dealing with young participants. My perceived ‘teacher’ status therefore placed me in a position of influence over students and, as Murphy & Dingwall (2001) make clear, signed consent forms do not necessarily indicate that participants’ rights have been respected. Instead, the onus is on the researcher to use their growing ethnographic awareness to continually reassess how well they are respecting their particular participants (Hammersley & Traianou: 2012; Murphy & Dingwall: 2001). On the one hand, my existing relations with participants, and the power implications of being a “White”, male adult, raised the potential of exerting undue influence. On the other hand, my knowledge of the participants also provided a basis for better understanding their particular needs, and I maintained a critical awareness throughout of how the research process impacted on the individuals involved, which influenced my approach in a number of ways:

- i. Firstly, as I mentioned in section 3.2.1, while collecting signed consent forms from all participants and their parents, I did not question those young people who chose not to participate about their reasons. As a former staff member at the school, such questioning on my part could have made some young people feel pressured to participate.
- ii. Secondly, when arranging the short interviews for the biographical survey, I allowed young people to choose the time so as not to miss their favourite lesson. My previous role as EAL coordinator had included taking young people out of lessons to confirm and update details on their home situation, and from this I had a fairly well developed sense of how to engage young people positively. I found that young people generally enjoyed talking about themselves and their families if they perceived that the questioner was both genuinely interested in, and respectful of, their answers. The fact that young people generally engaged enthusiastically with my questions during these survey interviews, with many afterwards encouraging other friends to participate, suggests this approach had some success.
- iii. Thirdly, by regularly employing both Portuguese and English with young people, I made it clear that they were free to use Portuguese with me. This provided a certain counterbalance to my perceived authority as my experience suggested this could facilitate interactions which did not strictly conform to the traditional teacher/pupil dynamic, with young people feeling less obliged to act in a formal and compliant manner. For example, both Danilo and the young person who declined to be a key participant expressed

in Portuguese their concerns to me about wearing the microphone. This also set my study apart to some extent as researchers bringing a linguistic ethnographic perspective to bear upon educational contexts in the UK often do not speak the languages other than English used by their participants (eg. Rampton, 1995b; Harris, 2006).

The impact of my ongoing focus on participants' rights was evident in the fact that, as mentioned above, one young person who was happy to participate in the biographical survey and who initially agreed to participate in audio data-gathering, later changed his mind about wearing the lapel microphone. This suggests young people were confident to refuse participation in elements of the research they did not feel comfortable with.

### **3.3.4 Considerations beyond the field work period**

In this chapter I have described an ongoing approach to reflexivity and research ethics, detailing the potential concerns at each stage of data collection. In this final section I would like to point out how these considerations extend beyond the period of actual data collection. In terms of analysis, Hymes (1996) highlights the impossibility of universally accepted conclusions from ethnography, writing that '[w]e can probably not hope to reach the point at which no one will object, but you analyzed the school in isolation from X, or started the analysis from Y instead of Z' (p12). This reinforces the need for the researcher to give their own situated perspective. Absolute truth cannot be the goal. Instead, the researcher must give their own account and acknowledge it as such, critically examining their own stance and detailing the limitations of their methodology. This also applies to ethical considerations. Murphy & Dingwall (2001) state that the main risks with ethnographic research come at publication. Although I have anonymised all my data, they point out that ethnographers 'are rarely able to give *absolute* guarantees that the identities of people and places will remain hidden' (p341, original emphasis). They go on to warn:

'knowledge can be used to manipulate or embarrass those it concerns, misrepresented by others, particularly in light of increased pressure for dissemination in social sciences (p341).

Murphy & Dingwall (2001) point out that there is also the danger of participants reading the final report as 'truth' given that 'positivism is the currently dominant epistemology' (p342). Hammersley & Traianou (2012) identify the potential for a range of individuals to be involved beyond direct participants, as wider groups and



collectivities represented by those in the study can be implicated. My approach of challenging generalised accounts of groups can be both a strength and a weakness in this respect. On the one hand, I am specifically seeking to question grand narratives about “Portuguese” young people by focusing on the complex specificity of individuals and their interactions. On the other hand, this focus on specificity makes the risk of identifying individuals all the greater. Nevertheless, I took steps to mitigate this danger by using pseudonyms for all participants and not mentioning the name of the school where I carried out my field work.

There is no simple resolution to this issue. Murphy & Dingwall (2001) identify two broad schools in dealing with ethical questions. *Consequentialist* approaches ‘focus on the outcomes of research’ (p339) asking if any harm has been caused and, if so, if it is outweighed by any benefits. *Deontological* approaches on the other hand ‘focus on the inherent *rights* of research participants’ (p339, original emphasis). I see the kind of ongoing reflexivity I have outlined as a middle path between these two extremes. Neither participants’ rights nor the benefits of research are as clearly definable as some codes of practice appear to imply. Participants cannot be imagined as some kind of universal subject whose concerns and wishes can be predicted in advance. This was exemplified when Danilo’s initial concern about wearing the microphone suddenly vanished and he explicitly asked to be recorded. Danilo’s wishes could not be predicted in advance as they changed day by day. Similarly, the point of research is to discover new knowledge and, if it is currently unknown then by implication so are the benefits it could bring. One small example of this was the satisfaction which Dara and Márcia expressed at having the opportunity to voice their frustrations about ethnic/racial labelling during the follow-up interview I conducted with them. As I will detail in Chapter 7, both girls were engaged in an ongoing struggle in relation to the label “Black”, and they spoke at great length about this during the interview. When I apologised for the fact that I had used up over an hour of their time, they both said this was OK as they had enjoyed this rare opportunity to discuss the issues raised. Participants’ rights, and benefits of research, then, emerge as part of the ethnographic endeavour. It is up to the researcher to be as well-informed, prepared and reflexive as possible. Research ethics are another element of the research process which, like everything in ethnography, is about keeping an open mind and applying reasoned judgement.

Existing studies of “Portuguese” young people in the UK provide a pertinent example of how detailed attention to processes can be more important than initial

intentions in research. Despite the advocatory aspirations of a number of such studies (eg. Abreu: 2003, Abreu & Lambert: 2003, Abreu, Cline & Lambert: 2003, Barradas: 2004, Demie & Lewis: 2008, 2010), I outlined in Chapter 1 how the inadequate theorisations of language and ethnicity in which they are rooted have led to an unjustified association between ‘Portuguese’ and ‘underachievement’. My study then seeks to address a gap in the existing literature in relation to young people in the UK labelled as “Portuguese”. By taking a ‘practices’ approach to language and ethnicity I hope to give a more nuanced and accurate account of the individuals thus labelled.

### **3.4 Chapter conclusion**

The Portuguese Language Orthographic Agreement outlined in Chapter 2 provides a clear example of how the notion of a common Lusophone identity plays out on the international stage. In an economically motivated drive for standardisation, ideas about “correct” and “incorrect” Portuguese are debated along national lines, with agreements reached in accordance with the economic and political might of nation states. My study of a Lusondoner discursive space has almost nothing in common with this endeavour, although participants did occasionally employ similar ideas about national and regional varieties of Portuguese within bantering exchanges amongst friends. I was not interested in universal notions of “right”, “wrong” or “authenticity” in relation to Portuguese. Instead, I investigated what Portuguese language practices could mean in a London space. From the survey data I gained a deeper awareness of participants’ backgrounds and the influences they received from home and family. As Blommaert (2014) advises, ‘[s]urvey work needs to be driven by ethnographically established and ecologically valid questions and insights, and quantitative outcomes need to be ethnographically verified’ (p12). In the following chapters I will present a series of analytic descriptions, highlighting the positionings that existed amongst Lusondoners at school. Through this I will set out how the diverse Lusophone links they brought with them played out in different ways, both in terms of connections with other Lusondoners, and the extent and manner in which they were recognised, or not, by other Londoners.

In this chapter I have set out how an ethnographic approach focusing on actual practices facilitates a more nuanced understanding of the ethnic and linguistic complexity in superdiverse contexts such as south London. The interactional and

survey data which this approach enabled me to gather are explored in subsequent chapters and suggest a broad pattern: the experience of living in the superdiverse environment of south London, mediated via the local peer context, is instrumental in framing individuals' ethnic and linguistic practices and affiliations. Young people's complex webs of ethnic and linguistic experience and inheritance provide potential points of connection which will at times coincide with and at times go beyond more simplistic ethnic and linguistic categorisations. While a "Brazilian" in Rio may feel no particular affiliation to someone from Portugal, within the context of a south London school their shared access to a common Lusondoner discursive space takes on a greater significance. However, this "context of south London" needs interrogating in itself. What will become apparent from the interactional data set out in the following chapters is how south London is populated by widely circulating discourses about particular languages and ethnicities. Individuals' complex webs of ethnic and linguistic experience and inheritance do not operate in a vacuum, but within a crowded landscape where notions such as "Black" or African" already carry local (albeit contested) connotations. As I will set out in Chapter 7, two key participants, Dara and Márcia, struggle to square being "Black" in London with their Lusophone African Portuguese descent, dominated as the local discursive space is with ideas of "Jamaicanness" and "Nigerianness". The interaction then of individuals' complex webs of experience and descent within the south London context leads to shifting ethnically- and linguistically-linked points of connection as well as friction. As I have set out in this chapter, this understanding was made possible through combining a broad biographical survey with the methods of linguistic ethnography which go beyond predetermined ethnic and linguistic categories to engage with the complexity of actual practices.

## Chapter 4

### A Lusondoner discursive space

*“I hate people like Jim. You’re Portuguese and you say that you’re English”*  
 Vinício (field notes 5/3/13)

#### 4.0 Introduction

In this thesis I am proposing the term ‘Lusondoner’ in order to address limitations in existing literature concerning Portuguese speakers in the UK, and more specifically in London. ‘Lusondoner’ responds to the heterogeneity of the participants in my study by providing a more open categorisation, neither wedded to standard language ideologies, nor carrying assumptions of reified ethnic identities. As I outlined in Chapter 2, use of the term “Portuguese” in academic studies does not account for the complex migration trajectories, affiliations and linguistic repertoires of those assigned this label. The vignettes in the introduction to this thesis suggest that rigid and reductive taxonomies underpin ethnic and linguistic monitoring regimes, as well as informing popular discourses, in the school where I carried out my field work. Significant groupings are denied recognition, as shown when Jéssica’s Brazilian descent was subsumed under the ethnic category “White Portuguese”. Equally, hybridity goes unaccounted for, as evidenced by Jamila’s “Black Caribbean” categorisation despite her mixture of Angolan and Jamaican descent. However, beneath this question of groupings and appropriate labels is the more nuanced issue of the actual repertoires and affiliations of individuals. The quotation at the head of this chapter shows Vinício (Year 10, male, “White Portuguese – Madeiran”) during a Portuguese GCSE lesson criticising his classmate Jim for claiming to be English. Although Jim’s parents were born in Madeira, he was born in the UK, had only visited Madeira once and had only extremely rudimentary knowledge of Portuguese. While Jim and Vinício disagreed about how Jim was best categorised, both espoused an absolutist conceptualisation of ethnicity. Jim’s refusal of “Portugueseness” was based on the same “all or nothing” approach as Vinício’s commitment to it. What my ethnographic data reveal is a vast spectrum of Lusophone-related knowledge, experience, fluency and claimed expertise. Vinício and Jim may both be described

as having Madeiran descent but in practice this manifested itself in completely different ways.

As explored in Chapter 2, some academic studies have investigated specific Lusophone fractions in the UK, such as Brazilians (Souza, 2006) or Madeirans (Mar-Molinero, 2010). However, none explicitly addresses three key features of superdiverse contexts such as London:

- i. the spectrum of knowledge, expertise and engagement within Lusophone fractions and how individuals are positioned in relation to this;
- ii. the hybridity of individuals drawing on complex family migration trajectories which encompass various Lusophone and non-Lusophone countries;
- iii. the locally grounded interplay between individuals with different transnational Lusophone ties.

The conflicting orientations of Jim and Vinício outlined above highlight the significance of this first point, while Jamila’s dual Jamaican/Angolan heritage (described in the vignettes at the beginning of this thesis) captures the second. The importance of the third point can be seen in the apparent linguistic borrowing between Adriana (Year 11, female, “White Portuguese – Madeiran”) and Alícia (Year 11, female, “Brazilian”), also documented within the vignettes in the introduction to this thesis. It was Adriana and Alícia’s co-presence in London, as much as their ties to different Lusophone countries, which facilitated their linguistic borrowing. Neither the descriptor “Portuguese” nor “Lusophone” then adequately renders the heterogeneity, hybridity and locally rooted specificity of the various practices and affiliations amongst my participants. In this chapter I set out why the term ‘Lusondoner’ and the notion of a ‘Lusondoner discursive space’ provide a way into conceptualising Londoners with transnational Lusophone links which is more open to the complexities outlined above.

In Part I, I set out the structure of the Lusondoner discursive space. I start in section 4.1 by explaining why I am proposing the term ‘Lusondoner discursive space’ to describe how London-based individuals with ties to various Lusophone countries interact, drawing on a common pool of Lusophone-indexed references. I set out how “Lusondonerness” manifests neither as a fixed ethnic essence nor as a bounded linguistic variety. Instead, it denotes a *local* common discursive space to which young people with ties to Lusophone locations across the world have varying levels of access. In section 4.2 I describe three broad ethnolinguistic fractions behind this

term which emerge from my broad biographical survey data, highlighting their key constitutive features.

*Lusondoner fractions*

- i. “White Portuguese” (including significant subcategories of “Madeiran” and “Mainland” Portuguese)
- ii. “Brazilian”
- iii. “Black Portuguese”

I explain that, although Lusondoners do not share identical experiences and practices, these young people do have some shared awareness and recognition of features associated with the fractions listed above. This is not evenly distributed, and the “Black Portuguese” fraction suffers from limited recognition while “Brazilians” often attract a particularly exoticising gaze. However, there is sufficient mutual understanding to provide a common set of diverse Lusophone-indexed references, contributing to a local Lusondoner discursive space.

In Part II, I set out the Lusondoner discursive space in interactional practice. Through examples relating to each of the Lusondoner ethnic fractions in turn, I demonstrate how Lusondoners orient towards this base level of shared, Lusophone-indexed, transnational references in locally grounded ways, facilitating peer interactions and connections not available to those beyond this group. I show that, although these shared references do not necessarily amount to extensive understanding of each other’s backgrounds, they provide a starting point for friendships which then facilitate a deepening of awareness. I argue that it is through London-based, Lusophone-inflected friendships that these individuals develop consciousness of a Lusondoner peer group, and of themselves as a constitutive part. Part of this process is the way they extend their knowledge of other Lusondoner fractions through close contact with individuals from different Lusophone backgrounds. As opposed to signalling common practices and affiliations, Lusophone ties provide entry to a common (albeit heterogeneous) local discursive space which different individuals respond to in different ways, depending on their own goals and resources. This fits with Blommaert & Backus’ (2012) insistence on attending to the complexity of individuals’ biographical trajectories in contexts of superdiversity. They highlight linguistic repertoires as a way into ‘analyzing the social and cultural itineraries followed by people’ (p26). Using the concept of the Lusondoner as a frame of reference to examine how Lusophone-indexed affiliations and linguistic practices are deployed in the school, then, provides a window on the workings of contemporary London superdiversity.

## Part I – The structure of the Lusondoner discursive space

### 4.1 A Lusondoner discursive space

In Chapter 1 I described the term ‘Lusondoner’ as referring to all London-based young people with links to Lusophone locations. In this section I set out how interactions between these individuals within a south London context can be seen as constituting a particular discursive space. I start by explaining what I mean by ‘discursive space’, then outline how this notion accommodates the diversity and hybridity, in terms of “language”, “nation” and “ethnicity”, characteristic of Lusondoners.

#### 4.1.1 Discursive space

As I outlined in Chapter 2, Lusondoners can be seen as a ‘complex diaspora’ (Werbner, 2004) in that they encompass various strands which have points of both convergence and difference. Rather than amounting to a reified collective Lusondoner identity, this mutual recognition is part of what I describe as a Lusondoner discursive space. This can be seen as a patchwork of connections, but with no assumption of completeness or boundedness. Heller (2010) writes:

*‘Discursive spaces* are assemblages of interconnected sites [...] traversed by the *trajectories* of participants and of *resources* regulated there. They ask us to think in terms of linkages and trajectories, of webs, rather than in terms of, say, rooted or fixed objects or even of levels.’ (p11, original emphases)

Although Heller is describing discursive space operating at the much higher scale level of ‘francophone Canada’ in general, I believe her definition is useful in relation to Lusondoners. As I outlined in Chapter 2, previous studies have categorised Lusophones in the UK via language, nation or ethnicity. However, Heller’s focus on trajectories and resources emphasises individual biographies, and the awareness which stems from them, over supposed “communities”. I believe this is much more suited to the participants in my study, embedded as they are in the superdiverse conditions of contemporary London where it is common for ties and affiliations to cross what are often assumed to be firm and distinct community boundaries.

Heller’s use of the notion of ‘discursive space’ in relation to ‘francophone Canada’ allows her to draw links between diverse individuals, groups, sites and practices. This is useful in a context where language explicitly does not map neatly onto nation

state and ethnicity. Similarly, I am using discursive space in relation to Lusondoners because of the open frame of reference it provides. ‘Lusondoner’ can be read in two interlinked ways. Firstly, it can refer to a group of individuals, London-based with Lusophone transnational links, largely falling into the three fractions of “White Portuguese”, “Black Portuguese” and “Brazilian” (as I detail in subsequent sections). Secondly, it refers to a set of common understandings about each other shared by these fractions. It is these common understandings which act as the ‘linkages’ Heller refers to. Alícia (Year 11, female, “Brazilian”) and Adriana (Year 11, female, “White Portuguese – Madeiran”), described in the vignettes in the introduction to this thesis, did not share a common ethnic background or migration trajectory. They were linked by their common understanding of Portuguese language as well as their mutual recognition of each other’s “Madeiranness” and “Brazianness”, not readily available to non-Lusophone peers. They were not part of a homogeneous bloc, but an interconnected network, or ‘web’ in Heller’s words, all within a specific local London context. This conceptualisation is open to the full range of ways that Lusophone-linked practices and affiliations can manifest themselves. It is not restricted to standard varieties of Portuguese language, bounded ethnicities or straightforward migration trajectories. Instead, the Lusondoner discursive space encompasses, for example, Adriana’s Brazilian-inflected Madeiran Portuguese and Jamila’s Angolan-Jamaican “Britishness” as well as Jim’s rejection of “Portugueseness”.

To summarise, Lusondoners share a set of commonly recognised references rooted in interlinked migration trajectories, as opposed to a common ethnic background. This manifests in shared understandings about Lusophone-indexed phenomena which are not immediately accessible to outsiders. These shared understandings grow out of specific biographies and trajectories. “Lusondonerness” then is not something preformed which Lusondoners can join. Rather, it is constituted by Lusondoners themselves. It is therefore an intrinsically flexible concept and in this thesis I present instances of how it is apprehended, not what it means definitively. The Lusondoner discursive space emerges through interactions between Lusondoners, sometimes explicitly foregrounded and at other times just one of many threads within contexts of multiethnic conviviality. In the following subsections I set out how this notion of a Lusondoner discursive space accommodates the complexity and hybridity which Lusondoners bring in relation to “language”, “nation” and “ethnicity”.



#### **4.1.2 Lusondoners and the problem of “language”**

The notion of a Lusondoner discursive space accommodates the heterogeneous linguistic repertoires of Lusondoners and the different ways these are drawn on by individuals. Simply describing Lusondoners as “Portuguese speakers” fails to acknowledge this complexity, as I set out in this section. The example of Jim and Vinício, discussed in the introduction to this chapter, is indicative of the kind of linguistic complexity which the notion of a Lusondoner discursive space accommodates. While both young people were recorded within official school data as having Portuguese as their “home language”, Jim had only extremely limited knowledge of it. In the Portuguese GCSE lessons I observed, Jim was unable to engage in even the simplest exchanges in Portuguese, whereas Vinício conversed fluently. However, Vinício did appear to struggle significantly with more demanding literacy activities in Portuguese, and complained consistently when given written tasks to complete. My sense from the months observing Vinício in these lessons was that his Portuguese literacy lagged far behind his oral fluency, and this was not surprising considering his formal schooling in Portuguese ended when he left Madeira at the age of 10. Despite Vinício’s obvious oral fluency though, there are almost no examples within my data of him using Portuguese in interactions with peers outside of his Portuguese classes. This is in stark contrast to Alícia (Year 11, female, “Brazilian”), another key participant, who employed Portuguese the majority of the time in her interactions with peers, and had sufficient literacy in Portuguese to pass her GCSE examination without any formal teaching. These differing profiles in terms of fluency and usage expose the limitations of “Portuguese-speaking” as a coherent categorisation which the more open and flexible notion of a Lusondoner discursive space overcomes.

Another factor which is better accounted for in terms of a Lusondoner discursive space is the use of multiple varieties of Portuguese, alongside a range of other languages. The case of Adriana and Alícia in the vignettes presented during the introduction highlights this, with each bringing in a distinct variety of Portuguese language from home (Madeiran and Brazilian respectively). While some existing literature on Portuguese speakers in the UK provides a useful refinement to the broad category of “Portuguese” by pointing to distinct fractions (Santarita & Martin-Jones: 1991; Beswick & Dinneen: 2010), these studies do not directly address the fuller range of languages and varieties used and how these are employed in context-specific ways. Nor do they address the heterogeneity in fluency, literacy and actual usage outlined above. This is a gap my study addresses through combining a broad

biographical survey with ethnographic observation and analysis of naturally occurring speech. As I show below, data from this broad biographical survey highlight the need to take a more nuanced approach to language when investigating Lusondoners, which the notion of a Lusondoner discursive space responds to.

At the school where I conducted my fieldwork, almost 11% of the student body was recorded as having “Portuguese” as their “home language”. Of the 58 young people who participated in my survey, 54 fell into this category, the other 4 having “English” as their “home language”. However, there were other levels of diversity not represented in this figure. The following table shows the combined number of languages spoken by the parents and grandparents of each survey respondent:

*Table II: Number of languages in Lusondoners’ families*

<b>Combined number of languages spoken by parents and grandparents</b>	<b>Number of young people</b>
2	27
3	18
4	6
5	3
6	4

Only in just under half of families were languages limited to Portuguese and English alone. Although these figures do not imply that the young people themselves were fluent in or even exposed to all of these languages, they do highlight that more complex linguistic backgrounds were fairly common amongst Lusondoners. The table below shows which languages were cited by participants as being spoken by members of their family:

*Table III: Languages mentioned other than English and Portuguese*

<b>Language</b> (as reported by participant)	<b>Number of participants who mentioned it</b>
Spanish	18
French	13
Italian	9
Kimbundu <sup>37</sup>	4
Cape Verdean	3
German	3
Lingala <sup>38</sup>	2
Angolan	1
Jamaican	1
Fula	1
São Tomé and Príncipe	1

This table shows that Spanish, French and Italian stood out as the most widely known other languages amongst Lusondoners' family members. The table also shows three languages, as reported by young people, which appear to be varieties of Portuguese or Portuguese-based creoles: "Cape Verdean", "São Tomé and Príncipe" and "Angolan". In both Cape Verde and São Tomé and Príncipe the main languages are local varieties of Portuguese and Portuguese-based creoles. What participants were then likely to be referring to in citing these countries was the use of the relevant local varieties or Portuguese creoles within their family. Similarly, the term "Angolan" is likely to refer to a local variety of Portuguese or Portuguese-based creole. Although it could refer to one of the local Bantu languages, the participant in question also cited "Lingala" as a language spoken within the family, suggesting she was well informed enough to refer to specific Bantu languages where necessary. These references to local varieties of Portuguese and Portuguese-based creoles show that the notion of "Portuguese" as a home language needs to be approached with caution. As well as the range of different African-derived Portuguese language varieties highlighted in the table, there are also significant differences between Madeiran, Brazilian and mainland Portuguese varieties spoken by participants, as evidenced in the audio recorded data I collected. This is explored at various points in the coming chapters. The summarised data in the tables above, then, show that labelling Lusondoners as "Portuguese speakers" is a partial description which can overlook significant sections of their linguistic repertoires. The multilingualism evident

<sup>37</sup> Ethnologue (2017b) describes Kimbundu as a language of Angola with a total of 1,700,000 speakers.

<sup>38</sup> Ethnologue (2017a) describes Lingala as a language of the Democratic Republic of Congo with a total of 2,256,710 speakers.

amongst Lusondoners is rooted in contemporary London's superdiversity, and this is not brought out by existing London-based studies of "Portuguese speakers" in which any references to language use focus solely on English and Portuguese (Keating: 2005, Souza: 2008; 2010, Barradas: 2004, Demie & Lewis: 2008; 2010, Arago: 2103). My conceptualisation of a Lusondoner discursive space accommodates this multilingualism, as I set out below.

Given the diversity behind the label "Portuguese-speaking" sketched out above, it is necessary to define how this is addressed by my notion of a Lusondoner discursive space. In Chapter 2 I outlined three aspects to "speaking Portuguese" either absent or not adequately conceptualised within existing literature:

- i. the different profiles of individuals in terms of their oral fluency in Portuguese and their ability and disposition to draw on this element of their linguistic repertoire;
- ii. the co-presence of distinct varieties of Portuguese (including non-Standard ones) within the same cohort of young people, and sometimes within the linguistic repertoire of individuals;
- iii. the mingling of individuals with differences and overlaps in relation to the profiles and linguistic repertoires mentioned above, and the potential for mixing and hybridisation this affords.

My use of the term Lusondoner encompasses individuals across the full range of profiles and linguistic repertoires alluded to above. Rather than attempting to define and delineate a group such as "native speakers" or "first language speakers" of Portuguese, my frame of reference is explicitly open to the actual diversity discernible through empirical observation. This is key to my definition of Lusondoners. From a linguistic perspective, Lusondoners can be defined as any London-based individuals with some kind of connection to some variety of the Portuguese language. However, these connections have to be understood empirically, hence the need for an ethnographic approach. Instead of starting with broad structures such as standard languages, nationalities or ethnicities as interpretive matrices, ethnography facilitates a focus on individuals and their practices and interactions. As I explained in the previous section, the idea of 'discursive space' allows for a conceptualisation within which standard languages or varieties may be salient for individuals and how they connect to others, without reducing individuals simply to members of bounded linguistic "communities". In this way, *Alicia* (Year 11, female, "Brazilian") could connect with *Adriana* (Year 11, female, "White Portuguese – Madeiran") through their shared knowledge of

Portuguese, but this did not preclude Alícia engaging at other times with “Brazilian” friends through their orientations to specifically Brazilian varieties of Portuguese.

#### 4.1.3 Lusondoners and the problem of “nation”

The multilingualism outlined above hints at complex migration trajectories within the families of Lusondoners. This makes isolated use of nationality or country of birth problematic as ways of categorising individuals with various and ongoing transnational links, another limitation which the notion of a Lusondoner discursive space addresses. The example of Jim (Year 11, male, “White Portuguese – Madeiran”) and Vinício (Year 11, male, “White Portuguese – Madeiran”) outlined above might seem to suggest that country of birth largely correlates with linguistic repertoire and affiliation but data from the broad biographical survey I carried out complicates this simple picture, exposing significant complexity in the migration trajectories of Lusondoners. The table below presents the countries of birth of the 58 participants I surveyed.

*Table IV: Lusondoners’ countries of birth*

<b>Country of birth</b>	<b>Number of young people</b>
UK	21
Madeira <sup>39</sup>	14
Portugal	12
Brazil	9
Angola	1
Ireland	1

What is immediately apparent from this table is that over one third of the Lusondoners were UK-born, highlighting the significance of the UK within the conceptualisation of Lusondoners. There were also large contingents from Madeira, Portugal and Brazil, but only one participant born in Lusophone Africa. However, migration trajectories were not always as simple as being born abroad and moving at some point to settle in the UK. Seven of the 58 Lusondoners surveyed had moved more than once:

- 2 were born in the UK, moved to Portugal then returned;
- 1 was born in the UK, moved to Angola then returned;

---

<sup>39</sup> Although Madeira is part of the state of Portugal, its distinct location and emigration patterns (as explored in Chapter 2), as well as the number of participants born there, made it worth treating as a territory in its own right for the purposes of this study.

- 1 was born in Portugal and spent time in Guinea Conakry before settling in the UK;
- 2 were born in Brazil and spent time living in Italy before settling in the UK;
- 1 was born in Angola and lived in Portugal, the USA and Canada before settling in the UK.

These data suggest that migration trajectories are often more than just a tale of two cities, and this becomes even clearer when looking at wider family migration trajectories.

*Table V: Combined number of countries lived in by the parents and grandparents of each Lusondoner*

<b>Number of countries (apart from UK) within last 2 generations</b>	<b>Number of young people</b>
1	15 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 7 from Portugal</li> <li>• 7 from Madeira</li> <li>• 1 from Brazil</li> </ul>
2	21
3	12
4	7
5	1
6	1
7	1

These data show that only about one quarter of the families had a simple trajectory involving one other country apart from the UK. Just over half had 2 or 3 countries and 10 had 4-7 countries. This suggests that experience of living in a number of countries was a common feature of the recent family history of Lusondoners. Migration then is not simply one-way or one-off but entails multiple ongoing links and very different individual family stories. My interactional data show that the sensibilities which individuals had in relation to these countries were complex and varied according to context, as I outline in the following chapters. These data reinforce the need for a nuanced approach to Lusondoners which is not based on simplistic categorisations such as country of birth. Despite this, existing literature dealing with Lusophone young people at school in the UK is largely grounded in such categories (Abreu & Lambert: 2003; Barradas: 2004). These studies then do not directly deal with the complexities, in terms of migration trajectories, of these young people. This is another gap my study addresses through the notion of a Lusondoner discursive space.

As with the label “Portuguese-speaking”, the apparently simple categories of “nationality” or “country of birth” mask deeper levels of complexity which must be directly addressed. Again, there are three elements to this:

- i. individuals with complex personal and family migration trajectories, often incorporating several Lusophone as well as non-Lusophone countries or regions;
- ii. the various, context-specific sensibilities held in relation to these countries and regions;
- iii. the mingling of individuals with differences and overlaps in their migration trajectories, and the potential for connections and conviviality which this affords.

The heterogeneity outlined above in relation to migration trajectories highlights the limitations of relying on broad categorisations. Lusondoners cannot be tied to a predefined set of migration patterns. Being a Lusondoner means having some kind of connection to at least one Lusophone country, but this definition also encompasses individuals with ties to a number of both Lusophone and non-Lusophone countries. As when approaching language then, to get at this complexity an ethnographic perspective is required which engages with the nuances in the lives of individuals. The idea of ‘discursive space’ which I detail in this thesis allows for a conceptualisation of how these connections play out when this diverse cohort of individuals interacts.

#### **4.1.4 Lusondoners and the problem of “ethnicity”**

Within the vignettes in the introduction to this thesis, I described how Jéssica, A Brazilian-born young person holding an Italian passport, was directed to tick “White European Portuguese” on the school’s ethnic monitoring form. I also pointed to the case of Jamila, a young person of dual Jamaican and Angolan descent whose Lusophone heritage went largely unnoticed within the school. These examples highlight the pitfalls of adopting a simple, ethnicity-based approach to describing Lusondoners: official ethnic taxonomies<sup>40</sup>, and the popular understandings they contribute to shaping, rely on simplistic categories which fail to account for the complexities of individuals. A key shortcoming of these taxonomies is the inclusion of colour-based “racial” categories such as “White”, alongside nationality categories such as “Vietnamese” and broadly ethnic labels such as “Gypsy/Roma”. As I

---

<sup>40</sup> See Appendix V for a full list of the ethnic categories employed by schools in the London Borough of Lambeth, where I carried out my research.

explained in Chapter 2, although ethnicity is popularly understood as an inherited set of attributes, from an empirical perspective it can be seen to function as a phenomenon of shared practices, both in terms of behaviours and the framework of meanings within which they operate. Seeing ethnicity in terms of practices allows for the flux and hybridisation particularly prevalent in superdiverse contexts. It can also enable a rebalancing to counter the overemphasis on transnational links implicit in ethnic categories such as “White European Portuguese” which include no acknowledgement of local affiliations. The notion of a Lusondoner discursive space provides a framework for investigating ethnic affiliations via practices, overcoming the limitations of essentialised conceptualisations ethnicity.

The table below shows how the 58 Lusondoners who participated in my broad biographical survey were recorded within school records on “ethnicity”:

*Table VI: “Ethnic group” of Lusondoners according to official school data*

<b>Ethnic group</b>	<b>Number of young people</b>
White Portuguese	42
Any other White background	7
Any other Black background	2
Any other Mixed background	1
Mixed White and Black African	2
Any other ethnic group	2
Black African	1
Black Caribbean	1

While there was a strong correlation between Lusondoners and the “White Portuguese” ethnic category, with over 72% of participants linked to this label, this data shows that just under one third of Lusondoners were spread across 7 other categories. This suggests that there is no single official ethnic category which can account for Lusondoners. Also, the examples of Jamila and Jéssica cited above show that individual categories can be at best a “loose fit” for those assigned to them. Some existing studies show that an approach to ethnicity based on practices can help to describe distinct Lusophone fractions in the UK, and also highlight their rootedness within specific localities (Keating: 2005; Beswick: 2005; Mar-Molinero: 2010; Sheringham: 2010). What my study adds is an account of the heterogeneity within these fractions as well as their local interconnectedness. Rather than taking any particular Lusophone fraction as a starting point, my study examines the various fractions which emerge within the superdiverse context of a London school. As with



language and nationality outlined above, this enables an account of three phenomena in relation to ethnicity amongst Lusondoners not explored in the studies described above:

- i. the ethnic hybridity of individuals such as Jamila (outlined in the vignettes);
- ii. context-specific orientations towards ethnic positionings;
- iii. the mingling of individuals with differences and overlaps in their ethnic practices and affiliations, and the potential for commonalities and conviviality which this affords.

Investigating Lusondoners then requires not only a broad approach encompassing linguistic repertoire, migration trajectory and ethnic affiliation, it also demands an openness to the diverse and hybrid ways these elements can manifest in practice. This necessitates a conceptual framework not restricted to reductive taxonomies which envisage bounded groupings, and this is why I am proposing the notion of a Lusondoner discursive space. In the section 4.2 below I use data from the broad biographical survey I undertook to describe the distinct fractions I identified within the Lusondoner discursive space. In Part II, I then draw on field notes and recordings of naturally occurring speech to highlight some of the ways in which these fractions can be glimpsed empirically in interactional practice. In setting out the nuances within this data I show the necessity of an ethnographic approach to language and ethnicity in order to unpick the complexities thrown up by superdiverse contexts such as London.

#### **4.2 Empirically grounded groupings within the Lusondoner discursive space**

Despite the heterogeneity amongst Lusondoners highlighted in the previous section, there are a number of orientating positions which emerged from my data. In the course of my research, as I described in Chapter 3, I carried out observations over a period of eight months, visiting 97 lessons, as well as recording and analysing over 35 hours of naturally occurring speech and 5 hours of retrospective interviews. From all of this data I developed an apprehension of three distinct groupings amongst Lusondoners:

- i. “White Portuguese” (including subcategories of “Madeiran” and “Mainland” Portuguese);
- ii. “Brazilian”;

iii. “Black Portuguese”.

These fractions and subcategories can also be discerned within patterns in the data from the broad biographical survey I undertook. Aragao (2013) in her study of ‘Luso-London’ sketches a similar tripartite breakdown, noting the presence of ‘Portuguese’, ‘Brazilians’ and ‘Luso Africans’. However, Aragao adopts a nation-state framework for categorising her informants which, as I outlined in the previous section, fails to account fully for the complexities of my research participants. The labels I am employing are not necessarily those that Lusondoners use to refer to themselves. While “Brazilian” is a term which features frequently in my data, “White Portuguese” and “Black Portuguese” do not. However, I set out my justification for my own categorisations below, firstly by drawing on data from the broad biographical survey I undertook, and then in Part II by triangulating this with ethnographic data from field notes and audio recordings. What emerges is a sketch of the framework of mutually recognised fractions which, although not always explicitly articulated, form a key constitutive feature of the Lusondoner discursive space. In setting out this sketch, I start with an account of “White Portuguese”, the largest of the three fractions I identified amongst my participants.

#### **4.2.1 “White Portuguese” (“Mainland” and “Madeiran”)**

I am using “White Portuguese” to refer to the 36 Lusondoners I surveyed for whom the majority of their parents and grandparents were born in and/or have strong ties to Madeira or mainland Portugal. These individuals are likely to have arrived in the UK during primary school, or been born here, and make regular visits to family members in mainland Portugal or Madeira. Young people in this category generally have a “Mediterranean” appearance (dark eyes and hair with pale to olive skin) and all but two were recorded as “White Portuguese” within the school’s ethnic monitoring data (two were recorded as “White Other”). This “White Portuguese” fraction however is not to be confused with the school’s ethnic monitoring category bearing the same label. Both Dara and Márcia, who I have categorised as “Black Portuguese”, as well as two of the participants I have categorised as “Brazilian”, were recorded as “White Portuguese” in the school’s official data, exemplifying the unpredictable application of this categorisation within the school monitoring regime. This may be partly due to the confusing layout of the actual ethnic monitoring form, where it is quite possible to tick “Portuguese” without noticing that this is classified as a subcategory of “White European” (see Appendix V). “White Portuguese”, then, as a category within the school ethnic monitoring regime, is often applied incoherently, but my use of “White Portuguese” as a fraction within the Lusondoner

discursive space is empirically grounded. Below I set out data from the broad biographical survey I carried out which give more detail on the subcategories of “Mainland” and “Madeiran”. These groupings are then reinforced when I bring in interactional data in Part II. While the terms “Portuguese” and “Madeiran” are those actually employed by Lusondoners, “White Portuguese” allows me to make important specifications about appearance and descent which, as I show, impact significantly on how a sense of “Portugueseness” is apprehended by individuals.

Country of birth, both of individual young people and their parents, provides a starting point for teasing out fractions within the Lusondoner discursive space. The table below shows the breakdown of the 36 Lusondoners I surveyed and identified as constituting the “White Portuguese” fraction.

*Table VII: Survey respondents I identified as constituting the “White Portuguese” fraction, divided by subgroup*

<b>Subgroup</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>Country of birth breakdown</b>
“White Portuguese” (Mainland)	12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ 6 born in Portugal,</li> <li>▪ 4 born in UK of only Portuguese heritage</li> <li>▪ 2 born in UK of Portuguese heritage and other non-Lusophone heritage</li> </ul>
“White Portuguese” (Madeira)	18	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ 14 born in Madeira <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ (2 of which recorded as “White Other”)</li> </ul> </li> <li>▪ 4 born in UK of only Madeiran heritage</li> </ul>
“White Portuguese” (parents a mixture of Madeiran and Mainland heritage)	6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ 2 born in UK</li> <li>▪ 4 born in Madeira</li> </ul>

The country of birth data show that, of those born in Portugal there was a roughly even split between Madeira and the mainland. These mainland- and Madeiran-born young people were also significantly more likely to have a less complex migration trajectory than other Lusondoners, making up 14 of the 15 in my survey whose families came to the UK without living in any other countries. Although 12 of the 36-strong “White Portuguese” fraction were born in the UK, there was very little in my data to suggest these UK-born individuals form a distinct grouping. Vinício’s (Year 10, male, “White Portuguese – Madeiran”) complaint about Jim (“You’re Portuguese and you say that you’re English”, field note 5/3/13), highlighted at the beginning of this chapter, was noteworthy for being the only time this discourse of

“pretending to be English” was raised. Instead, UK-born Lusondoners tended to be positioned within the fraction aligned with their parents’ country of birth. The lack of distinction between those born in mainland Portugal or Madeira and those born in the UK may be linked to the relatively young age the former group arrived at, as shown in the table below.

*Table VIII: Lusondoners’ average age of arrival in the UK broken down by country of birth*

<b>Country of birth</b>	<b>Average age of arrival in UK</b>
Brazil	11.9
Madeira	6.6 (excluding those who came twice)
Portugal	7.6

Significantly, “Mainland” Portuguese young people and “Madeirans” were more likely to arrive during primary school and so start secondary school as more established Londoners, as opposed to new arrivals. This would make them less distinguishable from those born in the UK, a point of contrast with the later-arriving “Brazilians”, which is explored below. Another contrast which is returned to in subsequent sections is the higher incidence of “Mainland” Portuguese and “Madeiran” young people making regular visits “back home”, as shown in the table below.

*Table IX: Holiday patterns of young people in “White Portuguese” fraction*

<b>Subgroup</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>Holiday pattern</b>
“White Portuguese” (Mainland)	12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ 10 visit Portugal every year</li> <li>▪ 2 have plans to visit Portugal</li> </ul>
“White Portuguese” (Madeira)	18	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ 14 visit Madeira every year or so               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ 1 of these also visits Venezuela</li> <li>○ 1 of these also visits Azores</li> <li>○ 1 of these also visits Portugal</li> </ul> </li> <li>▪ 3 have visited Madeira once</li> <li>▪ 1 visits Portugal every year</li> </ul>
“White Portuguese” (parents a mixture of Madeiran and Mainland heritage)	6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ all 6 visit Madeira regularly               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ 2 of these visit Portugal regularly as well</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

Three key points emerge from this table:

- i. every one of these young people had visited either Madeira or mainland Portugal at some point;

- ii. the vast majority of these young people made regular trips to their respective “home country”; and
- iii. despite these strong trends, family links were not entirely restricted to mainland Portugal and Madeira, with the Lusophone Azores and non-Lusophone Venezuela also mentioned (both due to family connections, as revealed by the biographical survey).

The impression of strong family ties to mainland Portugal and Madeira is reinforced by data on home ownership shown in the table below.

*Table X: Holiday home ownership of families of young people in “White Portuguese” fraction*

<b>Subgroup</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>Holiday homes</b>
“White Portuguese” (Mainland)	12	▪ 6 have a family home in Portugal
“White Portuguese” (Madeira)	18	▪ 7 have a family home in Madeira
“White Portuguese” (parents a mixture of Madeiran and Mainland heritage)	6	▪ 2 have a family home in Madeira ▪ 1 has a family home in Portugal

This table shows that almost half of the “White Portuguese” young people had a family holiday home in mainland Portugal or Madeira. This suggests committed ongoing links to these destinations was a key feature of family life for these young people. The data below also suggest that engagement with a Lusophone community was also a feature of family life in London for many of these young people.

*Table XI: Attendance at Lusophone “community” settings by young people in “White Portuguese” fraction*

<b>Fraction</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>Number who mention using Portuguese in London beyond school or home (either at a church, supplementary school or sports club)</b>
“White Portuguese” (Mainland)	12	6
“White Portuguese” (Madeira)	18	12
“White Portuguese” (Madeiran/Mainland)	6	1

From the data in this section, a picture emerges of a “White Portuguese” fraction amongst Lusondoners maintaining strong ongoing links to Madeira and mainland Portugal. While this fraction could be broadly divided into “Mainland” and

“Madeiran” subcategories, there were no particularly divergent trends between them in the survey data, apart from, understandably, where they took their holidays. As I detail in section 4.3, the common experiences shared by members of this fraction contributed to their mutual recognition as “White Portuguese”, and they were also identifiable to Lusondoners of other fractions, largely through their accents and appearance. It is this combination of shared experiences within the fractions, and mutual recognition between them, which is constitutive of the Lusondoner discursive space. In section 4.2.2 below, I set out some key differences between these “White Portuguese” young people and those in the “Brazilian” fraction.

#### **4.2.2 “Brazilians”**

I am using “Brazilian” to refer to the 9 Lusondoners<sup>41</sup> I surveyed for whom the majority of their parents and grandparents were born in and/or have strong ties to Brazil. These individuals were likely to have arrived in the UK more recently, during secondary school, and trips “back home” were rare. Young people in this fraction were not easily categorisable in terms of appearance, ranging from “Mediterranean” features (as described above in relation to “White Portuguese” young people) to the medium brown skin and curlier hair more associated with the term “mixed race” in the UK. “Brazilians” spanned 5 categories in the school’s ethnic monitoring data. Within the school, “Brazilian” young people were the focus of explicit references made to their alleged distinctiveness by their Lusondoner peers. This was apparent from the extensive country-related banter evident in the audio data I collected which I detail in the following chapters. Unlike the terms “White Portuguese” and “Black Portuguese”, “Brazilian” was used by Lusondoners themselves broadly to refer to the kinds of young people I have outlined here.

As well as being born in Brazil these young people had also spent a significant proportion of their childhoods there. The average age of arrival in the UK for “Brazilians” in the survey cohort was 11.9 years old, and this was also reflected in lower levels of fluency in English as compared to other Lusondoners. Every pupil in the school recorded as having a “home language” other than English was categorised as having “English as an Additional Language”. Alongside this they were assigned

---

<sup>41</sup> It is likely that there are further “Brazilian” pupils amongst the other 33 potential Lusondoners I identified who did not participate in the broad biographical survey.

a fluency stage, from “Stage 1 - beginner” to “Stage 4 – fully fluent”. As well as being assessed on entry to the school in order to gain an initial fluency stage, any pupil at stage 1, 2 or 3 would be periodically reassessed and their fluency stage updated. The table below summarises the number of survey respondents at each fluency stage at the point I commenced my field work, broken down by country of birth.

*Table XII: English fluency stage of Lusondoners broken down by country of birth*

<b>Country of birth</b>	<b>Stage 1</b>	<b>Stage 2</b>	<b>Stage 3</b>	<b>Stage 4</b>	<b>English only</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>Average stage</b>
Angola	0	0	1	0	0	1	3
Brazil	2	4	2	1	0	9	2.2
Madeira	0	2	7	4	1	14	3.2
Portugal	1	0	5	6	0	12	3.3
UK	0	0	0	17	4	21	4
Ireland	0	0	0	1	0	1	4
<b>Total</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>58</b>	

Of the 58 young people, only nine were at the lower stages of fluency meaning the vast majority were able to interact comfortably in English. Of those nine young people at stages 1 and 2, six were Brazilian-born (two thirds of the total). Mirroring this, of the nine Brazilian-born young people, six were at stages 1-2. This meant that not only were “Brazilians” likely to be less fluent in English than other Lusondoners, but also that less fluent Lusondoners were likely to be “Brazilian”. The data presented above on age of arrival sheds some light on this. “Brazilians” arrived on average 4-5 years older than other Lusondoners, making them much more likely to be English beginners at secondary school.

Young people in the “Brazilian” fraction spoke identifiably Brazilian varieties<sup>42</sup> of Portuguese and identified themselves as “Brazilian”. However, unlike Indian-, Pakistani- or Bangladeshi-born young people, there was no obvious ethnic category within the school monitoring regime for individuals born in Brazil. The nine Brazilian-born participants in the survey were recorded under five ethnic categories, as shown in the table below.

---

<sup>42</sup> Brazilian Portuguese has lexical, grammatical and syntactical differences, as well as distinctive pronunciation, which makes it distinguishable from European Portuguese. Brazilian Portuguese also includes a number of distinct regional varieties, although most “Brazilians” in my study came from São Paulo State or other areas in the South of Brazil.

*Table XIII: Ethnic categorisation of “Brazilians” according to official school data*

<b>Ethnic group</b>	<b>Number of young people</b>
Any other White background	3
White Portuguese	2
Any other ethnic group	2
Any other Black background	1
Any other Mixed background	1

Looking at this breakdown, “Brazilians” appear to be a fairly disparate grouping, spanning “Black”, “White” and “Mixed” categories, but there are two complicating factors here: racial and ethnic categories in Brazil are already notoriously complex, and in addition these, “Brazilians” are being forced into an ethnic taxonomy which has evolved in response to the historical specificities of migration into the UK as opposed to the complex makeup of the Brazilian population. Schwartzman (1999) writes that the Brazilian Census “racial” categories of “branco”, “preto”, “pardo”, “amarelo” and “indígena” (which translate literally as “white”, “black”, “dark/dusky”, “yellow” and “indigenous”) do not align with how many Brazilians self-define. He shows that, when given an open response box, while over 90% of those who tick “branco” (white) stick with this term, over 50% of those ticking “pardo” (dark/dusky) and over 60% of those ticking “indígena” (indigenous) opt for the term “moreno”. This translates roughly as “brunette”, “tanned” or “dark-skinned” but an exact equivalent is problematic as ethnic and racial terms in Brazil are imbued with positive and negative connotations which go beyond their literal meanings. On this point Schwartzman cites Nogueira’s (1985) analysis that conceptualisations of “race” and ethnicity in Brazil are heavily predicated on visible skin colour, as opposed to actual origins. Although UK ethnic categories make use of colour terms such as “Black” and “White”, they also include groupings whose origins are explicitly linked to specific nation states such as “British Pakistani”. The lack of alignment between UK ethnic categories and the Brazilian experience can be seen in the fact that seven out of the nine “Brazilians” in the survey opted for one of the catch-all categories which include the phrase “any other...”. The two who opted for “White Portuguese” constitute an interesting case as neither had any links to Portugal within the last two generations of their family but both had ties to Italy<sup>43</sup>. To understand this it is worth looking in more detail at family migration trajectories.

---

<sup>43</sup> Significant Italian migration to Brazil over the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries means that many millions of Brazilians can trace back some Italian descent. This provides a potential route to EU citizenship if Brazilians can obtain an Italian passport, a pattern I observed regularly during my years working at the school where I conducted my research.



Brazilian-born young people had an average of 1.9 other countries (apart from the UK) represented within their family's migration trajectory, putting them below the average of 2.4 for the Lusondoners surveyed. For five of the nine "Brazilians", Italy provided a transitional short-term stepping stone between Brazil and the UK, as Italian ancestry enabled families to gain Italian citizenship and therefore an EU passport. If these Italian stopovers were subtracted from the "Brazilian" families' migration trajectories then the average number of countries would drop to 1.4. "Brazilians" therefore tend to have fewer countries represented within their family migration trajectory and a more straightforward pattern of migration than the average within the Lusondoner cohort. This gives a different impression to the diversity implied by the spread of ethnic categories in the table above. "Ethnicity" then, as envisaged within UK monitoring systems is particularly problematic as a way of approaching the background of "Brazilian" young people.

Holiday patterns and home ownership for "Brazilians" did not follow the same pattern as for "White Portuguese" young people. Of the 9 "Brazilians" in the survey cohort, 3 had not been back to Brazil since moving to the UK, and for the 6 that had, this was on one-off or very intermittent trips. One of those who had been back to Brazil had also been to Portugal, and had links to the country as her step-father was Portuguese. The greater logistical and financial challenge of trips to Brazil (as opposed to Portugal) may well explain the less frequent trips, combined with the fact that these young people had not yet been in the UK for as long. Similarly, only 1 "Brazilian" family amongst the cohort owned a home back in Brazil, which could also be related to the challenges of actually visiting. Although direct contact with Brazil through trips "back home" were rare then, connections with other "Brazilians" were still strongly maintained via community involvement, with the majority (7 out of 9) of the "Brazilians" mentioning going to church services conducted in the Portuguese language in London. My sense from conversations with these young people was that, in general, this was at specifically Brazilian churches. The high incidence of intra-Brazilian community ties in London could be a counterbalance to the challenges of physical connection to Brazil through actual trips.

The data presented here suggest that "Brazilians" constituted a distinct fraction amongst Lusondoners with key differences from the "White Portuguese" described earlier. They arrived in the UK at an older age, had more straightforward family migration trajectories, took fewer trips "back home" and spoke recognisably Brazilian varieties of Portuguese. While these differences might not stand out to the

wider peer group, they would be potentially salient to other Lusondoners, as I show in section 4.3. In section 4.2.3, below, I set out the final fraction I identified, “Black Portuguese”.

#### 4.2.3 “Black Portuguese”

I am using the label “Black Portuguese” to describe Lusondoners who identify as “Black”<sup>44</sup>. Márcia’s (Year 10, female, “Black Portuguese”) words from her retrospective interview “I have to like tell people my whole life story to explain the fact that I’m black” (explored in Chapter 7) hint at the lack of wider recognition of this grouping, but also the complex migration trajectories it involves. Of the 12 young people in my survey cohort who constituted this fraction, 10 traced some descent back to both Portugal and Lusophone Africa. I am using the label “Black Portuguese”, rather than Aragao’s (2013) label “Luso Africans” for two reasons. Firstly, only 3 of the 12 had ever lived in Africa whereas 6 had lived in Portugal and all spoke some form of Portuguese. While references by these young people to being “Portuguese” were common in my data, self-ascriptions as “African” were not. Secondly, all identified as “Black” and, as I explain in Chapter 7, this is a highly salient identification within the London context. While both “Black” and “Portuguese” were terms used by and of these young people, the composite label “Black Portuguese” was not one I observed. As I outline in Section 4.3, there was some tension behind the notion of “Black Portuguese”, and it enjoyed much lower recognition in the Lusondoner discursive space. Within manifestations of this fraction there was a tendency for either “Blackness” or “Portugueseness” to be more salient at any particular moment, as opposed to a clear sense of “Black Portugueseness”. A key feature of the “Black Portuguese” fraction then was the dynamic of shifting interplay between these two constituent elements.

Within the cohort I surveyed there were 12 “Black Portuguese” young people, meaning this fraction outnumbered the 9 “Brazilians”. Their countries of birth are shown in the table below.

---

<sup>44</sup> A potential weakness of this categorisation is that some “Brazilians” who identify as “Black” could fit into both this and the “Brazilian” fraction. However, the fractions I identified are empirically based and there were no such individuals amongst my participants. I have opted not to extrapolate categorisations for individuals and phenomena I did not observe.

*Table XIV: Country of birth of Lusondoners and “Black Portuguese” fraction*

<b>Country of birth</b>	<b>Number of “Black Portuguese”</b>	<b>Total number of Lusondoners</b>
UK	6	21
Madeira	0	14
Portugal	4	12
Brazil	0	9
Angola	1	1
Ireland	1	1

The data in this table show that only 1 “Black Portuguese” young person was born in Africa, the other 11 were born in Europe. Of these, 4 were born in mainland Portugal but none were born in Madeira. This suggests stronger potential for connections with the “Mainland” Portuguese young people than the “Madeirans” within the “White Portuguese” fraction, and this is explored further in section 4.3. For 9 of the “Black Portuguese” young people either one or both of their parents were Angolan, making Angola the most cited country within their family migration trajectories. On top of this, Cape Verde appeared in the family migration trajectory of 3 young people and São Tomé and Príncipe in two. While Lusophone African states dominated these migration trajectories, there was one young person whose family came from Francophone Guinea-Conakry, but moved to Portugal, and another young person (Jamila) whose father was Angolan and her mother Jamaican. This grouping then had significant internal diversity but what did appear to mark it out was the complexity of family migration trajectories. The table below compares these “Black Portuguese” young people with the rest of the Lusondoner cohort in terms of number of countries and languages within the last two generations of their families.

*Table XV: Average number of countries lived in and languages spoken within two generations*

<b>Cohort</b>	<b>Average number of languages spoken within two generations</b>	<b>Average number of countries lived in within two generations</b>
“Black Portuguese”	3.9	3.34
Other Lusondoners	2.45	1.9

What is clear from this table is the higher level of complexity in the migration trajectories of the families of “Black Portuguese” young people. On average, their families had been through more countries and picked up more languages than those of other Lusondoners but this was not apparent in school monitoring data.

*Table XVI: Ethnic categorisation of the “Black Portuguese” fraction according to official school data*

<b>Ethnic group</b>	<b>Number of young people</b>
White Portuguese	7
Mixed White and Black African	2
Any other Black background	1
Black African	1
Black Caribbean	1

Like the “Brazilians”, they spanned 5 categories but over half of them were recorded as “White Portuguese” with “Portuguese” as their “home language”. As discussed earlier in this section, the high proportion of “White Portuguese” may be due in part to the confusing layout of the ethnic monitoring form. There was nothing though in the school data to distinguish these young people from the wider Lusondoner group, despite the significantly different trends in their migration trajectories. The young people recorded as “Black African” and “Black Caribbean” were subject to a similar disappearing trick as their “home language” was recorded as “English”. They therefore slipped seamlessly into the two largest ethnic groupings recorded in the school, undistinguished from other “Black African” and “Black Caribbean” English speakers in these categories despite their particular migration trajectories and linguistic repertoires.

In terms of holiday patterns the “Black Portuguese” young people aligned more closely with the “White Portuguese” than with “Brazilians”, but with some noticeable differences. Nine of the “Black Portuguese” young people visited mainland Portugal at least every year or two, but 5 also mentioned trips to Angola. In addition, visits to Guinea-Conakry, São Tomé, Jamaica and to see relatives in Leeds were also mentioned, each by a different “Black Portuguese” young person. Two young people mentioned family homes in Portugal and one a home in Angola. Like the “White Portuguese” young people then, these “Black Portuguese” young people maintained strong ongoing connections “back home”, but this concept of “home” spanned a wider range of countries. In terms of the London context, 6 of the

12 mentioned using Portuguese in a church, mosque or sports club setting, again in line with the proportions amongst “White Portuguese” young people. “Black Portuguese” young people then have considerable overlap with other Lusondoners (particularly “White Portuguese”) in terms of their migration experiences and current practices. However, the salience of being “Black” in London (explored in Chapter 7) marks a point of difference from other Lusondoners, and constitutes a key commonality amongst them. As mentioned above then, it is the shared experiences within each of the three fractions, as well as the mutual recognition between them, which constitute a Lusondoner discursive space. Another key feature of this discursive space are the blurred edges to these ethnic fractions, stemming from the complexities of contemporary superdiverse conditions, as I explain in section 4.2.4 below.

#### **4.2.4 Superdiversity and the blurred edges to ethnic fractions**

Despite the broad patterns, described in the sections above, which constitute the ethnic fractions I have identified, there were a number of participants in my study who did not neatly align with these. Rather than treating these individuals as outliers or anomalies, I am arguing that their complex migration trajectories are part of the basic circumstances of superdiversity in London which I explained in Chapter 2. Superdiversity challenges normative notions of “community”, “ethnicity” and “diaspora”, hence Brubaker’s (2005) recommendation to focus instead on ‘practices’ (p13) which I respond to in section 4.3. In this section I set out some examples of participants in my study whose complex migration trajectories highlight this point. Rather than undermining the coherence of the ethnic fractions I have explained thus far, the cases described below emphasise that these fractions can overlap and are only part of the story. The Lusondoner discursive space I have set out is not regimented into these fractions. Instead, these fractions are ideas which the individuals who traverse this space orient towards in particular, context-specific ways.

##### *(a) “Madeiran”/“African”*

An example of the blurred edges of the “White Portuguese - Madeiran” category is that of Danilo. Born in Madeira, Danilo came to the UK aged 8, then moved back before returning to the UK aged 10. This trajectory was fairly standard for Madeiran-born young people, both in terms of the multiple moves, but also that this all took place before Danilo reached secondary school. However, Danilo’s wider family migration trajectory was markedly different from that of his “Madeiran” peers.

Firstly, Danilo's maternal grandmother was born in Brazil, and his maternal grandfather spent time living in Brazil too. Secondly, Danilo's father and paternal grandparents were all born in Africa and had lived in a range of countries. His paternal grandmother was born in Mozambique and also lived in Madeira, the UK, France and Jersey, while his paternal grandfather was born in Cape Verde and also lived in Mozambique, Angola, Venezuela and Madeira. Danilo's father was born in Mozambique and had also lived in Madeira, the UK and Cape Verde. Danilo's ethnicity was recorded as "Any other White background" and there was evidence in the audio data of both a persistent fascination with Brazil on his part, as well as a desire to be recognised as African. Danilo's family migration trajectory, then, exemplifies the kind of complexity which, as I outlined in Chapter 2, Vertovec (2007) identified as characterising conditions in superdiverse contexts such as London.

*(b) "Brazilian"/"White Portuguese"*

Another young person, Lara, had strong ties to both Brazil and Portugal. Her father was born in Brazil, as were both her paternal grandparents, but he subsequently moved to Portugal then the UK. Lara's mother and her maternal grandparents were born in Mozambique (of Portuguese descent), and subsequently moved to Portugal then the UK. Lara was recorded as "White Portuguese" and, as explored in subsequent chapters, she spoke with a broadly Brazilian variety of Portuguese. Within the school data though there was nothing to differentiate Lara's complex family migration trajectory from another "White Portuguese" young person whose whole family were from Madeira, or from the Italian-connected "Brazilians" who were recorded as "White Portuguese". Lara had visited Portugal once, took trips to Brazil every 4 years, and attended Portuguese language church services in London. She therefore had overlaps with both the "Brazilian" and "White Portuguese" fractions in terms of background as well as practices.

*(c) Assigning of official school ethnic categories*

As well as the kind of complex trajectories outlined above, there also appeared to be variation in how official school ethnic categories were actually assigned. Firstly, two "Madeirans" were categorised as "Any other White background" within the school data, as opposed to "White Portuguese". For one of these young people, her mother had lived in Guernsey and father in Australia. For the other, both parents had lived in Venezuela, but all grandparents were Madeiran and this experience of other countries was common amongst many young people recorded as "White

Portuguese”. Even for those young people then whose family migration trajectories did appear to align closely with a particular ethnic category, there was no guarantee that this label would be assigned to them. This point was made even starker by the case of two full siblings who were recorded differently within the school data, the brother as “White Portuguese” and his younger sister as “Any other White background”. What did distinguish this family was that, although all grandparents and the father were born in Portugal, they all now lived in the UK where the mother was actually born and brought up. The children could not speak Portuguese although they did have some passive knowledge of it. During previous conversations with the mother when I was her son’s French teacher, she had expressed a feeling of explicit distance from more recently arrived members of the Portuguese community in London, lamenting their lack of integration. Although it was not clear why her two children ended up with different ethnic categorisations in official school data, her daughter’s label of “Any other White background” fitted with the ideology the mother had expressed to me in its distancing from the “Portuguese” label. Again, this emphasises the unpredictable way in which the ethnic categories were apprehended, regardless of the individual biographies of the young people and their families.

I explained in section 4.1 above how language, nation and ethnicity each have limitations as a matrix for categorising and describing Lusondoners. As I detailed in the current section, the Lusondoner discursive space encompasses distinct fractions (“White Portuguese”, “Black Portuguese” and “Brazilian”) which combine linguistic, national, racial and ethnic features. However, these fractions in themselves do not provide a full account of Lusondoner practices and affiliations. Instead, as I have outlined above, there are three further dimensions which must be considered.

- i. Firstly, the fractions represent broad trends not bounded formations. They have blurred edges and overlaps with individuals who do not fit neatly into any single one.
- ii. Secondly, the ways in which individuals position themselves in relation to discourses of language, nation and ethnicity are *locally embedded*, varying from context to context, and are not automatically predictable from an account of their biographies.
- iii. Thirdly, the mutual recognition between Lusophone-connected ethnolinguistic fractions, stemming from their intertwined history and

common Lusophone cultural references, amounts to a certain shared space, both metaphorical and at times physical.

For these reasons it is more helpful to conceive of Lusondoners via the notion of a Lusondoner discursive space.

The complexity outlined in this section exemplifies how superdiverse environments can lead to what Blommaert & Backus (2012) describe as an:

*‘extremely low degree of presupposability in terms of identities, patterns of social and cultural behavior, social and cultural structure, norms and expectations’* (p5, original emphasis).

They therefore advocate a shift away from straightforward reliance on traditional ethnic and linguistic categorisations, stating that, in light of the complexities of superdiversity, ‘descriptive adequacy has become a challenge for the social sciences’ (p6). In Part II below, and subsequent chapters, I seek to take up that challenge. Instead of settling for the reified accounts of Portuguese language and ethnicity postulated by institutional monitoring regimes, I bring to bear a perspective grounded in superdiversity. In presenting detailed analysis of interactions amongst Lusondoners I set out how overlapping, but also divergent migration trajectories can provide material for diverse and often unexpected points of connection with peers in the superdiverse context of London.



## **Part II - The Lusondoner discursive space in interactional practice**

### **4.3 Interactional examples of Lusondoner fractions**

In Part I of this chapter I sketched out some demographic trends behind the fractions I have identified amongst Lusondoners (“White Portuguese”: “Madeiran” and “Mainland”; “Black Portuguese”; “Brazilian”). However, as I set out in Chapter 3, my ethnographic research has enabled me to see Lusondoner discursive space in terms of interactional practice, and in Part II I draw on interactional data to give some examples of how Lusondoners positioned themselves in relation to these fractions. I set out heavily marked references to these fractions, by means of mocking and stereotyping, as well as lower key moments where links to these fractions were raised without being foregrounded. These interactions include episodes such as: “White Portuguese” young people investigating the stereotype that every Portuguese woman is short; “Black Portuguese” young people debating the criteria for claiming to be “Portuguese”; a “Brazilian” offering to teach a “Madeiran” how to dance to Brazilian music; and a group of “Madeirans” discussing how they tan when on holiday in Madeira. This section is not an attempt to define in concrete terms what it means to “belong” to any of these fractions, as the strict and restrictive alignment implied by such a notion is not how these fractions manifest themselves in practice. Instead, I describe a small number of illustrative examples of orientations towards these fractions. Through these examples I show that how such orientations play out within the Lusondoner discursive space is not always predictable, taking various and often unexpected forms which are tied to the immediate local context. Taken together though, these examples suggest a group of people able to participate and operate to some significant extent within a Lusondoner discursive space. A deeper description and analysis of this participation then form the subject of the rest of this thesis. I start in section 4.3.1 below by setting out some orientations towards “White Portugueseness”.

#### **4.3.1 “White Portuguese”**

*(a) “White Portuguese” stereotypes invoked in a Portuguese GCSE class*

As I pointed out above, manifestations of particular Lusondoner fractions emerged within specific local circumstances. The almost exclusively “White Portuguese” composition of Vinício’s (Year 10, male, “White Portuguese – Madeiran”) Portuguese GCSE class, as well as the official objective of developing Standard

Portuguese, had a particular effect on how Lusondoner fractions were oriented towards. As different levels of fluency in Standard (European) Portuguese were exposed amongst the group of supposed “Portuguese speakers”, other forms of ethnolinguistic authenticity became important. Orientations towards particular Lusondoner fractions then need to be viewed in this light. The Portuguese GCSE group consisted of about 12 young people, all but two of them Lusondoners from the “White Portuguese” fraction, with some knowledge of Portuguese from home. The two non-Lusondoners (one of Polish and the other of Palestinian descent) were included in the group for being particularly talented linguists. The presence of these two young people provides another example of the ‘*extremely low degree of presupposability*’ in terms of ethnic configurations, highlighted by Blommaert and Backus (2012, p5, original emphasis) as typical of superdiverse contexts such as London. As I set out in section 4.2, “Brazilian” young people tended to arrive in the UK at an older age than other Lusondoners, and this meant they had more developed literacy in Standard Portuguese. For this reason they were able to sit their Portuguese GCSE exam without needing formal teaching, so the GCSE class was made up of young people with mainland Portuguese and Madeiran descent, but not “Brazilians”. Similarly, the four “Black Portuguese” young people in this year group had already sat their Portuguese GCSE so were not part of the class. The teacher was also Portuguese, coming from Viseu, a medium-sized town in the North of the Portuguese mainland, and these factors, along with the linguistic content of the lessons themselves contributed to a specific “White Portuguese” atmosphere. Over the months I spent in this class I observed stereotypes relating to “Portugueseness” intermittently voiced either by young people, the teacher or emerging from the course materials. The nature of the group, as outlined above, meant that these stereotypes were widely recognised, and young people felt able to participate in confirming and contesting them.

One young person who was often involved in this stereotyping of “Portugueseness” was Davina (Year 10, female, “White Portuguese” – “Mainland”). Having grown up in the UK, her fluency in Portuguese was fairly limited and this was frequently the focus of banter from her friend Vinício who was much more fluent (as explored in subsequent chapters). Positioning herself in relation to Portuguese stereotypes provided Davina with an alternative resource for claiming “Portugueseness”. In one lesson Davina said to Vinício:

“is your mum short? See I told you, every Portuguese woman is short.” (Field notes 23/4/13)

She then proceeded to repeat this question to each Lusondoner in the group in order to back up her point. Davina’s exclusion of the two non-Lusondoners (as mentioned above, one of Polish and the other of Palestinian descent) from her questioning highlights who was, and was not, implicated by the notion of “Portugueseness” she oriented towards. While ostensibly addressed to Vinício, Davina’s mini-survey was carried out in front of the whole group, publicly emphasising both their common tie of Portuguese descent, and the shared understandings surrounding this. In her questioning, Davina made no distinction between those with Madeiran or mainland Portuguese heritage. At times, distinctions between these two groupings were marked (particularly when Davina wanted to tease Vinício, as set out below), but at other times they could be combined under the broader “White Portuguese” umbrella. Later in the same lesson Davina used the following put-down whilst bantering with Vinício:

“your grandma don’t even know how to make chouriço<sup>45</sup>” (field notes 23/4/13).

The suggestion was that any Portuguese Grandmother (mainland or Madeiran) should have this skill. Davina was implying that her own grandmother was more legitimately Portuguese than Vinício’s, casting them both in a common contest of “Portugueseness”. The context of the Portuguese GCSE class then framed orientations to “Portugueseness” in a particular way. The focus on Standard Portuguese fluency exposed students’ differing levels, prompting Davina to make up for her linguistic “deficit” by drawing more heavily on stereotyped cultural references. These interactions relied on commonly recognised Lusophone-indexed references, and it is therefore through such interactions that the Lusondoner discursive space can be glimpsed.

*(b) A London-based perspective on Madeira*

In the examples above I have shown how stereotypical or emblematic “Portugueseness” could be raised in locally-grounded ways in interactions between “White Portuguese” Lusondoners, including “Madeirans”. In the following extract, a conversation between three “Madeirans”, “Madeiranness” was referenced in much more low-key ways. The conversation involved Délia (Year 8, female, “White

---

<sup>45</sup> Chouriço is a pork sausage which is a speciality of Portugal.

Portuguese – Madeiran”) chatting during a break time to two other “Madeiran” girls about how they tan. Instead of emerging through stereotypical or emblematic references, Madeira was mentioned as the three girls discussed holidays and tanning. Their shared perspective on Madeira was specifically that of London-based Madeirans, and “Madeiranness” was not overtly marked out through oppositions to another Lusondoner fraction. It emerged as an everyday element of the girls’ shared repertoire of references. What stands out as distinctive though is Délia’s uncharacteristic involvement in a marked Madeiran discursive space. The focus on Madeira and shared Madeiran experiences of the three speakers contrasts with the majority of field notes and audio data I collected involving Délia. Generally, I observed Délia within a mixed friendship group with young people of various ethnolinguistic backgrounds, often including one or two other Lusondoners (although not necessarily “Madeirans”). The extract below then is an example of how the Lusondoner apprehension is capable of concentrated moments where narrower affiliations can be enacted. In this instance, a specifically Madeiran discursive space was marked by:

- i. Madeiran ways of talking. I noticed specifically: the heavily nasal inflection; shorter, more staccato pronunciation with syllables condensed together; and the cutting short or swallowing of word endings so that these are only partially audible<sup>46</sup>. These are features I came to associate with “Madeirans” through my years of working with these young people at the school and differentiated these young people from other Lusondoners. These were also features accentuated by the Portuguese teacher on occasions when I observed him mocking Vinício’s (Year 10, male, “White Portuguese” – “Madeiran”) Madeiran accent.
- ii. Common understandings about Madeira as a destination for regular visits. As shown by the data on holiday patterns I set out in section 4.2.1, trips to Madeira were a distinctive feature of “Madeirans”.
- iii. Common understandings amongst UK-based (generally female) individuals about Madeira as an easily accessible location to get a tan. This common preoccupation with tanning relied on the shared experience of having relatively pale skin. This is a feature not shared by “Black Portuguese” young people, and only inconsistently relevant for “Brazilians”, making it

---

<sup>46</sup> For a fuller account of Madeiran accents see Rebelo (2015).

a more specifically “White Portuguese”, and in this case “Madeiran” marker.

Such concentrated moments where narrower affiliations were enacted also emerged in relation to other fractions. In Chapter 5 I outline an example of this amongst two “Brazilians”, based around nuanced awareness of different regional varieties of Brazilian Portuguese. Similarly, in Chapter 7 I set out a conversation where Dara (Year 10, female, “Black Portuguese”) and Márcia (Year 10, female, “Black Portuguese”) discuss their struggle to be recognised by peers as both “Black” and “Portuguese” which represents a distinctly “Black Portuguese” discursive space.

The three “Madeiran” girls in the following extract drew not only on shared knowledge of Madeira, but on shared experience of a London-based perspective on Madeira. Although I do not have the details of exactly who the other two girls with Délia are, their Madeiran ways of talking and the nature of their conversation suggests they were “Madeirans”. As this extract begins the girls are discussing what happens to their skin tone when they tan.

**Episode I<sup>47</sup>** (audio recording of naturally occurring speech, 10/7/13)

Speaker	Ethnolinguistic background
Girl 1 (Year 8? <sup>48</sup> )	From the conversation and her use of Portuguese I assume this girl could be categorised as “White Portuguese”, according to the criteria I set out in Part I of this Chapter.
Girl 2 (Year 8?)	From the conversation and her use of Portuguese I assume this girl could be categorised as “White Portuguese”, according to the criteria I set out in Part I of this Chapter.
Délia (Year 8, female)	“White Portuguese”, according to the criteria I set out in Part I of this Chapter, with “Mediterranean” features. Moved to the UK from Madeira at age 5 – speaks English with a London accent, also fluent in Portuguese.

Key: Portuguese

- 1 Girl 1 *tu ficas castanha eu fico laranja*  
 ((Translation: ‘you go hazel and I go orange’))
- 2 Girl 2 ((laughs))
- 3 Girl 1 *não ela fica laranja eu fico castanha bronzizada tu ficas*  
 4 *castanha*  
 ((Translation: ‘no she goes orange I go tanned hazel and you go hazel’))
- 5 Girl 2 *eu fico ( )*  
 ((Translation: ‘I go’))
- 6 Girl 1 *tu és igual a mim (2) tu nem tens cor nenhuma caralho*  
 ((Translation: ‘you’re like me (2) you don’t have any bloody colour at all’))
- 7 Girl 2 *eu vou mandar e vou ver se eu vou em setembro*  
 ((Translation: ‘I’m going to ask and see if I’m going in September’))
- 8 Délia (1) *eu vou para Madeira todos os anos*

<sup>47</sup> For transcription conventions see Appendix VI

<sup>48</sup> It is likely that both the unidentified girls were in Year 8 as, from my experience working at the school as well as my observations during my research, young people at the school almost always socialised with peers from their own year group.

- ((Translation: 'I go to Madeira every year'))
- 9 (2) *minha casa é cinco minutos da maldita praia* (1.5)  
 ((Translation: *my house is five minutes from the damn beach*'))
- 10 and yet I can't get a sun tan
- 11 (1) *eu te juro que eu vim sete horas na praia* (.) e pus (.)  
 ((Translation: ' ('I swear that I came to the beach at seven  
*o'clock* (.) and I put on'))
- 12 just a bit of sun cream and I don't get tanned

Due to the UK climate, tanning is something generally associated with being abroad. This is reflected in the extract when, after lines 1-6 which focus on which shade each girl turns, Girl 2 added:

*"eu vou mandar e vou ver se eu vou em setembro"* (*I'm going to ask and see if I'm going in September*).

She did not specify where she would be going but the other two did not appear confused by this, and Délia then followed with:

*"eu vou para Madeira todos os anos"* (*I go to Madeira every year*).

This suggests that Madeira was commonly understood by all three as where their tanning took place. As I outlined in Section 4.2, almost all "Madeiran" young people visited Madeira on a regular basis and 7 out of 18 had a family home there. This tallies with Délia's reference to "minha casa" (my house) in line 9. Both the topic of this conversation and the way it was articulated in a mixture of Madeiran Portuguese and English suggest a London "Madeiranness". The girls' common understanding of references to Madeira emphasises their links to the island, but it is because they were based in London that they took trips there. These were essentially holidays, hence the focus on tanning and going to the beach. That September is mentioned (line 7) as a potential month for such a trip resonates with a recurrent pattern I observed at the school where a minority of families would take term-time holidays to take advantage of the lower off-season prices. It was their perspective as Londoners with links to Madeira that they shared, as much as their "Madeiranness" itself, again reinforcing the locally situated nature of the conversation. This highlights the importance of locality in how Lusondoner fractions were actually apprehended. This is particularly salient with regard to how other Lusondoners

positioned themselves in relation to “Brazilianness”, as I describe in section 4.3.2 below.

### 4.3.2 “Brazilians”

#### *(a) Popularity of Brazilian language and culture*

As I mentioned above, “Brazilianness” carried a particular cachet amongst Lusondoners conferred by the popularity of Brazilian popular culture and the dominance of Brazilian media exports in the Lusophone world. Straubhaar (2013) has suggested that, largely due to exports of Brazilian telenovelas by TV Globo, Brazil’s largest media company, along with the Brazilian music featured in them, ‘Brazilian popular culture has become the second culture of the Lusophone world’ (p67). This heavily influenced the way “Brazilianness” was apprehended within the Lusondoner discursive space. Aragao (2013) in her study of Lusophones in London identifies a surge in interest in Brazil in London and notes ‘the increasing popularity of Brazilian dialects as the dominant form of Portuguese in popular culture’ (p32). This interest appeared to be shared by many of the Lusondoners in my study but was not necessarily grounded in a nuanced awareness of Brazilian cultures and dialects. Alcía (Year 11, female, “Brazilian”) supported this in a retrospective interview when she said that other young people liked her Goiânia<sup>49</sup> accent because of the stronger R sound so were always imitating it. She added that her non-“Brazilian” (Lusondoner) friends also liked the São Paulo accent as they associated it with clips of favelas seen on television. Conversely, as mentioned above, she said that “Brazilians” tended to like the Madeiran accent because it emphasises the “sh” which sounds funny to “Brazilians”<sup>50</sup>. As I show in the rest of this section then, the popularity of “Brazilianness” could at times provide a resource for “Brazilian” young people, but equally the often reductive nature of the accounts of Brazil deployed by other Lusondoners this rested on could pose a challenge to “Brazilian” young people who might want to disavow popular stereotypes.

#### *(b) Brazilian music and dance*

One feature of “Brazilianness” which recurs in my research data is the popularity of Brazilian music. Many young people without Brazilian heritage attested to an interest in Brazilian music during the broad biographical survey I undertook, and this

---

<sup>49</sup> Goiânia is the capital of the central Brazilian state of Goiás.

<sup>50</sup> Pronunciation of the letter ‘s’ as [ʃ], particularly at the end of a word, is widely recognised as typical of European Portuguese. In many Brazilian varieties of Portuguese, [ʃ] would be replaced with [s] or [z]. For example, it would be common to hear “malas” (suit cases) pronounced as [ˈmælæʃ] in Portugal but as [ˈmælæz] in many parts of Brazil.



was reinforced by evidence in other parts of my data set. I observed Denise (Year 11, female, “White Portuguese – Madeiran”) listening to Brazilian music on her phone during a Health and Social Care lesson (field note 10/5/13) and Délia (Year 8, female, “White Portuguese – Madeiran”) described in a retrospective interview how she preferred listening to Brazilian music because of its “upbeatness” and enjoyed discussing it with Lusondoner peers at school. She mentioned 3 specific friends she had these discussions with: one of whom was “Brazilian”, one “White Portuguese” and one “Black Portuguese”. Alícia (Year 11, female, “Brazilian”) also claimed during a retrospective interview that Portuguese young people preferred Brazilian music over Portuguese music. While Alícia was wearing the audio microphone she had a conversation with Denise where the two discussed some *forró*<sup>51</sup> songs (audio recording 10/5/13). When Alícia found out that Denise did not know how to do the dance for these songs she told Denise she would teach her later on after school. As with varieties of Portuguese, these snatches of cultural practices may not have been shared by all members of the Lusondoner peer group, but they were at least recognised and as such formed part of a common pool of references. Alícia’s offer to teach Denise to dance *forró*, and Délia’s discussions of Brazilian music with friends from other Lusondoner fractions, show how more general awareness of other Lusophone backgrounds could reach a deeper level through the close contact of ongoing friendships. However, as I stated above, this did not preclude the taking up of Brazilian stereotypes by other Lusondoners, as I describe in more detail in Chapter 5.

### 4.3.3 “Black Portuguese”

#### (a) *Lack of recognition of “Black Portugueseness”*

As I outlined in section 4.2, a key element of the “Black Portuguese” fraction was a tension between “Blackness” and “Portugueseness”, in particular a lack of recognition that individuals could be both “Black” and “Portuguese”. Dara (Year 10, female, “Black Portuguese”) and Márcia (Year 10, female, “Black Portuguese”) alluded to this during a retrospective interview (28/6/13) when they described how they could eavesdrop on other Portuguese-speakers on the bus without being suspected. This was also apparent in a retrospective interview (12/7/13) with Délia (Year 8, female, “White Portuguese – Madeiran”) when she explained why she did not expect that two “Black” classmates would be Portuguese speakers:

---

<sup>51</sup> A type of music danced to in pairs which is popular in, and originates from, Brazil.

“you’ve got an image of someone that’s Portuguese in your head” which is “kind of tanned, or like very like, light-skinned to tanned, and then dark hair”. (retrospective interview 12/7/13)

Although not explicitly stated here it is probably safe to assume that this image was restricted to “European” dark hair and facial features. This is supported by Aragao’s (2013) research amongst Lusophones in London which characterises ‘the Luso African community’ (p34) as often ‘completely absent’ from the perspective of many Portuguese and Brazilians. Da Silva (2011), in his study of ‘Portuguese-Canadian youth in Toronto’ notes a similar phenomenon, writing of one of his participants:

‘Julia, like many others, is “amazed” and even “shocked” whenever she sees racialized minorities speak Portuguese’ (p196).

If other Lusophones then had no expectation that young people of Dara and Márcia’s features were likely to speak Portuguese or have Portuguese affiliations, then it is highly unlikely that non-Lusophones would either. Having said this, at one point during my field work I was approached by a young person of Somali descent who asked to participate in the study, saying “I speak Portuguese, I’m Angolan”. Although she was joking, her claim displayed specific awareness of the existence of “Black African” Portuguese speakers. This was an isolated example but does show that non-Lusondoners can have specific awareness and knowledge of Lusondoner fractions, often as a result of close contact via friendships with Lusondoners. In general though, as I show below, the struggle for recognition as both “Black” and “Portuguese” was a persistent factor in how the “Black Portuguese” fraction managed to manoeuvre within the Lusondoner discursive space.

*(b) “Black Portuguese” young people claiming to be more legitimately Portuguese*  
As I suggested above, the “Black Portuguese” fraction rarely manifested itself through simultaneous claims or references to both “Blackness” and “Portugueseness”. Instead, “Black Portuguese” young people took up positioning towards either “Blackness” or “Portugueseness” at different moments in particular contexts. The following statement came from Márcia (Year 10, female, “Black Portuguese”) during a retrospective interview with her and Dara (Year 10, female, “Black Portuguese”):

“they call themselves the Portuguese people but we say we’re Portuguese cause *we’re* from Portugal”. (audio recording 28/6/13)

Márcia was complaining about the label “the Portuguese people” being self-ascribed by “Madeiran” and “Brazilian” young people, when she and Dara had a more legitimate claim as she saw it, having been born in Portugal. Márcia reinforced this, saying that “Madeirans” and “Brazilians” claiming to be Portuguese was “like calling Irish people English”, and Dara added that Madeira was “all the way down next to Morocco”. This vehement rejection of Brazilians’ and Madeirans’ claim to the label “Portuguese” on the part of Dara and was not something I observed amongst “White Portuguese” young people. I outlined above how having brown or black skin could make claiming “Portugueseness” particularly problematic, and it appears that this lay behind Dara and Márcia’s need to emphasise their legitimacy, and distance themselves from “Madeirans” and “Brazilians”, through their country of birth. Their forceful arguments suggest an insecurity in their own ability to command recognition as Portuguese, rooted in their “Black African” descent. As I detail in Chapter 7, this was also mirrored by an insecurity in their ability to be recognised as “Black” in certain local London contexts, emphasising the inherent tension and struggle within the “Black Portuguese” fraction. This tension in relation to “Black Portugueseness” highlights limitations and constraints within the Lusondoner discursive space I have been describing. In this chapter, I have detailed examples of Lusondoners from diverse backgrounds sharing common Lusophone-indexed references. However, Dara and Márcia’s struggle shows that the different Lusondoner ethnic fractions do not enjoy parity of recognition within the Lusondoner discursive space.

#### **4.4 Chapter conclusion**

In this chapter I have made the case for the utility of the term ‘Lusondoner’. The broad biographical survey I undertook highlights the diversity below the catch-all label “Portuguese” as an ethnic group and as a “home language”. More empirically grounded ethnic fractions of “White Portuguese” (with “Mainland” and “Madeiran” subcategories), “Brazilian”, and “Black Portuguese” were discernible with their own general trends and connotations. However, these ethnic fractions did not provide a simple framework for capturing the essence of individuals. Instead, they pointed to broad patterns which contribute to a common pool of references amongst Lusondoners. Many individuals had more complex migration trajectories which did not fit neatly even into these more empirically grounded categories. More fundamentally, the ways these ethnic fractions were drawn on depended on local factors. It was through the prism of London-based friendship groups that individuals

apprehended and affiliated with these ethnic fractions, making the particular composition of these groups a key factor in how language and ethnicity played out in practice. While these ethnic fractions may have been commonly recognised by Lusondoners, they were apprehended in diverse ways dependent on the particular combinations of individuals in specific contexts. Getting to grips with superdiversity means investigating the complex combination of ethnic and linguistic threads that individuals draw on, but also how these play out in interaction with peers in local contexts.

I outlined in Section 4.1 how previous studies of Portuguese speakers in the UK have stopped at the level of labels based on language, nationality or ethnicity. What these approaches overlook is the significance of local context, something I have addressed by adopting an ethnographic approach. As shown by the interactional examples I set out in Part II of this chapter, labels do not translate simply into particular affiliations or practices, and I maintain this specific focus on interactional examples in subsequent chapters. In Chapter 5 I set out in more detail how individuals participate in an environment of jostling and banter where labels must be justified and are taken up in instances of mockery which demand responses. The superdiverse nature of London makes it a constantly evolving web of interactions and connections where new realities are created all the time. This means that ethnolinguistic labels alone are not adequate to describe and theorise the practices and affiliations of individuals in this context. For this reason I have adopted the notion of a Lusondoner discursive space to capture the common pool of shared references and practices, broadly divided into three ethnic fractions, to which Lusondoners orient themselves in particular, local ways. In this chapter I have set out some examples of how these Lusondoner ethnic fractions manifested, but these represent only one part of the discursive space within which Lusondoners operated. In Chapter 5 I broaden the focus to show how the Lusondoner ethnic fractions were part of a wider picture of multiethnic conviviality in superdiverse London. This provides a deeper grounding to my overall point about the openness of ethnicity and its rootedness in visible practices and local contexts.

## Chapter 5

### Multiethnic conviviality

*“I’m a British citizen, not an immigrant; I came here legally, not on the back of a truck.”*

Márcia (field notes 26/03/13)

#### 5.0 Introduction

In Chapter 4 I described a Lusondoner discursive space accessible to Londoners with Lusophone ties through their shared recognition of Lusophone-indexed points of reference. Through this, I highlighted the importance of examining the specifics of the local peer context in understanding the ethnic affiliations and linguistic practices of Lusondoners. In this chapter, I explore this local peer context in more detail, setting out how the Lusondoner discursive space is rooted in an environment of London multiethnic conviviality which affects how Lusondoners relate both to their non-Lusondoner peers, and to each other. Two key features of this local conviviality can be discerned through examining the context surrounding Márcia’s (Year 10, female, “Black Portuguese”) words above:

- i. the overlapping experiences of young people from diverse backgrounds, and
- ii. the low-key and playful trading in ethnically linked stereotypes which permeated the interactions of these young people.

Márcia made the above assertion during a French lesson whilst joking with three friends<sup>52</sup>. Each one of these girls had not only migrated to the UK from abroad, but had experience of being in one sense or another an ethnic or linguistic minority in their country of birth (Dara and Márcia’s African descent in Portugal; Laura’s Colombian descent in Sicily; Elena’s Castilian Spanish-speaking family in Catalonia). They therefore shared a certain overlap in first-hand experiences of “outsiderness” popularly associated with the negative discourse of “immigrant” which Márcia invoked. Such overlaps in experience form one of the central planks of the local multiethnic conviviality I describe in this chapter. The other key plank is the accommodation of ethnic differences through low-key trading in stereotypical ethnic representations. Márcia’s depiction of immigrants “on the back of a truck” raises a widely circulating discourse in the UK which associates ethnic minorities

---

<sup>52</sup> Dara (Year 10, female, “Black Portuguese”); Laura (Year 10, female, born in Sicily of Colombian descent); Elena (Year 10, female, Castilian Spanish speaker from Catalonia).

with illegal immigration status<sup>53</sup>. The fact that all four girls responded with laughter to this stereotype exemplifies the relaxed and playful approach which the young people in my study tended to adopt towards the ethnic diversity which surrounded them, and their own status as constitutive of this diversity. In this chapter I explain the importance of this pervasive local multiethnic conviviality for understanding how Lusondoners interacted amongst themselves, as well as with “outsiders”. I set out how the Lusondoner discursive space needs to be understood within the multiethnic, superdiverse context in which it is rooted. More precisely, I show that the ethnic fractions I identified in Chapter 4 *within* the Lusondoner discursive space itself cannot be understood outside of this wider environment of multiethnic conviviality specific to London.

Knowles (2013) writes:

‘With 179 nationalities and 300 languages, superdiversity is deeply imbricated in London, in co-productions of everyday lives and urban architectures.’  
(p652)

My field site is characterised by this diversity. School monitoring data reveals that, of the 22 possible ethnic categories available within the official monitoring system, 18 are represented within the school. More than 30 different “home languages” are recorded, which for over 40% of young people is a language other than English. However, superdiversity is not just a question of the co-presence of different “communities” but concerns how they intermingle to create a particular environment. Nava (2007) describes how the multiplicity of ethnolinguistic backgrounds to be found amongst Londoners produces a ‘visceral everyday cosmopolitanism’ (p15) which is more than simply a patchwork of “communities”, evidenced in the decisive rejection of “Brexit” in London in the June 2016 referendum. As suggested by the data above, the Lusondoner participants in my study were in daily contact with a diverse range of individuals, and all these young people operated within an environment populated by multiple ethnolinguistic discourses. The intermingling between individuals of different ethnolinguistic

---

<sup>53</sup> For two indicative examples see:

- Reeve-Lewis, B. (2013) ‘Immigration checks will exclude ethnic minorities from renting’, *The Guardian*.
- Little, A. (2016) ‘UK ‘can no longer duck the issue of immigration’, says social policy expert’, *Sunday Express*. (This article starts with the following summary: ‘NEW immigrants should swear an “oath of integration” and schools must teach British values to ethnic minorities, a hard-hitting report warned today.’)

backgrounds took convivial forms, and this conviviality was also mirrored in interethnic interactions amongst Lusondoners. It is this convivial intermingling which is the subject of this chapter. This fits into the broader argument of this thesis that ethnicity is rooted in practices as opposed to the essential and bounded conceptualisations underpinning institutional ethnic monitoring. Ethnicity therefore cannot be understood outside of specific practices in specific contexts.

In this chapter, I start in section 5.1 by explaining how the multiethnic and multilingual context of my field site was characterised by a conviviality discernible in specific practices. I set out several examples of how such practices emerged through encounters and friendship groups which crossed ethnolinguistic boundaries, something I observed to be commonplace during my years working and researching at the school. I show how, within these routine convivial interactions, widely circulating discourses relating to particular ethnolinguistic groups were drawn on which tended to be grounded in simplistic accounts of those they were attached to. This meant that young people often traded in fairly essentialised notions, or stereotypical ethnic representations, of the groupings they claimed affiliation to, as well as those of their peers. I explain that, rather than amounting to definitive claims and assertions, these stereotypical ethnic representations are better conceived of as ‘emblems’ through which individuals made conscious and ludic use of widely circulating ethnolinguistic discourses as part of bantering<sup>54</sup> interactions with peers. These jostling interactions could entail boundary transgressions in the form of assertions of knowledge of “other” groups and instances of ‘crossing’ (Rampton, 1995a), however, the absence of tension or conflict resulting from these not only indicates that such interactions were commonplace, but also highlights the lack of interethnic hostility surrounding them. Through this, I show that “Lusondonerness” operates within a convivial multiethnic and multilingual environment alongside other ethnic discourses.

Throughout this chapter I stress that conviviality characterises the local context and so convivial interaction is a way for individuals to assert local “insider” status. In section 5.2, I explain how this conviviality is also mirrored in interactions between individuals tied to the ethnic fractions *within* the Lusondoner discursive space. I show that Lusondoners engage in a similar trade in emblematic ethnic and linguistic

---

<sup>54</sup> By “banter”, I am referring to teasing remarks and interactions which students engage in with a sense of mutual good humour.

representations related to these ethnic fractions, as part of constituting their shared discursive space, and asserting their “insiderness” in relation to it. However, Lusondoners’ access to Portuguese language and shared awareness of points of reference from the global Lusophone space adds an extra dimension to this conviviality. I show that, in certain instances, the high level of mutual understanding between Lusondoners of different ethnic fractions permits a sense of “joint custody” in relation to these ethnic fractions. Individuals are able to engage in linguistic borrowing and adoptions from their Lusondoner peers, and even make pronouncements on the nuances of each other’s Portuguese language use. Lusondoners then at times transgress the boundaries between particular Lusondoner ethnic fractions. Finally, in section 5.3, I explore how a similar process of boundary transgression can occur with “outsiders” inviting themselves into the Lusondoner discursive space. I mentioned above that conviviality involves trading in emblematic ethnic and linguistic representations drawn from locally dominant discourses. This meant that more widely recognised ethnic discourses were open to appropriation by “outsiders”, and I set out the example of a “Madeiran” young person bantering with a “White British” peer who is able to ‘cross’ into Portuguese.

In this chapter then, I show that the tendency towards reification of ethnicity within convivial contexts provides an accessible framework for interaction amongst individuals from different ethnic backgrounds. However, widely available stereotypical representations allow non-Lusondoners to invite themselves to participate in the Lusondoner discursive space, as well as permitting Lusondoners access to other Lusondoner ethnic fractions. From time to time then, the access afforded by these widely circulating stereotypical discourses allows individuals to challenge the definitive boundaries surrounding, and within, the Lusondoner discursive space. As I outlined above, underpinning all of this are the local conditions of conviviality which I now set out in detail.

### **5.1 Local conditions of conviviality**

As I explained in the introduction to this chapter, the school context is characterised by a plurality of languages and ethnic affiliations and regular contact with individuals from a range of ethnolinguistic backgrounds is therefore the day-to-day normality for young people. Alongside this, there are also broad overlaps in the lives of individuals, both in terms of their experiences of migration and multilingualism,



and their rootedness within the locality. In this section I will set out how this diversity plays out in a sense of ‘conviviality’ (Gilroy: 2004; 2006) amongst the young people. This involves ethnic and linguistic backgrounds being referenced, albeit through stereotypical or emblematic representations, within the course of ordinary interactions. This highlights the imperative of attending to actual practices. Harris & Rampton (2009) explain the advantages of such an approach, writing:

‘This sometimes reveals that people aren't as preoccupied, fractured or troubled by particular identifications as we initially supposed, and that they are actually rather adept at negotiating “ethnicities without guarantees”, inflecting them in ways that are extremely hard to anticipate in the absence of close empirical observation.’ (p117)

Examining practices then can often reveal people living relatively unproblematically with ethnic complexity, sharing a sense of conviviality, as I will explain in the following section.

### **5.1.1 Conviviality**

Conviviality describes the “rubbing along” of different groups in contexts of diversity. As Gilroy (2006) states:

‘Conviviality is a social pattern in which different metropolitan groups dwell in close proximity, but where their racial, linguistic and religious particularities do not – as the logic of ethnic absolutism suggests they must – add up to discontinuities of experience or insuperable problems of communication. In these conditions, a degree of differentiation can be combined with a large measure of overlapping.’ (p40)

As well as emphasising the degree of overlap in the experiences of different groups, Gilroy also stresses that, in such convivial environments, ‘racial and ethnic differences have been rendered unremarkable’ (p40). This does not mean, however, that the subject of ethnicity goes ignored. Blommaert (2013a) describes how individuals in convivial contexts interact via emblems of identity, which are:

‘presented (and oriented towards) as ‘essential’ and inflexible combinations of features that reflect, bestow, and emphasize ‘authenticity’’ (p4).

As I detail below, individuals trade in stereotypical ethnic representations for ease of recognition and exchange. These simplified accounts, or reified ethnicities, can then be invoked through references to stereotypical features. Blommaert (2013a) writes:

‘what is commonly understood as ‘culture’, also in the sense of ‘identity’, is empirically best seen as ‘accent’: small inflections—‘big enough’ however—of conventional (emblematic) patterns and templates’ (p5).

The data explored in the rest of this chapter suggest that stereotypical ethnic discourses relating to a variety of particular ethnic groups are widely recognised within the school context, and are therefore available to be drawn on within day-to-day interactions. While these interactions may involve teasing and banter, this does not suggest deep ethnic tensions but instead a sense of ethnic differences as a relatively mundane feature of daily life. This recognition of ethnic difference, however, does not accommodate all ethnic positionings equally. Some groups enjoy much greater recognition and prestige, while others are not accounted for. This can leave some individuals perpetually struggling to assert ethnic positionings which are recognised by their peers, as will be explored in more detail in section 5.3.

Rampton (2015) states that ‘conviviality’ describes a *particular local ideology*’ (p87, original emphasis), but that it is necessary to address ‘its relationship with other ideologies, both local and national’. Márcia’s (Year 10, female, “Black Portuguese”) comment, cited at the head of this chapter, was made during a wider conversation in which four friends were trading stereotypical representations of each other’s “home countries”. While these often drew on globally circulating discourses, the exchange also suggests a sense of local commonality, rooted in a shared experience of being in London but having family heritage from elsewhere. Rampton also writes:

‘an account of conviviality-as-ideology needs to rest on a description of the shared spaces and everyday projects which make ethnic and linguistic difference subsidiary to getting on with practical activity’ (p87).

The kinds of interactions taking place then may not be directly concerned with conviviality, but this is the tone they take, whatever the particular focus might be. In the bantering interaction involving Márcia, she was not principally attempting to construct a space of multiethnic appreciation and understanding. Rather, she was chatting and joking within a multiethnic friendship group and this took the form of convivial exchanges. Such interactions may appear fraught with ethnic tension to an outsider, but within the local context they are part of convivial “rubbing along”. Below I set out three further interactions from my data which exemplify this often misconstrued conviviality.

*a) A “Black Caribbean” young person teasing a Ghanaian-heritage young person about Ghana’s lack of development*

During a Maths lesson when Vinício (Year 10, male, “White Portuguese – Madeiran”) was wearing the microphone, a short bantering exchange occurred, within which a British-born “Black Caribbean” boy raised a discourse of African poverty (explored in Chapter 7), teasing his Ghanaian-born classmate that “there’s like no planes in Ghana” (audio recording 27/6/13). This taunt about Ghana’s lack of development elicited laughter both from the “Black Caribbean” young person and from Vinício. This laughter suggested that a discourse of African poverty was a common reference which was immediately recognised. The Ghanaian-born boy, whilst disagreeing, did not appear overly surprised by this line of teasing, and the exchange was short-lived, not leading to significant tension or conflict. This example suggests that, although Vinício was relatively passive in this interaction, this is the routine environment of multi-ethnic conviviality which Lusondoners like him inhabit and participate in on a daily basis.

*b) A “Madeiran” young person calling an “Albanian” young person a “terrorist”*

During a Science lesson Danilo (Year 11, male, “White Portuguese – Madeiran”) was sitting with a group of girls, some of them Lusondoners. The group were talking light-heartedly about their ambitions for future careers. Danilo mentioned wanting to be famous in Hollywood, while his friend Denise (Year 11, female, “White Portuguese – Madeiran”) joked that she wanted to become a “porn star”. Danilo then said to his friend Ariana (Year 11, female, “Albanian”):

“I can imagine you as a terrorist when you grow up, will you be that? This is what happens when you have an ex that's sitting next to you” (audio recording 14/5/13)

It is quite possible that Ariana is Muslim. Of the 15 young people at the school with Albanian heritage, 6 were recorded in official school data as “Muslim”, while only 1 was recorded as “Christian”. The other 8 (of which Ariana is one) had no religion recorded. As Danilo mentioned, he was previously in a relationship with Ariana so was likely to have been very aware of any religious affiliation on her part. Considering the widely circulating popular discourse associating Muslims with terrorism, it seems probable that Danilo was drawing on this to tease Ariana that becoming a terrorist was a plausible path for her to take. The bantering nature of this suggestion was reinforced by Danilo’s follow-up “This is what happens when you have an ex that's sitting next to you”. The residual animosity implied by this

comment also appears to be a joke as I did not see any evidence of ill-feeling between these two young people during the months I spent observing Danilo. In fact, the two often engaged in low-key flirtation, such as another Science lesson where Danilo convinced Ariana to let him pull one of her hairs out (field notes 8/5/13). While Danilo's comment could be interpreted as deeply offensive, it elicited no overt reaction from Ariana and the conversation continued in the same relaxed vein.

*c) A "Madeiran" boy teasing a "Lithuanian" girl about putative Lithuanian sexual mores*

During relaxed conversation in a registration period when Vinício (Year 10, male, "White Portuguese – Madeiran") was wearing the microphone (audio recording 28/6/13), he made some comments to his classmate Kamile (Year 10, female, "Lithuanian") about the sexual mores of girls from Lithuania (explored in more detail in Chapter 6). These included "they're good in bed innit?" and "they're right skets<sup>55</sup> as well". During my time working as a teacher at the school I regularly observed the term "sket" being used pejoratively. However, Vinício's comment did not lead to serious tension or conflict. While Kamile did express disagreement, the conversation continued and maintained an amicable tone.

The conviviality in evidence in these examples gives a very different account of diversity to that underpinning the ethnic and linguistic monitoring endeavour (as outlined in Chapter 2). It stresses overlap rather than difference, with stereotypical ethnic representations taken up playfully to facilitate exchange between individuals of different backgrounds, instead of locking groupings down into bounded communities. In this way conviviality responds to political attacks on multiculturalism, countering, as Gilroy (2006) stresses, 'the tendentious political and theoretical assumption that solidarity and diversity cannot coexist' (p29). Gilroy highlights the 'exhilarating cultural interaction' found in cities like London, describing 'unruly, convivial multiculturalism as a sort of 'Open Source' co-production' (p43) which provides an alternative to more static conceptions of multiculturalism. Similarly, Rampton (2015) emphasises the 'optimism-against-the-odds and subaltern political significance' (p87) of conviviality as an ideology. However, this is not to ignore the different levels of recognition afforded to particular groups, as I mentioned above. Conviviality does not emerge from a level playing field, but rather

---

<sup>55</sup> This is a local slang term equivalent to "slag" to deonte someone (typically female) with loose sexual morals.

it builds on locally dominant ethnic discourses. An understanding of the Lusondoner discursive space then needs to be grounded in the local context of multi-ethnic conviviality in which this discursive space is embedded.

In the rest of this chapter I will describe and analyse examples from my data where participants engage in convivial interaction. As I have emphasised above, conviviality is characteristic of the local context and in the rest of this section I will show how this dynamic underpins interactions between individuals of different ethnic backgrounds. However, conviviality does not simply operate between bounded groups and in section 5.2 I also set out how it contributes to shaping the ways Lusondoners interact with each other. This reinforces the importance of attending to the local context within which Lusondoners operate in order to understand the intra-ethnic positionings which can be glimpsed. A key feature of these positionings is the use of emblematic ethnic and linguistic representations, as I explain below.

### **5.1.2 Use of emblematic ethnic and linguistic representations**

As I have highlighted in this chapter, the Lusondoner discursive space I identify was embedded in a local environment characterised by a sense of multiethnic conviviality. A key strategy employed by young people for engaging in convivial interactions was the use of emblematic ethnic and linguistic representations. In the explanation of conviviality above, I cited Blommaert's (2013a) reference to 'conventional (emblematic) patterns and templates' (p5) which are taken up as indexical markers of particular languages and ethnicities. In my data my informants seemed to work with these ideas as they regularly attempted to employ emblematic ethnic and linguistic representations linked to widely circulating discourses, in reference both to themselves and others. My data suggest that such use of emblematic ethnic and linguistic representations provided an accessible ethnolinguistic shorthand for participants in my research as they engaged in convivial interactions. The particular emblematic representations employed highlight the common references circulating which Lusondoners and their non-Lusondoner peers had access to, including in some instances references to "Portugal" or "Portuguese" (as explored in Episode II below).

While these simplified emblems mirrored to some extent the reified ethnicities and bounded languages of institutional monitoring regimes, they were often employed in a ludic fashion within convivial interactions. Although individuals drew on

stereotypical ethnic representations, this did not mean that these representations aligned neatly with individuals' own ethnic conceptualisations and positionings. Instead, these emblematic representations provided a stock of references which could be drawn on for particular purposes in specific contexts. Some examples of this are observable in the set of interactions I outline below, in which references to "Portugal" feature alongside references to six other countries which the participants involved have ties to. Through this example I return to Rampton's (2015) warning about the need to attend to 'the shared spaces and everyday projects which make ethnic and linguistic difference subsidiary to getting on with practical activity' (p87). Conviviality may be observable amongst my participants but it is not necessarily a first-order concern for them. Rather, it describes the pattern of interactions they engage in, which are actually geared towards a whole range of goals relevant to the concerns of individuals. This is the environment of conviviality in which Lusondoners are embedded. At times they are observers and at other times participants, trading in emblematic references to other groups as well as interacting with peers employing emblematic references to "Portugueseness".

Below I set out an indicative example of this convivial environment in which Lusondoners operate. It involves Vinício (Year 10, male, "White Portuguese – Madeiran") both observing and participating in the trade in emblematic references. The episode contains competitive banter involving emblematic references to nation and nationality, in which a group of boys were engaged in amicable one-upmanship. A key resource at their disposal was their ethnonational ties, and the boys drew on this in their teasing. Despite the trading in apparently insulting national and ethnic stereotypes, the tone of the interactions did not suggest interethnic tension. Instead, the activity at hand was competitive banter, and ethnonational ties were a convenient resource which it was commonly viewed as acceptable to draw on within this. I set out how the example shows ethnonational ties as part of the backdrop to conviviality, with "Portugueseness" a recognised element within this backdrop. While the boys drew on ethnonational ties, their principal concern was amicable one-upmanship, not serious national differences.

Young people referring to stereotypical ethnonational representations was very common throughout my data and Lusondoners participated in this alongside their non-Lusondoner peers. This took the form of young people defining and defending their own ethnonational claims and contestations, as well as mocking and defaming the claims and contestations of their peers. Especially for boys, this could often take

on a competitive “football banter” style edge. During one fairly relaxed Science lesson I observed an extended interaction between a group of boys, each with a different country of family origin, which began as a discussion of their respective national football teams (summarised below). The convivial banter they engaged in was typical of interactions I observed during my research, where ethnonational ties, including at times “Portugueseness”, were referenced in unremarkable ways. In analysing the episode below, I highlight how mundane it appeared to be for Vinício. While his “Portugueseness” provided a reference recognisable to his peers, and therefore granted him access to the banter, it did not completely hold his attention. Vinício was comfortable to drift in and out of the interaction, emphasising how commonplace this kind of convivial banter was in the local environment in which Lusondoners operated.

**Episode II** (reconstructed from field notes, 11/6/13)

<b>Participant name</b>	<b>Country of family origin</b>
Erion	Albania
Hani	Eritrea
Vinício	Portugal
Samaan	Somalia
Dada	Nigeria
Terry	Ireland
John	England

Erion (Albania<sup>56</sup>) is dominating the conversation and teases Hani (Eritrea) saying “primary school kids play for Eritrea” and that “the houses are made out of sticks and rocks” there. He contrasts this with Albania where he claims to have a “three-storey house”. Alongside this Samaan (Somalia) teases Dada (Nigeria) about Nigeria. Vinício (Madeira) is half listening to this conversation, but is also using a laptop and has headphones in. During the football sparring Vinício looks up national rankings on the BBC sport website and contributes these to the conversation. As the banter turns to national stereotypes he opens Google Images and types “Eritrea woman,” followed by “Eritrea national team”. Vinício shows the images to Erion (Albania) and laughs, and Samaan (Somalia) joins in, particularly amused by the photos of dirt pitches in Eritrea. Vinício then searches for “Somalia national team”. After this, conversation moves onto flags and Vinício searches Google Images for the Madeiran flag. Next the Union Jack is

---

<sup>56</sup> I have added in the participants’ countries of family origin as they are mentioned in the account.

googled and shown to John (England) and several of the boys comment “it’s sick bruv<sup>57</sup>”. Erion then googles the Albanian flag on another laptop and shows it off proudly. All the boys argue about which of their countries had independence first then Terry (Ireland) looks up the Irish flag. Vinício argues with John about the relative standing of different national teams, then laughs as Erion (Albania) teases Hani (Eritrea). Erion talks about how good Albania is in comparison to England, to which John (England) responds “why are you in my country then?” Vinício finds this particularly funny.

The interactions recounted above were fairly typical amongst boys within the convivial south London multiethnic youth context in which my Lusondoner participants operated. Several features of this episode highlight how emblematic ethnonational representations could be referenced within mundane interactions, a strategy for convivial interaction which also permeated the Lusondoner discursive space (as I outline in section 5.2 below). Firstly, the whole discussion was fairly relaxed and low-key. Although potentially inflammatory remarks were exchanged, such as Erion claiming that “houses are made out of sticks and rocks” in Eritrea, and John asking Erion “why are you in my country then?”, the whole episode passed off apparently without any of those involved taking the comments as more than light-hearted banter. The fact that Vinício drifted in and out of the conversation, often more interested in what he had on the laptop, suggests that the content of the discussion was not particularly remarkable for him. This fits with Gilroy’s (2006) observations that ‘racial and ethnic differences have been rendered unremarkable’ (p40). Secondly, there was significant use made of emblematic ethnonational representations, slipping between national football teams and notions of ethnonational identity. The episode began as very recognisable football banter between teenage boys but quickly slipped into sparring about the countries each boy had ties to, and related national stereotypes. There was a competitive edge to this banter which mirrored the earlier football-focused discussion: whose country had the best flag? whose country was the first to gain independence? Thirdly, having a national “team” affiliation appeared to be, at least for boys, a key characteristic of the south London multiethnic youth context. Rather than bonding over supporting the same team, what the boys all had in common was their affiliation to another place. Even

---

<sup>57</sup> “Sick” carries the meaning “very good/excellent/cool” within the Local Multiethnic Vernacular (LMEV – explored in Chapter 6), while “bruv is an LMEV term of address or exclamation similar to “mate” or “man” deeply connected to London working-class speech features (derived from “brother” and influenced by cockney pronunciation of “th” as “v”). Thorne (2014) defines ‘bruv’ as ‘friend, companion, fellow gang-member’ (p68). A number of the terms described as in this thesis as belonging to LMEV are also found more widely in teenger vernaculars in the UK.



John's Englishness sat on a similar footing to the other boys' affiliations as just another team in the conversation. "Portuguese" held status in this context both due to its local numerical significance (as set out in Chapter 4), as well as extensive media coverage via successful football personalities such as José Mourinho<sup>58</sup> and the Madeiran Cristiano Ronaldo<sup>59</sup>. It was perhaps the security afforded by the solid status of "Portuguese" within a context of football-related sparring that enabled Vinício to remain fairly relaxed and aloof during the interaction.

Within the example set out above, three key features of conviviality can be glimpsed:

- i. the referencing of emblematic ethnonational representations;
- ii. common understandings of transnational ties to other countries;
- iii. the use of ethnonational ties as a resource for other locally relevant purposes.

This episode of ethnonational banter captures the local environment of multiethnic conviviality within which Lusondoners operate. This environment is populated by a range of ethnolinguistic discourses which individuals draw on in jostling interactions. This is the context in which the Lusondoner discursive space, and the ethnic fractions which constitute it, must be understood, as I set out in section 5.2. While the banter evident in the account above focuses on contrasting emblematic ethnonational representations, I also stated above that this banter rests on a common understanding amongst the participants of what it means to have transnational ties. While each of the participants has ties to different countries, they all have an overlapping experience of ties to "elsewhere". Even John, who has no declared non-English heritage, has a strong familiarity with this phenomenon via his diverse friendship group. This example then encapsulates what Gilroy (2006) describes as a 'large measure of overlapping' (p40) in the experiences of individuals from different ethnic backgrounds, a phenomenon he cites as central in constituting convivial environments. I frequently observed references to "my country" or "my language" from both Lusondoners and non-Lusondoners during my research, and this suggests a key feature of this "overlapping" which underpins multiethnic conviviality is the common understanding of what it means to have a "home country" beyond the UK, or a "home language" other than English. Harris' (2006) study of adolescents of

---

<sup>58</sup> José Mourinho is a Portuguese football manager who gained widespread notoriety and success in the UK as manager at Chelsea FC.

<sup>59</sup> Cristiano Ronaldo is a highly successful Portuguese footballer, originally from Madeira, who plays for the Spanish club Real Madrid and has captained the Portuguese national team.

mainly South Asian descent in West London found similar evidence. He writes of his participants:

‘phrases like “my culture”, “my language” and “my religion”, regularly occurred alongside bashful and rueful acknowledgements of their own deficient expertise in the tenets of idealised community emblematic practices’ (p117).

As with Harris’ study, these kinds of phrases occurred regularly amongst my participants, suggesting they were commonly understood within the local context. Such phrases linked to conceptualisations of emblematic ethnic, linguistic or national belonging, as Harris suggests, rather than implying ‘expertise in the tenets of idealised community emblematic practices’ (p117) on the part of those who employed them. Like the emblematic ethnic and linguistic references traded in convivial banter, the notions of “my language” and “my country” were another form of ethnolinguistic shorthand, shared reference points which helped to facilitate a local multiethnic conviviality.

As I have set out in this section, ethnic and linguistic claims and contestations were key features of the convivial environment in which Lusondoners operated. In section 5.2 below I explain how these convivial conditions provide the context within which the Lusondoner discursive space can be understood.

## **5.2 Conviviality within the Lusondoner discursive space**

So far in this chapter I have described how the local context within which my Lusondoner participants operated was characterised by a sense of conviviality, involving references to emblematic ethnic and linguistic representations rooted in dominant discourses, as well as common understandings about language and nation which cut across conventional ethnic boundaries. These features of conviviality were also discernible *within* the Lusondoner discursive space in relation to the three ethnolinguistic fractions I outlined in Chapter 4 (“White Portuguese”, “Brazilian” and “Black Portuguese”). The Lusondoner discursive space was rooted in these local conditions of conviviality and cannot be understood in isolation from them. However, it cannot be seen as a simple microcosm of this wider conviviality. I have explained above how conviviality is tied to a trade in emblematic ethnic and linguistic representations, rooted in locally dominant discourses. In this section I

explain how, within the Lusondoner discursive space, a different set of discourses were available, and the significant effect this had on the nature of convivial interactions.

I start in section 5.2.1 by setting out the emblematic ethnic and linguistic representations traded amongst Lusondoners. I explain that Lusondoners' access to the global Lusophone space affords them greater awareness of widely circulating Lusophone-indexed discourses than non-Lusondoners. This awareness then contributes to shaping the representations traded within the Lusondoner discursive space. However, within this global Lusophone space, different groups enjoy different levels of recognition, with a particular focus on discourses of "Brazilianness" and a general blind spot for discourses of "Black Portugueseness". This dynamic then permeates the convivial trade in emblematic ethnic and linguistic representations within the Lusondoner discursive space. In section 5.2.2, I set out how access to Portuguese language facilitates an extra dimension in Lusondoners' interactions with each other, allowing communication on a level not possible for non-Lusophones. This goes beyond trading in linguistic representations to repeated examples of Lusondoners adopting elements of Portuguese linguistic varieties, in unmarked ways, from peers of different Lusondoner ethnic fractions. Again, a widespread interest in "Brazilianness" largely informs this phenomenon with "White Portuguese" young people using linguistic items associated with Brazil, but there are also instances of adoptions in the other direction. This common access to Portuguese language resources then means that the Lusondoner discursive space is not only characterised by a convivial trade in emblems, but also in locally rooted practices in the form of linguistic adoptions and borrowings. Such practices highlight how Lusondoners do not have complete control of the boundaries of the ethnic fractions they are associated with. Instead, there is a degree of "pooled sovereignty", and linguistic adoptions and borrowings represent a key way in which Lusondoners signal local belonging and "insiderness" in relation to this wider Lusondoner discursive space.

In section 5.2.3 I explore how this "pooled sovereignty" amongst Lusondoners facilitates a level of convivial banter in which the adoptions and borrowings mentioned above themselves become the focus of teasing. To some degree this marks a reversal of the convivial banter of the boys described in section 5.1.2 above, which revolved around ridiculing each other through association with emblematic ethnonational representations. Instead, convivial banter within the Lusondoner

discursive space could also take the form of pointing out where Lusondoner peers were deviating from the linguistic norms associated with their ethnic fraction. While Lusondoners may not use the labels I employ for the different ethnic fractions, their recognition of these groupings can be glimpsed in the references to emblematic ethnic and linguistic representations they engage in. Lusondoners understand these ethnic fractions in relation to specific individuals they encounter day by day, so their recognition is based on the interplay between actual individuals and wider stereotypes. While a Lusondoner then is likely to be aware both of the ethnic fractions and how specific classmates relate to these, non-Lusondoners are unlikely to be able to work with such recognitions. This level of conviviality then, while rooted in the same context as the wider multiethnic conviviality outlined in section 5.1, is specific to Lusondoners.

### **5.2.1 References to emblematic ethnic and linguistic representations**

In Chapter 4 I set out how particular Lusondoner fractions were often referenced via stereotypical ethnic and linguistic representations. The specificity of such representations suggests Lusondoners could draw on a level of Lusophone-related linguistic and cultural awareness which went beyond that readily available to most non-Lusondoners. Within this, the differing prevalence of references to each Lusondoner ethnic fraction reflects the profile these have within the Lusondoner discursive space. There were some references to “White Portugueseness”, but no explicit references to “Black Portugueseness”. However, references to “Brazilianness” were a regular feature of the Lusondoner discursive space. While “Black Portugueseness” had very limited recognition both within and beyond the Lusondoner discursive space, the prominence of “Brazilianness” within the sphere of Lusophone popular culture contributed to a particular focus on this ethnic fraction. This is reflected in three further examples of emblematic references to “Brazilianness” I set out below.

#### *a) A stereotype of “Brazilianness”*

As stated above, stereotypes of “Brazilians” were one of the most common subjects of emblematic references by Lusondoners. Stereotypical representations of “Brazilians” were commonly recognised within the discursive space, and generally provoked reactions of amusement from other Lusondoners, including “Brazilians”. The example below involving Danilo (Year 11, male, “White Portuguese – Madeiran”) is a fairly typical instance of this. Danilo regularly enjoyed teasing Priscila (Year, 10, female, “Brazilian”) about being Brazilian, and during a break

time while he was wearing the microphone, he can be heard asking her if she is from the “favela” (shanty town) (audio recording 14/5/13). This elicited laughter from the rest of the Lusondoner group, including Brazilians such as Alícia. The joint laughter of the group emphasised that the discourse of favelas was a common reference point in the Lusondoner discursive space. However, this did not mean that it was eagerly supported by Brazilian young people, but nor did they seriously object to it. As I stated in Chapter 4, Alícia made it clear that other Lusondoners had skewed perceptions of Brazil, implying that this could be frustrating at times. What is clear from the data though is that, despite a crude stereotype being referred to as emblematic of “Brazilian” by a non-Brazilian, this did not lead to serious conflict. Rather, it is another example of emblematic references rooted in commonly recognised stereotypical representations which formed part of a Lusondoner conviviality. Like the ethnonational banter outlined in the previous section, Danilo’s amicable teasing was his prime concern. A stereotypical representation was enlisted within this teasing as it was readily available within the context of Lusondoner conviviality. This same context also facilitated Danilo’s engagement in emblematic linguistic references, discussed below.

*b) Crossing into Brazilian Portuguese*

As well as invoking “Brazilian” stereotypes, Danilo (Year 10, male, “White Portuguese – Madeiran”) also referenced “Brazilianness” by engaging in ‘crossing’ into a recognisably Brazilian variety of Portuguese. This was facilitated by short, emblematic snatches of language, as part of fairly mundane convivial exchanges. Danilo frequently referenced “Brazilianness” by employing words ending in “-te” (such as “gente”) with the palatalization making the final “te” sound like “chee”<sup>60</sup> (tʃi:). A frequent example of this was his use of the word “piriguete”<sup>61</sup> (pronounced with a typically Brazilian final “ch” sound: piriˈgetʃi:), which had a double indexicality as it simultaneously referenced the perceived licentiousness of Brazilians (outlined in Chapter 2). There were several instances in the data of Danilo using the Brazilian term “piriguete” with female, Brazilian peers. During a

---

<sup>60</sup> Carvalho (2004) traces this palatalization of dental stops to the prestigious Rio de Janeiro dialect, which ‘reaches the entire country through the Rio de Janeiro-based Rede Globo, the largest national television network’ (p134). Although widespread in Brazil, palatalization is not yet dominant in southern states where Carvalho notes that ‘dental realizations are common enough to constitute a stereotype of Southern dialects’ (p134). Danilo’s use of palatalization can therefore be interpreted as an attempt at an accent commonly recognised as Brazilian.

<sup>61</sup> A recognisably Brazilian slang term meaning slag/whore.

changeover between lessons while Danilo was wearing the audio microphone he could be heard shouting to Alícia (Year 11, female, “Brazilian”):

“você é uma piriguete” (*you are a slag*) (audio recording 14/5/13)

in a loud and exaggerated voice in the corridor. However, his flamboyant performance and attempt at Brazilian pronunciation (as well as the thrill of swearing loudly in the corridor without significant risk of sanctions) appeared to be an end in itself, rather than any attempt to actually offend Alícia, and she responded with laughter. Instead of seriously aligning Alícia with this Brazilian stereotype, Danilo appeared to be foregrounding the stereotype itself for the general amusement of his Lusondoner peers, including Alícia. On another occasion, during a break time when Danilo was wearing the microphone, he could be heard saying the same phrase:

“você é uma piriguete” (*you are a slag*) (audio recording 14/5/13)

to Bruna (Year 11, female, Brazilian). Again, this did not lead to audible protestations or signs of offence on her part. In a similar incident, Danilo shouted out in the corridor:

“é verdade que as brasileiras são todas piriguetes” (*it's true that Brazilian girls are all slags*) (audio recording 14/5/13).

This was voiced in a mock Brazilian accent, and Danilo followed up by repeatedly shouting out “piriguetes”. Here he explicitly articulated the Brazilian stereotype and focused on the word “piriguetes” itself, rather than any specific event or person it might refer to. A range of encounters captured in the audio data revealed Danilo’s status as a rare male confidant within female friendship circles, where details of sexual behaviour were openly shared with him by female friends. It is unlikely these girls would have been so open if he were known for disapproving attitudes towards such behaviour. This suggests that Danilo’s repeated use of the word “piriguete” was principally about linking into the Lusondoner discursive space through reference to a commonly recognised stereotype, rather than attacking Alícia or Bruna. Danilo’s emblematic referencing keyed into common awareness of the Brazilian stereotype for comedic effect, and this was reinforced by Alícia’s laughter as well as evidence elsewhere in the data of their close friendship. Danilo’s emblematic ethnic and linguistic references to “Brazilianness” reinforce the point I made above that “Brazilianness” had a particularly high profile within the Lusondoner discursive

space. Rather than simply stigmatizing Brazilians, Danilo was making ludic use of “Brazilianness”, relying on the common recognition and interest it enjoyed, for his own purpose of amusing his Lusondoner peers. His ability to do this – sharing key understandings of “Brazilianness” with his Lusondoner peers but without causing serious offence to the “Brazilians” amongst them – is evidence of the Lusondoner conviviality of the local context. The particular role of “Brazilianness” within this is further elaborated in the following example of adoptions of elements of Brazilian Portuguese by non-“Brazilian” Lusondoners.

### 5.2.2 Adoption of emblematic linguistic features

I set out above how emblematic linguistic features could be used as part of convivial banter between Lusondoners of different ethnic fractions. In this section I explain how, over time, such interactions contributed to the shaping of new regular linguistic practices whereby Lusondoners adopted emblematic linguistic features from varieties of Portuguese “belonging to” other Lusondoner ethnic fractions. This shows how shared access to the Portuguese language facilitated a level of mutual influence amongst Lusondoners which was not the case for their non-Lusondoner peers. In section 5.2.3, I explain how these practices then contributed to the shaping of more nuanced Lusondoner-specific convivial interactions.

#### *a) Brazilian Portuguese being noted and adopted*

In this chapter I have presented examples of Brazilian Portuguese being mocked. Below I will set out an instance of a recognisable Brazilian phrase being noted, but also adopted by non-Brazilian Lusondoners. This supports the notion of widespread recognition of emblematic snatches of language facilitating convivial exchanges, but also shows that this recognition could be coupled with an interest that went beyond stigmatization or teasing, even involving emulation. The phrase was recorded during a break-time when Alícia (Year 11, female, “Brazilian”) was wearing the microphone (audio recording 10/5/13). Alícia was recounting to her close friend Denise (Year 11, female, “White Portuguese – Madeiran”) some dialogue she had had with her ex-boyfriend. Whilst paraphrasing her ex-boyfriend, Alícia said:

“ele falou que, tipo assim...” (*he said that, like*).

The phrase “tipo assim” translates as “like” or “sort of like”, and during the exchange Alícia used it several times. Denise then began to mimic the phrase back at her, emphasising the mimicry by pronouncing the “ti” of “tipo” as “chi” (tʃi:), a

recognisably Brazilian pronunciation which contrasted with the “ti” (ti:) which would be typical in Madeira. When I raised this with Alícia during a retrospective interview (13/5/13) she confirmed that “tipo assim” is a typical Brazilianism and that the other Lusondoners often teased her for this. This could be seen as aligning with the dominant language ideology outlined in Chapter 2 within which Brazilian Portuguese is assigned a lower value than European varieties. However, Alícia also stated that her Lusondoner friends all used “tipo assim” from time to time in the course of normal speech without foregrounding this as emblematic stylisation.

Alícia’s account of other Lusondoners adopting “tipo assim” suggests that, within the context of the Lusondoner discursive space, heavily marked items could provide a connection point. When they were used by Brazilians this provided an opportunity for non-Brazilians to engage in Portuguese-indexed teasing banter, referencing these snatches of language as emblematic of “Brazilianness”. Denise did not impersonate Alícia all the time, although Alícia’s Portuguese was almost always recognisably Brazilian. Instead, Denise took the opportunity of an instance of archetypal Brazilian speech to engage in teasing (Danilo displayed a similar reliance on archetypal Brazilianisms when bantering with Alícia and Bruna, as outlined above). This heavily marked item was also sufficiently recognisable and commonplace that it could be taken up by non-Brazilians in non-marked ways within their own speech, as mentioned by Alícia in the interview referenced above. This suggests that awareness of different Portuguese varieties amongst Lusondoners did not need to be extensively developed in order to be drawn on. The references to emblematic ethnic and linguistic representations which underpinned Lusondoner conviviality could rely on fairly rudimentary awareness. The examples above show that, over time, these emblematic speech markers could make their way into the unmarked everyday speech of Lusondoners who generally spoke a different variety of Portuguese to that of the emblematic term. There is a parallel here with the adoption of terms associated with particular ethnic groups within the kind of Local Multi Ethnic Vernacular found in south London, as I explain in Chapter 6. Convivial conditions then did not just facilitate banter and jostling exchanges amongst Lusondoners, but also helped to enable the more routine adoption of linguistic markers associated with other Lusondoner ethnic fractions, albeit with a particular focus on “Brazilianness” reflective of the nature of the Lusondoner discursive space in general. Further examples of such adoptions are given below.



*b) Adoption of European Portuguese grammatical construction by a Brazilian*

The following example is one instance of the kind of adoption of linguistic features described above. This particular instance occurred during a Science lesson (audio recording 10/5/13) and involved Alícia (Year 11, female, “Brazilian”) adopting a typically European Portuguese grammatical construction instead of the common Brazilian form. Alícia voiced the following question and comment as she was discussing which tasks she had completed with her friend Adriana (Year 11, female, “White Portuguese – Madeiran”):

*“já terminaste o seis ponto três Adriana? aqui ó” (have you already finished six point three Adriana? look here).*

Alícia used the word “terminaste”, a second-person preterite conjugation which, while common in Portugal, is very rarely used in Brazil<sup>62</sup>. This was juxtaposed within the same utterance with “aqui ó<sup>63</sup>” a very typically Brazilian construction meaning “look here” or “this one”. The form “terminaste” would typically be seen as overly formal or fussy to other Brazilians, a point confirmed by Alícia when she described her father’s reaction to her use of it when I quizzed her on this during a retrospective interview (13/5/13). She stated:

*“meu pai fica me zoando falando ‘ah você não deveria falar assim, você deveria falar direito’” (audio recording 13/5/13)  
(my dad teases me saying ‘ah you shouldn’t speak like that, you should speak properly’).*

Her father’s words suggest Alícia’s use of this form is seen as incongruent with the Brazilian variety of Portuguese she generally speaks at home with her family. It is therefore very likely she has picked up this feature from “Mainland Portuguese” and “Madeiran friends” at school, and this is reinforced by numerous examples in the audio data of this conjugation being used by such friends, all passing without commentary. For example, Denise (Year 11, female, “White Portuguese – Madeiran”) used “recebeste” (audio recording 10/5/13) a second-person preterite conjugation meaning “received”, and Dino (Year 11, male, “White Portuguese – Mainland”) uses “apanhaste” (audio recording 15/5/13) a second-person preterite conjugation meaning “picked up”, both passing without commentary. Alícia also

<sup>62</sup> The more common form in Brazil generally, and certainly in Goiânia where Alícia comes from, would be the third person (“terminou”).

<sup>63</sup> “ó” is a contraction of “olha” (look)

employed it a number of times, including during a Health and Social Care lesson when she asks Denise:

“já terminaste o unit one?” (have you finished unit one yet?)

This example, like the adoption of “tipo assim” (sort of like) described above, shows how emblematic features of particular varieties of Portuguese could be taken up within a peer context by speakers who did not generally use that variety. This suggests that convivial conditions amongst Lusondoners did not just provide a space for emblematic linguistic referencing from moment to moment; they also helped to facilitate peer-influenced Portuguese linguistic practices. Over time and with repeated exposure through interactions with close friends, linguistic emblems could cross into the regular unmarked speech of Lusondoners tied to ethnic fractions not normally associated with these emblems. A further example of this is given below.

*c) Adoption of Brazilian phrases and pronunciation by a Madeiran*

As outlined in Chapter 4, there are far more “White Portuguese” young people than “Brazilians” in my field site. It could be assumed that Alicia’s adoption of European features in her Portuguese (described above) was simply a matter of adjusting to the dominant variety within the school in terms of number of speakers. However, as already outlined, the influence between varieties of Portuguese was not one-way. Madeiran-born Adriana, Alicia’s best friend, made fairly regular use of the marked Brazilian expressions “cala boca” (shut up) and “gente” (us/guys – also used as an exclamation). In Chapter 4 I explained how the high profile of Brazilian popular culture had led to a widespread interest in Brazil and Brazilian Portuguese. However, this tended to manifest in stylised renditions of Brazilian Portuguese which were explicitly referenced, as outlined above in relation to Danilo. With Adriana (Year 11, female, “White Portuguese – Madeiran”) though, her Brazilian-influenced phrases were slipped into her speech in low-key ways, not remarked on by her or other Lusondoners she was interacting with. The lack of commentary suggests that, like Alicia’s use of the grammatical construction described in the previous subsection, Adriana’s use of Brazilian phrases was a relatively unconscious accommodation towards the speech of her close friend. This is further evidence of locally rooted Portuguese linguistic practices, developed in the peer context as opposed to the family home.

The traditional language ideologies outlined in Chapter 2 envisage specific linguistic varieties as “belonging to” particular groups of people. However, my data suggest that this can miss the local practices, and in particular peer-to-peer borrowings and adoptions, which can emerge through friendships in superdiverse contexts. Convivial conditions then are not just about interactions between different ethnic fractions, but between specific individuals often bound up in close friendships. The keen awareness of different Portuguese linguistic varieties on the part of Lusondoners, and how these related to the sometimes complex biographies and backgrounds of their Lusondoner friends, was a key feature of the conviviality within the Lusondoner discursive space. It is to a more detailed explanation of this that I now turn.

### **5.2.3 Convivial banter and linguistic commentary rooted in nuanced linguistic awareness**

The linguistic borrowing and adoptions between Lusondoner ethnic fractions outlined in the previous section highlight how, in certain contexts, Lusondoners felt able to cross the boundaries between different Lusondoner ethnic fractions. While individual Lusondoners were generally associated with particular ethnic fractions and linguistic varieties, the examples outlined show that Lusondoners were often comfortable to stray beyond the Portuguese linguistic variety that “belonged” to them. Further examples I set out below show that this flexibility also extended to making pronouncements about the linguistic practices of their peers as these related to particular ethnic fractions. In doing so, Lusondoners drew together awareness of peers’ biographies and backgrounds with knowledge of Portuguese varieties other than their own. They were therefore able to engage in a more nuanced level of convivial interaction than that accessible to non-Lusondoners. As I mentioned in the introduction to section 5.2, this was a key way in which Lusondoners signalled their “insiderness” within the Lusondoner discursive space. The first example below highlights how Lusondoners were often able to build up detailed awareness of different Portuguese linguistic varieties through exposure to other Lusondoner peers, while the other two examples show such awareness being deployed within convivial interactions.

#### *a) Heightened awareness of Brazilian lexical items on the part of a Madeiran*

During a break time when Alícia (Year 11, female, “Brazilian”) was wearing the microphone (audio recording 10/5/13) she could be heard talking to Lara (Year 11, female, “Brazilian/White Portuguese”). As mentioned above, Alícia is Brazilian

while Lara has a mixed background including both Portugal and Brazil. Within the conversation Alícia used the word “tréguas” (truce/pause/respite), which can also mean “hope” in Brazil. Lara did not understand this word so then Denise (Year 11, female, “White Portuguese – Madeiran”) explained the Brazilian meaning to her. During a retrospective interview (13/5/13) Alícia explained that really Lara should have understood this word as her dad is Brazilian, but that because Denise spent more time around Alícia, Denise understood Alícia’s Brazilian Portuguese better. In other words, despite Denise’s Madeiran background she had a well-developed understanding of Brazilian Portuguese vocabulary due to her close friendship with Alícia. This peer influence suggests that friendships were an important engine of convivial interaction amongst Lusondoners, with continued exposure over time contributing to a deeper awareness and understanding of each other’s linguistic repertoire.

*b) Convivial banter between two “Brazilians” related to Brazilian regional varieties of Portuguese*

In section 5.2.1 I outlined instances of linguistic referencing whereby emblematic linguistic features were used to reference the ethnic fraction these features were associated with. Within my data there are also instances of more subtle references which display nuanced awareness on the part of Lusondoners about the biographies and backgrounds of their peers and how these link to their linguistic repertoires. One such episode occurred between Bruna (Year 11, female, “Brazilian”) and Alícia (Year 11, female, “Brazilian”) when they were chatting during a lunch break (audio recording 9/5/13). Bruna pronounced the word “gordinha” (*chubby*) with a rolled R and Alícia then mimicked this pronunciation, strongly emphasising the rolled R. Alícia later explained to me in a retrospective interview (13/5/13) that Bruna’s pronunciation here had rubbed off from her boyfriend. He is from Bahia in north-eastern Brazil where this pronunciation is common, unlike in São Paulo state where Bruna is from, more to the south of the country. Alícia explained that this rolled R is actually also common in Goiânia in central Brazil where Alícia is from. This shows that Alícia was not teasing Bruna for being different to her, but for using a feature which was not typical of where Bruna is from. This Portuguese-indexed banter relied on knowledge not just of different Brazilian regional varieties of Portuguese, but also of which was “appropriate” according to the background of the friend being teased. This episode therefore highlights how Lusondoners could combine awareness of Portuguese varieties with an understanding of the often complex biographies of their peers in their convivial interactions.

c) *Convivial banter between a “Madeiran” and a mixed “White Portuguese/Brazilian” related to “appropriate” varieties of Portuguese*

Another example of this more nuanced teasing involved Lara (Year 11, female, “Brazilian”/”White Portuguese”) who has both Brazilian and mainland Portuguese heritage but tended to speak a broadly Brazilian variety of Portuguese. On one occasion when Alícia was wearing the microphone it picked up Lara during break time conversation (audio recording 10/5/13). She was speaking with her usual Brazilian accent, using recognisably Brazilian terms, including the following:

“a gente” (“us/guys”, also used as an exclamation).

She pronounced this with a final “ch” (tʃi:) sound, which, as I explained in section 5.2.1, is widely understood as a marker of Brazilian Portuguese (see Carvalho: 2004). Lara then juxtaposed this with her pronunciation of another word:

“importante” (*important*)

This word was pronounced with a rolled R and hard final T, emblematic of European Portuguese (see da Silva Coelho & Santos Burigo: 2009).

*Table XVII: Pronunciation of “importante”*

<p><b>How Lara pronounces “importante”:</b></p>	<p><b>Pronunciation of “importante” in line with the particular Brazilian variety of Portuguese Lara employed just before when saying “a gente”:</b></p>
<p>impɔ:r'tæntə</p>	<p>impɔ:h'tæntʃi:</p>

While both a rolled R and a hard T (as in “impɔ:r'tæntə”) are common in some parts of Brazil, they are emblematic of European Portuguese. Also, Lara used a soft “ch” ending in her pronunciation of “gente” ('ʒentʃi:) just before, making this hard T stand out as incongruent. Denise (Year 11, female, “White Portuguese – Madeiran”) immediately picked up on this and echoed Lara’s pronunciation of “importante”, stressing the rolled R and hard final T. Denise was teasing Lara for using a pronunciation that Denise herself would normally use. It was singled out as noteworthy because it contrasted with the Brazilian Portuguese Lara would generally speak. These last two examples highlight the linguistic awareness and the levels of

attention these Lusondoners were capable of drawing on in their convivial interactions. Again, this is something which would not be available to non-Lusondoner peers.

This is an example then of how a level of awareness amongst Lusondoners – both about each other’s backgrounds, but also the ways in which different Lusondoner ethnic fractions were salient within these – underpinned Lusondoner conviviality. In the following section I will address some of the struggles Lusondoners faced in interactions with non-Lusondoners, either for ownership of, or recognition for, their Lusondonerness.

### **5.3 Lusondoners and outsiders**

In section 5.1 I outlined the general conditions of multiethnic conviviality which characterise the field site in my study, and the importance of emblematic ethnic and linguistic references within this. In section 5.2 I explained how a narrower, Lusondoner-specific version of this conviviality operates between the Lusondoner ethnic fractions. What sets this Lusondoner conviviality apart is the more nuanced awareness Lusondoners have both of the Lusondoner ethnic fractions, but also of how these fractions might be salient within the sometimes complex trajectories of their Lusondoner friends. In this section I detail an interaction which highlights how, under conditions of conviviality, Lusondoners can get drawn into contestations with non-Lusondoners. Alongside the conviviality I have described in this chapter then, there is also the potential for tension. While in my data interactions between Lusondoners and “outsiders” do not come to crisis point, the example explored below shows that Lusondoners can come across challenges from non-Lusondoner peers inviting themselves to access the Lusondoner discursive space.

#### **5.3.1 Crossing into Portuguese**

Rampton (1995a) coined the term ‘crossing’ to describe linguistic borrowings which carry a ‘sense of social or ethnic boundary transgression’ (Rampton, 2009, p149). This sense of boundary transgression stems from the ‘one-language/one-culture assumption’ (Gal & Irvine, 1995, p994), outlined in Chapter 2, whereby a language is seen as tied to a particular culture. Individuals therefore have languages which are “theirs”, which are culturally associated with them, and languages which are not.

Rampton (2009) writes that crossing can be said to occur when ‘the variants being used are more likely to be seen as anomalously “other” for the speaker’ (p149). While widely circulating discourses relating to particular languages are likely to be a factor in instances of crossing, they do not provide a straightforward interpretive framework. Instead, Quist & Jørgensen (2007) stress: ‘[i]t is the concrete, local employment of the variety that tells us how the crossing should be interpreted’ (p374). As discussed in section 5.1, immediate, local concerns are key in understanding what is actually taking place. This is evident in the example which follows, where John, a “White British” non-Lusondoner, engages in crossing into Portuguese as one tool within amicable verbal sparring with his Lusondoner friend Vinício (Year 10, male, “White Portuguese – Madeiran”).

The extract below shows John, a good friend of Vinício’s, producing two complete and accurate phrases in Portuguese as part of a bantering exchange. This crossing occurred within the context of verbal sparring, as John and Vinício each attempted to provide come-backs to the insults the other had produced. This then provides the frame for interpreting the instances of crossing. Rather than reading the use of Portuguese as John claiming or mocking “Portugueseness”, the crossing fits into a wider exchange concerned with amicable competitive sparring. John’s ability to temporarily trump Vinício by using Portuguese accurately within the banter highlights the potential for non-Lusondoners to unsettle established Lusondoners within convivial exchanges.

The conversation took place during a fairly relaxed English lesson, and this extract starts with John making claims about his expected performance in the upcoming school sports day.

**Episode III** (audio recording of naturally occurring speech, 27/6/13)

Speaker	Ethnolinguistic background
Vinício (Year 10, male)	“White Portuguese”, according to the criteria I set out in Part I of this Chapter, with “Mediterranean” features. Born in Madeira, then moved to the UK during Year 7 as a beginner to English. Speaks English with a London accent and is fluent in Portuguese which he speaks with a Madeiran accent.
John (Year 10, male)	Recorded as “White British” and has “Caucasian” features: John and both his parents are UK-born and he speaks English with a London accent.
Me (Age 31, male)	Recorded as “White British”, with an olive skin tone. Born and grew up in UK. Generally speaks a fairly standard variety of English. Fluent in Portuguese with a recognisably Brazilian accent.

**Key:** Portuguese

- 1 John and handball I'll win it for our form
- 2 Vinício huh?
- 3 John I'll win it for our form
- 4 Vinício you're shit (1) you're lucky you got in the basketball [team then
- 5 John [so's your
- 6 mum
- 7 Vinício ((*kisses teeth*<sup>64</sup>)) your mum is shit in bed as well
- 8 ((*covers microphone*)) she's shit in bed as well (4) ((*laughs*))
- 9 ahh joke
- 10 John ((*into microphone*)) hello
- 11 Vinício ((*laughing*)) why you saying hello bruv?
- 12 John ( )
- 13 Vinício what?
- 14 Me just keep it on over lunch and I'll see you in Textiles (3)

The conversation in this extract took the form of a bantering exchange which drew in several different strategies as the level of competition escalated. The episode

<sup>64</sup> Sucking air through the teeth with pursed lips in order to produce a kind of elongated tut – a feature associated with “Black” speech and LMEV which is used to show annoyance.





- ((Translation: 'shut your mum'))
- 17 John [eu fodi a tua mãe  
 ((Translation: 'I fucked your mum'))
- 18 Vinício no I am gonna fuck your mu (.) uuuuum
- 19 John eu fodi a tua mãe ((laughing))  
 ((Translation: 'I fucked your mum'))
- 20 Vinício ((laughs)) oh yeah ((rising intonation))
- 21 John *cala boca cala boca* ((taunting intonation)) (1) what? (2)  
 ((Translation: 'shut your mouth'))
- 22 *cala boca* man  
 ((Translation: 'shut your mouth'))
- 23 Vinício you're calling yourself gay
- 24 John no I'm not
- 25 Vinício you are ((laughs))
- 26 John that's why I'm putting it up your mum's arse

John's use of Portuguese did not appear to surprise Vinício, but instead necessitated a further shift in gear. Vinício responded by switching to Portuguese himself and combining both John's "cala boca" with the previous reference to mothers to create "cala a tua mama" (shut your mum – line 16). This is not a phrase I had heard from other young people in the school or elsewhere, and Vinício's heavy emphasis on the first syllable of "mama" suggests he was deliberately exaggerating the contrast with "boca". This implies he had improvised the phrase in the moment, thus foregrounding his flexibility in Portuguese, in contrast to John's memorised phrases. Vinício cemented his trumping with some crossing of his own, adding the Jamaican Creole term "bumbaclart" (line 16) to index his street toughness (see Chapter 6). My sense of John was that he did not present a particularly tough image and I had never heard him using Creole terms. He was possibly not comfortable following Vinício into this repertoire, but instead he escalated with a longer, accurate and stronger phrase in Portuguese "eu fodi a tua mãe" (I fucked your mum – line 17). Vinício was initially unable to find a stronger comeback and resorted to simply mimicking this in English (line 18). John was able to repeat his comment (line 19) and his laughter suggests he was pleased with the success he had achieved in the banter stakes. His subsequent repetition of "cala boca" (line 21-22) with a taunting intonation implies he was revelling in this victory. John's combination of "cala boca" with the LMEV emphasiser "man" (line 22) reinforced the bid for prestige, as well as suggesting a

certain ease and comfort in this crossing. Vinício's ownership of Portuguese had been undermined and his response "you're calling yourself gay" (line 23) was correctly contested by John (line 24). John then cemented his taunting with some vulgarity in English, saying "that's why I'm putting it up your mum's arse" (line 26). Vinício then took the initiative, working on exposing John's lack of fluency in Portuguese.

### Episode III continued

- 27 Vinício say I a eu [*sou pandoleiro*  
 ((Translation: 'I'm gay'))
- 28 John [*eu fodí a tua mãe*  
 ((Translation: 'I fucked your mum'))
- 29 Vinício say say eu sou pandoleiro  
 ((Translation: 'I'm gay'))
- 30 John [ah
- 31 Vinício [*eu sou pandoleiro*  
 ((Translation: 'I'm gay'))
- 32 John *eu sou pandomoéiro*<sup>66</sup>
- 33 Vinício ((*laughing*)) ah you're gay ah ( [ )
- 34 John [what does it mean?
- 35 Vinício ((*laughing*)) ah ( ) bruv you say I was I'm gonna fuck  
 36 your mum
- 37 John (you said) I'm gonna fuck your mum? (2)
- 38 Vinício say it again (3)
- 39 John what does this mean in your language?
- 40 Vinício what?
- 41 John ah kee gee (1) ah kwee gee<sup>67</sup>
- 42 Vinício I don't understand that word
- 43 John ((*laughs*))

Vinício pressed on with his reassertion of ownership of Portuguese, getting John to repeat the phrase "eu so pandoleiro" (I'm gay – lines 27-32). John initially attempted

<sup>66</sup> John's difficulty in imitating this word reinforces the impression that his ability to pronounce '*cala boca*' and '*eu fodí a tua mãe*' accurately was the result of hearing and practising these terms repeatedly over time.

<sup>67</sup> It is not clear what John is attempting to say here.

to stick with his established phrase “eu fodi a tua mãe” (line 28), but soon got drawn in by Vinício and was left in the disempowering position of having to ask “what does it mean?” (line 34). When John tried to move onto another Portuguese phrase he had tried to learn (line 41) his rendition was unsuccessful. This extract shows how Portuguese can be taken up both by Lusondoners and non-Lusondoners for locally relevant purposes. Although Vinício was back on top by the end of the exchange, at points John managed to leverage Portuguese to trump Vinício in verbal sparring. Control of the linguistic emblems associated with Portuguese then did not always lie with Lusondoners. Although this was the only extended example in my audio data of crossing into Portuguese, I had often heard non-Portuguese speaking young people around the school using the phrase ‘cala boca’ (shut up), as well as asking Portuguese speakers how to say certain words. John’s fairly accurate pronunciation also suggests his Portuguese phrases were quite well practised. After the exchanges presented in the extract above, the conversation moved back to the upcoming sports day, suggesting that the episode of crossing did not represent a break from the flow of conversation, but instead was just one of a number of strategies briefly taken up within a broader endeavour of competitive banter. This extended extract shows that Portuguese was an established feature of local convivial conditions, making it available to some degree as a resource for non-Lusondoners. While Vinício was able to reassert his superior knowledge of Portuguese, John’s use of it shows how conviviality can open up the Lusondoner discursive space to “outsiders”, sometimes posing a challenge to Lusondoners.

#### **5.4 Chapter conclusion**

The Lusondoner discursive space is a phenomenon deeply rooted in the conviviality which characterises local conditions in south London. Significant ethnic and linguistic diversity contribute to the shaping of recurring patterns of interaction whereby individuals trade in stereotypical ethnic and linguistic representations via simple emblematic references. While this reproduces often reductive and essentialised accounts of languages and ethnicities, it does provide an accessible common framework through which individuals bringing different transnational links can interact in mutually intelligible ways, negotiating diversity without serious tension. Although young people are saddled with somewhat stereotypical notions of their “own” language and ethnicity, they are empowered to engage with and comment on the linguistic repertoires and ethnic affiliations of their peers.

Conviviality means there is a certain “pooling of sovereignty” in the domain of ethnolinguistic identification through which diversity is accommodated without major crises or conflict.

A similar structure of convivial interaction also appears to operate at the narrower level of the Lusondoner discursive space. Lusondoners of different ethnic fractions trade with each other in stereotypical representations of “Brazilianness” and “Portugueseness” which are not readily accessible to non-Lusondoners. However, a nuance of this Lusondoner conviviality is the level of general awareness about other ethnic fractions which individual Lusondoners bring. This is rooted in the interlinked histories of the Lusondoner ethnic fractions and is reinforced by overlapping friendship groups. Aragao (2013) identifies significant crossover in Lusophoners’ use of shops and services in London, noting the tendency for shops to brand themselves as “Luso” rather than singularly Portuguese, Brazilian or African’ (p6). This suggests that Lusondoners are likely to have more developed understandings of the transnational links of their Lusondoner peers from other fractions, than they are of classmates with ties to places such as Nigeria or Turkey. These understandings, plus the tie of access to mutually intelligible varieties of Portuguese, create an interconnectedness between the Lusondoner fractions whereby individual Lusondoners feel comfortable to make more nuanced pronouncements on Lusondoner ethnic fractions and linguistic varieties other than their “own”.

While the Lusondoner discursive space has a distinctiveness within the context of multiethnic conviviality, it is not a zone completely sealed off to non-Lusondoners. The example of John’s crossing into Portuguese shows that Lusondoners do not hold absolute control of the discursive space. Equally, Lusondoners themselves are not bound into this space to the exclusion of the wider multiethnic convivial context. The example of Vinício described in this chapter shows how Lusondoners operate on multiple levels. Vinício is referenced as “Portuguese” when he participates in the multiethnic context, but is also assigned (and takes on) the label of “Madeiran” in the context of his Portuguese GCSE class. The complexities of operating on multiple levels will be further explored in the Chapter 7, where I describe Dara and Márcia’s struggle to position themselves in relation to both “Blackness” and “Portugueseness” in the London context. In the current chapter I have set out how local conditions of multiethnic conviviality underpin the Lusondoner discursive space. In the next chapter I explain another key feature of this local context; the dominance of a Local

Multiethnic Vernacular (LMEV) which Lusondoners must negotiate within their ethnic positionings and linguistic practices.

## Chapter 6

### Lusondoners and Local Multiethnic Vernacular

“(kisses teeth<sup>68</sup>) you’re wrong innit<sup>69</sup>, you piece of shit bruv young<sup>70</sup> g<sup>71</sup>”  
 Vinício (audio data 28/6/13)

#### 6.0 Introduction

In Chapter 5 I explained how the local context in which my Lusondoner participants operated was characterised by a sense of multiethnic conviviality which enabled diversity to be negotiated in low-key ways through a common, locally grounded framework. I showed how convivial interaction was a way for individuals to embed themselves in the local, and served as a mark of local belonging. This conviviality also underpinned interactions between Lusondoners of different ethnic fractions, helping to construct a sense of belongingness to a Lusondoner discursive space. While use of Portuguese language was a key way of demonstrating insider status within this Lusondoner discursive space, a different set of linguistic resources fulfilled a similar role at the wider level of the local multiethnic context. In this chapter I set out how a Local Multiethnic Vernacular (LMEV) was employed by many individuals as part of demonstrating local insiderness. The bedrock of LMEV is traditional London working class speech, with significant influences from Jamaican working class speech. It is open to individuals of all ethnic backgrounds, and incorporates linguistic features from other ethnically marked speech which is influential in the locality. LMEV draws heavily on Jamaican Creole and London Jamaican linguistic features and, in keeping with the local cultural dominance of a working-class “Jamaican”-led “Blackness” (explored in Chapter 7), LMEV carries the status of a prestige linguistic variety amongst young people in the south London locale (as explained in Chapter 2). For the majority of the youth in the working-class locality where I carried out my research, LMEV was a natural unmarked form of

---

<sup>68</sup> Sucking air through the teeth with pursed lips in order to produce a kind of elongated tut, used to show annoyance. The provenance of this practice is the West African diaspora (West Africans, African Americans and African Caribbeans) but it is associated with both “Black” speech and LMEV.

<sup>69</sup> An LMEV term used to express or seek agreement (derived from “isn’t it”).

<sup>70</sup> This may be a reference to the LMEV term “younger”, a friend who is of lower status in the social hierarchy, usually due to younger age (originally used to describe more junior gang members).

<sup>71</sup> An LMEV term of address for a close friend, an abbreviation of “gangster”.

communication, used either actively and confidently or at least apprehended without effort or difficulty. However, the ability to employ LMEV in ways viewed as “legitimate” by peers depended on factors which varied across different Lusondoners and the particular contexts they operated in. The example above comes from an English lesson where Vinício (Year 10, male, “White Portuguese – Madeiran”) was arguing with a “Black Caribbean” classmate about this young person’s claim that “White” people were “wannabes<sup>72</sup>” (explored in more detail in 6.1.3 below). In contesting this claim, Vinício drew heavily on LMEV, incorporating five LMEV linguistic items into one utterance. That he was able to do so shows not only that he had sufficient linguistic competence, but also the confidence to adopt the local “insider” positioning associated with use of LMEV. His decision to use LMEV also linked to the specific context of the interaction, a disagreement with a peer where insider status was at stake. This utterance exemplifies how use of LMEV depends on both individual factors, such as competence and a sense of legitimacy in using LMEV, and contextual factors, such as the mix of peers present and the particular situation at hand. In this chapter I argue that, for Lusondoners, although LMEV is the dominant mode of communication within their peer group, it is not necessarily a comfortable one for them. Vinício displays an ease with LMEV, managing it relatively comfortably, and I suggest this is because his particular persona means he is comfortable with a certain kind of bantering, slightly aggressive masculinity, which often goes hand in hand with use of LMEV. However, other Lusondoners do not share Vinício’s ease with LMEV and I will show a range of positionings in how they manage it, generally employing snatches of LMEV only in very specific contexts.

The draw of LMEV and its significance for the linguistic practices of young people is not accounted for within the literature on “Portuguese speaking” youth in UK schools (reviewed in Chapter 2), which instead envisages students moving from a Standard Portuguese to Standard English (eg. Abreu: 2003, Abreu & Lambert: 2003, Abreu, Cline & Lambert: 2003, Barradas: 2004, Demie & Lewis: 2008, 2010). In this chapter I emphasise the fundamental importance of LMEV in Lusondoners’ linguistic environment, both in their interactions with non-Lusondoners, and with each other. I start in Section 6.1 by describing the specific forms LMEV took within my field site. I also outline the wider episode surrounding Vinício’s words quoted

---

<sup>72</sup> An LMEV term for someone who tries to fit in with a particular social group by pretending to be something they are not.



above to show how LMEV was drawn on particularly in situations where insider status was at stake. In Section 6.2, I examine further instances of Vinício using LMEV and explain how he employed it as a tool to distance himself from the stigmatised figures of the “neek”<sup>73</sup> and the “freshie”<sup>74</sup>. In Section 6.3 I describe how other Lusondoners “stepped around” LMEV, for reasons rooted in the specifics of their ethnolinguistic backgrounds, migration trajectories and immediate peer groups. Through examining the different responses of Lusondoners to the dominance of LMEV, I show how ethnic positionings and linguistic practices cannot be read off predictably from an individual’s ethnolinguistic background. Instead, such practices emerge from ethnic affiliations and linguistic repertoires interacting in complex ways with the specifics of local contexts and peer groups.

## **6.1 LMEV and the local linguistic ecology**

I stated in the introduction to this chapter that a working-class “Jamaican”-led “Blackness” was a dominant feature of the local ethnic landscape in south London which Lusondoners responded to in different ways (explored in Chapter 7). In this section I set out how LMEV was heavily tied to this locally dominant working-class “Blackness”, and represented another feature of the local landscape which Lusondoners had to take account of in their positionings and linguistic practices.

### **6.1.1 Use of Local Multiethnic Vernacular in my south London field site**

In Chapter 2 I cited Hewitt’s (1986) claim that ‘youth languages’ manage to establish themselves as prestige varieties in generationally specific social contexts’ (p102). I now return to this idea, setting out how competent use of LMEV was a key way in which participants in my study demonstrated local “insider” status. Like ethnically related convivial banter (explored in Chapter 5), LMEV was a feature of the local environment and, to a degree, successful engagement with it equated to being successfully embedded in the local. In this section I set out some of the particular prestige-related purposes for which participants in my study enlisted LMEV as part of demonstrating local “insider” status. I have included in Appendix VII a list of the LMEV terms I noted in my observations and audio recordings, alongside how frequently, and by whom, these terms were used. Table XVIII below

---

<sup>73</sup> A portmanteau term formed from and synonymous with “nerd” and “geek”.

<sup>74</sup> Someone displaying qualities stereotypically characteristic of a recent immigrant to the UK, especially a lack of modern, urban savvy.

summarises the purposes these uses of LMEV served, according to my understanding of the interactions taking place. While interactions were multifaceted and any summary is necessarily a simplification, the table does help to highlight some broad trends in the ways LMEV was employed by my participants.

*Table XVIII: Purposes behind uses of LMEV*

<b>Main purpose of Using LMEV term</b>	<b>Frequency</b>
To insult, ridicule or denigrate others – often as part of banter and jovial self-aggrandisement (e.g. “moist <sup>75</sup> ”)	27
To reference social relations (e.g. “bruv” and “fam <sup>76</sup> ”)	24
For emphasis (e.g. “walahi <sup>77</sup> ” and “trust <sup>78</sup> ”)	19
To reference resistance or toughness (e.g. “bang <sup>79</sup> ”)	4
Other	12

As I explained in Chapter 2, there is significant overlap between how LMEV was used by my participants, and how Creole<sup>80</sup> is often drawn on by young people, according to the findings of other studies. Creole use has been associated with the following: ‘danger and toughness’ (Hewitt, 1986, p109); ‘superiority or annoyance’ (p111); ‘prestige and personal excellence’ (p111); ‘resistance, both symbolic and interactive’ (Brandt, 2000, p235); and ‘assertiveness, verbal resourcefulness, and opposition to authority’ (Rampton, 2011b, p278). There are some immediately apparent parallels here with the categories in Table XVIII above<sup>81</sup> but, as I stated, the multifaceted nature of instances of LMEV demand a focus on the details of interactions in order to understand more fully the ways LMEV can be leveraged as part of specific positionings. In light of this, I now return to Vinício’s words cited in the introduction to this chapter, and the wider episode of interaction from which they were taken. In setting out an analysis of this episode, I highlight both the cultural

<sup>75</sup> “Moist” is an LMEV term roughly equating to “uncool”, “embarrassing”, “displeasing” or “idiotic”.

<sup>76</sup> “Fam” is an LMEV term of address or exclamation similar to “mate” or “man” (from “family”).

<sup>77</sup> “Walahi” is an LMEV exclamation meaning “I swear” (from Arabic).

<sup>78</sup> “Trust” is an LMEV exclamation meaning “believe me”.

<sup>79</sup> “Bang” is an LMEV term meaning “beat up” or “fight”.

<sup>80</sup> I am referring to the broad influence of Caribbean Creole, within which Jamaican Creole is dominant.

<sup>81</sup> ‘Self-aggrandisement’ can be seen as equating to “prestige and personal excellence”, while ‘toughness’ and ‘resistance’ are common themes in the associations with Creole which are also present in the Table I.

dominance of a working-class “Blackness” amongst young people in my field site, and the opportunities afforded by these class and ethnic connotations to LMEV for competing in the stakes for local insider status. While Vinício’s confident use of LMEV demonstrates the potential it holds as a tool for asserting local insiderness, he represents one end of a spectrum in how Lusondoners engaged with LMEV. In section 6.3 I contrast Vinício’s ease with LMEV to its general absence from the speech of my other key informants. Through this I show that Vinício’s confidence to adopt traditionally working-class “laddish” masculine positionings (see Francis, Skelton & Read: 2010 – explored in section 6.2 below), and his status as a “White” boy within a multiethnic male friendship group, helped to facilitate his use of LMEV. However, for other Lusondoners, their particular combination of ethnolinguistic background, disposition and friendship group, meant that they did not have the same access or inclination to use LMEV.

Episode IV below occurred during an English lesson when Vinício was wearing the lapel microphone. As it was almost the end of term, the teacher had put on a film, *La Haine*<sup>82</sup> (Kassovitz, 1995), for the class to watch. A scene had just concluded where three youths (one “Black African”, one “White Jewish” and one “Maghrebi Arab”) failed to impress two girls at a sophisticated gallery event after the “White Jewish” boy became overly aggressive. Levon then apparently made a comment about “white people”, and Vinício took this up in line 1 below.

---

<sup>82</sup> A French drama depicting life in a poor suburb of Paris.

**Episode IV** (audio recording of naturally occurring speech, 28/6/13)

Speaker	Ethnolinguistic background
Vinício (Year 10, male)	“White Portuguese”, according to the criteria I set out in Part I of this Chapter, with “Mediterranean” features. Born in Madeira, then moved to the UK during Year 7 as a beginner to English. Speaks English with a London accent and is fluent in Portuguese which he speaks with a Madeiran accent.
Levon (Year 10, male)	Recorded as “Black Caribbean” and has a dark brown skin tone. British born, and speaks English with a London accent.

Key: **LMEV**

- 1 Vinício what?
- 2 Levon what? what?
- 3 Vinício white people are what?
- 4 Levon white people are **wannabes**
- 5 Vinício (1) ((**kisses teeth**)) you’re just jealous you’re jealous of
- 6 us you’re jealous of us **bruv**
- 7 Levon ( )<sup>83</sup>
- 8 Vinício you’re jealous of us coz we get the girls who like you
- 9 wanted but you can never can get coz you’re not as romantic
- 10 as us
- 11 other boy (roman)
- 12 Levon what d’he say? **fam I ain’t a flower boy**<sup>84</sup>
- 13 I don’t need to be a **flower boy**

**15seconds later**

- 14 Levon **fam** d’you know don’t really bother need to be romantic all
- 15 the time y’know some girls aren’t looking for that (1) not all

<sup>83</sup> During this interaction Levon was sitting on the other side from Vinício of a large desk. A number of Levon’s less emphatic utterances were inaudible due to his distance from the microphone that Vinício was wearing.

<sup>84</sup> “Flowerboy” is an LMEV term used to refer to men seen as effeminate.

- 16 of them are (.) well some of them  
 17 Vinício most of them  
 18 Levon not most of them (1) what d’you by romantic what d’you  
 19 mean? by romantic  
 20 other boy (2) Vinício (1) Vinício (3)  
 21 Levon Vinício ((*whispers*)) Vinício ((*normal speech*)) by romantic  
 22 what do you mean by romantic?  
 23 Vinício ((**kisses teeth**)) you’re wrong **innit** (2)  
 24 you piece of shit **bruv young g**  
 25 Levon ( )  
 26 Vinício kiss my arse **bruv**  
 27 Levon ( )  
 28 Vinício so shut up

In this exchange Vinício engaged directly with dominant discourses of “Black” and “White” masculinity. His initial insistence that Levon repeat his claim (lines 1 and 3) shows that he was not happy to let an apparent comment about “White” people pass unchallenged. Levon’s implication was that the “White” character’s unconvincing toughness and failure in impressing women was emblematic of “White” people more generally. The claim clearly touched a nerve and when Vinício used the word “us” in “you’re jealous of us” (lines 5-6) he explicitly aligned himself with “White”. Rather than accept the dominant discourse of “Black” masculinity as higher status<sup>85</sup> he reframed Levon’s comment as jealousy in the face of a claimed ability on the part of “White” people (“us”) to be more “romantic” (line 9) and therefore “get the girls” (line 8). Here Vinício was raising a supposed superiority in attracting women to negate Levon’s questioning of “White” masculinity, and Levon responded to this by saying “I ain’t a flower boy I don’t need to be a flower boy” (line 12-13). Again, Levon questioned “White” masculinity, this time with the implication of an effeminate form of behaviour which he, contrastingly, had no need to resort to. However, his disregard for Vinício’s notion of being “romantic” weakened in line 16 when he conceded that “some” girls were looking for romantic gestures, and in lines 18-22 when he repeatedly asked Vinício to define this romantic behaviour. LMEV was used by both boys during the exchange, with Vinício

---

<sup>85</sup> Phoenix, Frosh & Pattman (2003) cite the tendency for “black Caribbean” young men to be viewed as “super-masculine” (p191), while Mendick & Francis (2012) find that “Black” students are often seen as particularly ‘cool’ (p20).

employing “bruv” (line 6) and Levon “fam” (lines 12 and 14). Vinício took this further though, both kissing his teeth (line 23) and throwing out the insults “you piece of shit bruv young g” (line 24) and “kiss my arse bruv” (line 26). While Levon could comfortably repeat “White people are wannabes”, Vinício may have felt he had much less leeway to make negative pronouncements about “Black people” as this could have incurred accusations of racism. Instead then, in order to contest the dominant discourse of superior “Black” masculinity with a “Black” peer, Vinício resorted to aggressive use of LMEV.

This episode highlights a number of the categories of LMEV usage from Table XVIII above. Firstly, Vinício referenced ‘social relations’ by using LMEV terms of address (“bruv”: lines 6 and 24; “g”: line 24). This does not mean that he was attempting to “build bridges” with Levon. Rather, he addressed him using an LMEV term to position himself as an LMEV speaker, and therefore a local insider. The trading of insults in the episode is also something which mirrors a trend highlighted in Table XVIII. In disavowing the label “flower boy” (line 12), Levon implied that this term characterised Vinício’s behaviour. When Vinício later responded with non-LMEV insults of his own, these were the fairly forceful phrases “piece of shit” (line 24) and “kiss my arse” (line 26), perhaps to counter a perceived advantage that Levon’s use of an LMEV insult gave him. There is also an instance of ‘emphasis’ in the episode when Vinício uses “innit” in line 23. Although “innit” can be used to display agreement, or to reference an assumption of agreement on the part of the listener (see footnote<sup>28</sup>), Vinício’s use of it in this episode served to emphasise his own opinion (that Levon was wrong), which contradicted that of his listener. These examples show then how instances of LMEV must be examined in context in order to unpick the ways that LMEV can be taken up for particular purposes. In Episode IV, Vinício used LMEV to counter the disadvantage he experienced in the stakes for local insider status when positioned as “White” in competition with a “Black” classmate. In defending the prestige of “White” people, Vinício was able to employ LMEV, a linguistic speech practice heavily associated with “Blackness” without encountering ridicule or gatekeeping practices on the part of his “Black” classmate. This highlights how, for some Lusondoners, LMEV use is feasible, active, productive and accepted by authoritative peers. However, as I outline in section 6.3, it was much less available to some other (particularly “Black Portuguese”) Lusondoners who could not adopt positionings recognised by their peers as legitimate for employing LMEV.

In this section I have outlined how effective use of LMEV could provide a means for Lusondoners such as Vinício to assert local “insider” status, and even contest the ethnic positionings and claims of peers associated with more locally dominant ethnic discourses. In the next section I look in more detail at the criteria for local “insider” status, and I outline further examples of how Vinício used LMEV to support claims in relation to these. However, as suggested above, this is not a strategy which was equally accessible to all Lusondoners, and in Section 6.3 I explain how other Lusondoners “stepped around” LMEV as they negotiated positionings in different peer contexts at school.

## 6.2 Vinício’s use of LMEV as a marker of insiderness

Vinício joined the school part way through Year 7 as a shy beginner to English who had been in the country, but without a school place, for several months. He was occasionally picked on by other boys in his class and on a couple of occasions I had to talk to his older sister after she intervened physically to deter these boys. His first friends were two other Portuguese-speaking boys, both recently arrived in the UK, the three of them communicating together almost exclusively in Portuguese and generally viewed as “outsiders” by other peers within the year group. Just over three years later, while Vinício was wearing the microphone during my fieldwork it picked up the following exclamation from him: “salaam aleikum<sup>86</sup> the man<sup>87</sup>’s coming inside the game” (audio recording 28/6/13). These words accompanied Vinício inviting himself into a game of football that was underway between a group of popular boys in his year group and hint at a marked transformation in his social status since first arriving at the school. The confidence and fluency stand in stark contrast to my sketch of Vinício as a new arrival, and his language points towards a process of Londonisation bound up with his attempts to achieve local insider status. His ‘crossing’ with the use of the Arabic greeting “salaam aleikum”<sup>88</sup>, picked up from Muslim peers, suggests an ease and engagement with the multiethnic nature of the London context, while his reference to himself as “the man” highlights his development of vernacular fluency. Vinício was able to interact using the language

---

<sup>86</sup> An Islamic Arabic greeting meaning “Peace be unto you”.

<sup>87</sup> An LMEV term which can be translated as “I” in this context.

<sup>88</sup> It could be argued that “salaam aleikum” is part of LMEV as there are a lot of Muslim peers in the locality who use it, and Vinício, a non-muslim, is able to embed this phrase relaxedly in his speech. However, as this is the only instance of this phrase which appears within my data set, it is a claim that would require further investigation.

of the insider in this social context and this went hand in hand with his confidence to enter the game alongside other popular young people on the strength of his own permission. From a linguistic outsider with low social status, Vinício had become a socially successful young Londoner. In this section I describe key markers and red flags around insider status in the school context, and how Vinício leveraged LMEV in relation to these as a strategy for asserting insiderness.

### **6.2.1 Vinício and key markers of local insiderness**

In the London multiethnic youth context, and specifically at school, Vinício navigated a discursive terrain populated by widely recognised stereotypes. Constructions such as “neek” and “freshie” provided key reference points against which practices were interpreted, and Vinício’s struggle for insider status was largely carried out in opposition to these stereotypes. A tension surrounding how “Portugueseness” figured in this struggle runs through my field notes and audio data involving Vinício. His attempts to present himself as a cool, savvy local insider revolved around emphasising features such as his sporting prowess, success with girls, non-conformist stance and street toughness, and use of LMEV often provided a tool to support these positionings. This went hand-in-hand with a distancing from anything which could be associated with the outsider figures of the neek or the freshie. Notions of “Portugueseness” intersected with these features in complex ways, providing potential both for enhancing and undermining Vinício’s insider status. Portuguese was constructed as an academic subject within the school, meaning strong engagement with it risked connotations of “neekiness”. Also, being too closely associated with Portuguese language at the expense of familiarity with local practices and fluency in the prized local idiom brought associations of being a “freshie”. However, as I show in this section, one strategy Vinício had for dealing with this was to make use of LMEV in order to position his “Portugueseness” as linked to prestige and insiderness.

Vinício’s utterance “salaam aleikum the man’s coming inside the game” (described above) highlights his trajectory towards the status of “cool Londoner” and the central role within this of competence in the locally prized multiethnic vernacular. During my years working at the school I witnessed similar transformations time and again amongst young people arriving from a vast range of different countries. Mendick & Francis (2012) write that ‘compulsory schooling is a highly intense and influential experience, in which popularity and ‘fitting in’ (or not) can trump other capitals’ (p21), and this chimes with my experience of how children reacted to finding



themselves in a London school. Francis, Skelton & Read, (2010) in their study of ‘high-achieving and popular pupils’ (HAPs) unpick the key strategies employed by young people to bolster their social standing, and these provide useful reference points for examining Vinício’s behaviour. Their central contention is that these strategies revolve around ‘particular gendered performances and practices’ (p317), meaning that for Vinício referencing his masculinity was vital in his bids for insider status. Francis, Skelton & Read, point out that ‘research in this area maintains that ‘laddish’ performances of masculinity attract the highest social status in state schooling environments (albeit this construction is somewhat ‘raced’ and classed)’ (p318). These are ‘based on hedonism, rebellion and so on’ which can conflict with the business of schooling and go hand in hand with the ‘production of academic application as feminine’ often resulting in ‘boys who are seen to work hard being positioned as effeminate’. Linked to this is a ‘prioritisation of sport as a preferred activity’ (p322) amongst more popular boys. Francis, Skelton & Read strongly emphasise the importance of this, writing:

‘It appears to us that ‘being good at sport’ can provide an important cornerstone of authentic masculinity which allows HAP boys to incorporate other, potentially ‘feminine’ constructions into their subjectivities (e.g. orientation to schoolwork; articulate communication; reflexivity), without the overall masculine construction being disturbed.’ (p329)

Sporting prowess was regularly referenced by Vinício, and even linked explicitly by him to his “Portugueseness”. One break-time when Vinício was wearing the microphone he was engaging in verbal sparring with a friend focused on who was likely to win the fun run at the upcoming sports day (audio recording 27/6/13). Vinício’s friend asked “how’ve you got so much stamina?”, to which he replied “coz I’m I’m Portuguese”, and laughed. This example also fits with my explanation of local multiethnic conviviality (detailed in Chapter 5), whereby emblematic ethnic representations are traded amongst young people as part of amiable “rubbing along”. As I outlined in Chapter 5, “Portuguese” enjoyed recognition amongst Vinício’s peers for its footballing success through figures such as Cristiano Ronaldo and José Mourinho, lending it potential as a ticket to insider status within a peer group where football was highly valued.

Toughness is another feature of the prized masculinity mentioned above, and it was implied through Vinício’s references to fighting and an almost constant engagement in competitive banter. Pattman, Frosh & Phoenix (2005), in their study of secondary age boys in London, found that ‘[b]eing strong physically and emotionally and being

good at sport and even fighting were raised by many of the boys as defining characteristics of boys and as what boys aspired to be' (p555). This fits with the general pattern of interaction between Vinício and his male peers. Pattman, Frosh & Phoenix also point out that '[b]oys are not naturally 'tough' and 'hard' but have to work hard at constructing themselves as this, often through misogyny and homophobia' (p559). Similarly, Phoenix, Frosh & Pattman (2003) write that boys 'are primed to be tough and unwilling to display emotion in order to protect themselves from humiliation and unsympathetic treatment that will threaten their masculinity' (p193). This requirement for sustained effort to maintain masculine positionings helps to contextualise the ubiquity of banter amongst Vinício's interactions with male peers. Such positionings were far less comfortable for Danilo (Year 11, male, "White Portuguese – Madeiran), the other male key informant in my study, as I explain in section 6.3.1 below.

Another key aid to popularity highlighted by Francis, Skelton & Read (2010) is appearance, and they note 'the overwhelming tendency for HAP (High Achieving Popular) pupils to be noted as both 'good looking' and fashionable' (p323). While this is both subjective and not always possible for individuals to manipulate, Francis, Skelton & Read specify 'gelled or styled shorter hair, ties and collars worn in certain 'jaunty' or casual ways, and 'masculine' accessories such as dark-coloured sportswear branded bags, pencil cases and so on' (p324) as key markers amongst the boys they studied. Interestingly all of these features apply to Vinício, and my strong sense over the 4 years I knew him was of a young person who became increasingly popular with girls. In fact, two years before the field work, during a week-long creative writing residential trip where each young person had to produce one extended text, a girl in the group chose to write about being "in love" with Vinício, and even read out her text to the group while he was present. Francis, Skelton & Read conclude that 'aesthetic aspects such as 'good looks' and fashionability appeared important elements in [the students'] production of 'intelligible' gender' (p324), and performances of heterosexuality fulfilled a similar role. They note that the most popular pupils 'are constantly 'doing' heterosexuality in the classroom' (p330) through practices such as talking about heterosexual relationships, with boys typically making references to physical sexual acts. This was a recurrent theme for Vinício, as will become clear in the rest of this chapter. Similarly, Phoenix, Frosh & Pattman (2003) observed in their study that 'homophobic name-calling provided a quick, easy way for boys to claim masculinity' (p192). Having set out some features of a highly prized masculinity in the youth context, I now explore two recognisable

figures which stand in opposition to these, the “neek” and the “freshie”, and set out how Vinício employed LMEV as part of his attempts to distance himself from these figures.

### **6.2.2 Vinício’s use of LMEV to distance himself from “freshies”**

The freshie provides a figure which stands in opposition to notions of local insiderness. Talmy’s (2010) definition “‘FOB’ – ‘fresh off the boat’ – a noxious label signifying a recently-arrived, monumentally uncool, non-English speaking rube<sup>89</sup> of mythical, and for some, hilarious proportions’ (p150) captures well how this figure signified amongst young people within the field site. I outlined above Vinício’s transformation from a shy and bullied new arrival with little English to a confident user of a LMEV, but the prospect of the freshie still hung over him. On one occasion I witnessed the EAL coordinator at the school checking with Vinício whether he had been withdrawn from a Maths exam that day for support from the EAL department (field notes 27/6/13). He stressed that he did not need to sit the exam as he sat it the previous year. The fact that this teacher thought Vinício might require extra support due to having EAL shows that, despite his significant efforts to assert local insider status which I have been outlining in this chapter, he could still be potentially viewed as in some ways a “linguistic outsider”. This fits with Talmy’s description of ‘the creation of an FOB subject position’ (p169) in which not only young people but also ‘an array of national and local institutional policies, school curriculum and instructional practices’ are implicated. In the following lesson Vinício asked Damião (Year 10, male, “White Portuguese – Madeiran”), a student with weaker English, if he had been withdrawn from the same Maths exam (field notes 27/6/13). When Damião replied that he had not, Vinício expressed exaggerated surprise, implying that Damião’s level of English would have merited extra support, and therefore emphasising Damião’s “freshness” in front of other young people. This example shows how school support systems can unwittingly contribute to the freshie subject position for a Lusondoner, thus necessitating the kind of compensatory practices exhibited by Vinício in order to reassert his insider status in contrast to his classmate Damião.

Interestingly though, the very teachers involved in this support can also bear the freshie label. Vinício’s Portuguese teacher frequently found himself in this territory as students played on his weaker command of English. During one Portuguese lesson, Damião (the same student whose English fluency Vinício questioned) asked

---

<sup>89</sup> An awkward, inexperienced, naïve or unsophisticated person.

the teacher ‘como se diz “praia” em inglês?’ (field notes 5/3/13; translation: *how do you say “beach” in English?*). Damião was attempting to get the teacher to say “beach” out loud as he knew the teacher would pronounce it as “bitch”. Although unsuccessful, Damião’s attempt still cast the teacher as a kind of freshie, making him a figure of fun on the grounds of his inferior command of English. Creese, Blackledge & Takhi (2014) describe a similar situation in a Panjabi supplementary school where a recently arrived teacher’s greater use of Panjabi and limited use of English ‘means that the students position her as illegitimate in their classroom’ (p946). The figure of the freshie then could carry particularly negative associations for Lusondoner young people like Vinício who had gone through the experience of being new to English within the school. As I outline in the following section, freshness could also link to neekiness. Phoenix, Frosh & Pattman (2003) report a similar case in their study, writing that ‘in one state school, several boys identified two Turkish boys, reported to work hard and to spend all their time together, as “gay”’ (p190), adding that these boys were also reported as tending to speak Turkish to each other. This reinforces the negative associations which both labels carry. Vinício displayed a particular preoccupation in distancing himself from these labels which may have been linked to his strong experience of being a social outsider when first joining the school. He often employed LMEV in his efforts to achieve this distancing, as I show in the example below.

In Episode V below, Vinício was referred to as “foreign” as part of banter with a “Black” classmate (Marvin). In his attempts to counter this charge Vinício made use of LMEV in order to emphasise his local insiderness. This highlights both the spectre of damaging associations which freshness represented for Vinício, but also the potential which LMEV held for asserting a strong local positioning. The episode took place during a morning registration session when Vinício was wearing the microphone.

**Episode V<sup>90</sup>** (audio recording of naturally occurring speech, 28/6/13)

Speaker	Ethnolinguistic background
Vinício (Year 10, male)	“White Portuguese”, according to the criteria I set out in Part I of this Chapter, with “Mediterranean” features. Born in Madeira, then moved to the UK during Year 7 as a beginner to English. Speaks English with a London accent and is fluent in Portuguese which he speaks with a Madeiran accent.
Marvin (Year 10, male)	Recorded as “Black Caribbean” and has a dark brown skin tone. British born, and speaks English with a London accent.
Kamile (Year 10, female)	Recorded as “White Other” and has “Caucasian” features. Born in Lithuanian, then moved to the UK at the very end of Year 9. Speaks Lithuanian and has become fairly fluent in English which she speaks with a part London/part Lithuanian accent.

Key: **LMEV**

- 1 Marvin now you two might as well both go out **fam**
- 2 you're both foreign ((*laughs*))
- 3 Vinício are you dumb **bruv**? (1)
- 4 Marvin I'm being serious though
- 5 Vinício what country are you from?
- 6 Kamile hmm?
- 7 Vinício are you Polish?
- 8 Marvin Polan[d
- 9 Kamile [no
- 10 Marvin she's from Poland (.) I'm joking she's from s( )
- 11 Kamile no I ( )
- 12 Vinício from Russia?
- 13 Marvin no Lithuania

<sup>90</sup> This episode was also briefly referenced in Chapter 5 as an example of multiethnic conviviality.

- 14 Vinício from where? (.) Lithuania (.) **bad girls**<sup>91</sup> **you know**<sup>92</sup>
- 15 Marvin you're shit at football **innit**?
- 16 Kamile hmm?
- 17 Marvin you're shit at football (1) they're shit [( )
- 18 Vinício [but they're good
- 19 in bed
- 20 Kamile yeah that's true
- 21 Marvin why (.) they're shit at football
- 22 Vinício they're good in bed **innit**?
- 23 Kamile h[mm?
- 24 Marvin [innit?
- 25 Vinício they're good in bed as well (.) the girls that's what I heard
- 26 Marvin are they **skets** over there?
- 27 Vinício they're right [**skets** as well
- 28 Marvin [I'm asking I'm asking ( )
- 29 Kamile no (.) the girls from my country don't have sex till
- 30 eighteen
- 31 Marvin Jesus [( ) they are **sick** but (.) but you're different
- 32 (.) I'm joking ((*laughs*))
- 33 Vinício [you liiiie
- 34 Marvin I'm joking ((*mock insistent tone*))
- 35 Vinício **bad girl** ((*sung*))
- 36 Marvin I'm joking
- 37 Vinício she got all **pissed** man (.) **man was** joking calling her
- 38 bitch she's like ((*mock tearful*)) don't call me bitch
- 39 ((*Marvin laughs*)) **man was** joking **man** (1) she got oh

The spectre of freshness was raised in lines 1-2 with the suggestion to Vinício “you two might as well both go out fam you're both foreign”. Kamile had been in the country less than a year and, although she had learned English very quickly, the connotations of freshness still clung to her. Vinício therefore used several of the

<sup>91</sup> This expression appears to be an LMEV version of the Jamaican Creole term “badgal” or “badgyal” which Reynolds (2006) defines as ‘a sensational woman; a female of the street; an unscrupulous or rude female’ (p6-7).

<sup>92</sup> Used in this context, “you know” is an LMEV exclamation used to express or seek agreement, similar to “innit”.

strategies described above to both distance himself from this, and assert his masculine prowess. Use of LMEV was a strategy in itself as it emphasised Vinício's local insiderness, but it also served as a tool to support his other strategies. Vinício's first response was immediately to emphasise his toughness and command of LMEV with "are you dumb bruv?" (line 3). Then, when Marvin persisted with "I'm being serious though" (line 4), Vinício focused on Kamile's foreignness, asking "what country are you from?" (line 5). Before she answered Vinício made two guesses, Poland then Russia, highlighting the existence of these widely recognised categorisations circulating within the local context. Once he heard Kamile was from Lithuania, Vinício responded with "bad girls you know". His use of LMEV here showed his insiderness, but also supported his attempts to disavow any perceived alignment with Kamile by showing he was willing to tease her about sexual mores. Again, this also indexed a key strategy for masculine "fitting in" by doing heterosexuality, reemphasising his insiderness.

Marvin took up national affiliation in a similar way to the boys in the episode of nation-related banter described in Chapter 5, asking "you're shit at football innit?" (line 15), but Vinício soon reemphasised the sexual perspective with "but they're good in bed" (line 18-19). By line 26 Marvin had joined this line of questioning asking "are they skets over there?" and so confirming the realignment that Vinício was aiming for. Whereas at the start of the episode Vinício was being associated with Kamile and her foreignness, by emphasising his masculine prowess he successfully repositioned himself, aligning with Marvin in opposition to Kamile as a foreign girl. Use of LMEV lent support to Vinício's initial contestation of Marvin's accusation, his teasing of Kamile, and his assertions of heterosexuality. The use of "Lithuanian" as a label for this foreignness was helpful for Vinício as its greater specificity meant he was not implicated, as he had been with "foreign". Elsewhere in my audio data Vinício teased another girl by calling her a "Russian scrape"<sup>93</sup> (audio recording 27/6/13). She also turned out to be "Lithuanian", showing how the use of these broad and inaccurate labels mirrored the kind of ill-fitting categorisations that Lusondoners themselves were subjected to. This hints at how the London multiethnic youth context is populated by widely circulating discourses in relation to particular ethnicities which make more nuanced backgrounds and affiliations more difficult to assert (as I set out in Chapter 7). Lusondoners are therefore engaged in a continuing struggle for recognition and position – some more successfully than others. In this

---

<sup>93</sup> Another LMEV term for "slut".

section I have examined how Vinício used LMEV to counter associations of freshness. In the following section I set out how he had a similar approach to distancing himself from the spectre of the “neek”.

### **6.2.3 Vinício’s use of LMEV to distance himself from “neeks”**

Francis, Skelton & Read (2010) find that ‘overt performance of engagement and application in the classroom jeopardises a pupil’s popularity, and risks construction as a ‘boffin’ or ‘keeno’ (p331), and this risk is crystallised in the context of Vinício’s school by frequent derogatory references to “neeks”. Mendick & Francis (2012) explore the role such figures play amongst young people at school, writing:

‘the abjection of the boffin as classroom ‘pariah’ serves a regulatory function in relation to other pupils, in its reminder of the potential consequences/punishments that may result in their own ‘imbalance’ of academic application at the cost of sociability’ (p16).

Whether there is an identified “boffin” or “neek” within the classroom or not, the prospect of being labelled as such exerts an insidious pressure on all young people to ensure that they do not come across as overly focused on academic achievement. Francis, Skelton & Read state that, in interviews with “High Achieving Popular” pupils, many ‘articulated the tension between high achievement and popularity’ (p331), but also identify a key strategy employed to overcome this. Building on earlier work by Clarricoates (1980) and Mac an Ghail (1994) they highlighted the potential of ‘effortless achievement’, writing:

‘Many studies have identified the high status that apparent achievement without diligent application commands from both pupils and teachers, and how the notion of ‘effortless achievement’ has profoundly masculine associations’ (p331).

The perception of ‘effortless achievement’ appears to be exactly what Vinício was aiming for when he exclaimed “chillax total marks” (audio recording 27/6/13) during a Portuguese GCSE lesson when the class was going over answers to part of a mock exam paper they had recently sat. Vinício achieved full marks on this section and his utterance crystallises some patterns in his behaviour which recur frequently in interactions during these Portuguese classes. Most obviously, Vinício was drawing attention to his achievement. Numerous references within my field notes attest to an ongoing desire on Vinício’s part to present himself as an “expert” within the Portuguese GCSE group, thus claiming explicit Lusondoner status with an emphasis on the “Luso” dimension, in contrast to his behaviour elsewhere. However, Vinício



was always at pains to present this expert status as effortless, the result of knowledge and skills he already possessed and not a product of hard work. Vinício's use of "chillax" linked to this concern. While I often observed this term being used by young people at the school (including Vinício) as an instruction to "chill out" or "relax", Vinício appeared to be using it to imply something along the lines of "that was easy". Although Vinício was drawing attention to his academic achievement in Portuguese, he simultaneously balanced this apparent bookishness by highlighting the effortlessness with which this was accomplished and through his command of a locally valued idiom. This supports Francis, Skelton & Read's claim that 'performances involved in the production of such 'effortless' achievement are themselves far from effortless' (p336) and in fact the young people they studied were 'engaged in constant and perhaps arduous identity work to maintain their classroom subjectivities' (p335). The struggle to maintain local insider status which is hinted at in the example above emerges as a preeminent concern for Vinício, and his Lusondoner status posed both a challenge and an opportunity in relation to this. While Vinício's Portuguese oral fluency required careful presentation within the Portuguese GCSE class to avoid any hint of academic effort, on other occasions he leveraged his "Portugueseness" as a badge of status (see Vinício's claims about Portuguese stamina discussed in section 6.2.1 above).

I stressed in the introduction to this chapter that asserting local insider status emerged from my data as a key preoccupation for Vinício as a particular kind of Lusondoner. I also explained the prestige associated with Creole use and how this has significant overlaps with the way LMEV is employed by my participants. In Episode VI below Vinício referenced popular culture, invoked another high status young person and engaged in stylised Jamaican speech as badges of social prestige, policing the boundary of insider/outsider status in the peer group. The episode took place in the library where Vinício and two friends had been given permission to complete science work independently instead of going to their Religious Studies lesson. They were each working on a laptop and were using headphones to listen to Youtube clips as they chatted and wrote up tasks. As the episode started Vinício was showing Samaan an image on his laptop screen.

**Episode VI** (audio recording of naturally occurring speech, 28/6/13)

Speaker	Ethnolinguistic background
Vinício (Year 10, male)	“White Portuguese”, according to the criteria I set out in Part I of this Chapter, with “Mediterranean” features. Born in Madeira, then moved to the UK during Year 7 as a beginner to English. Speaks English with a London accent and is fluent in Portuguese which he speaks with a Madeiran accent.
Samaan (Year 10, male)	Recorded as “Black African” and has a dark brown skin tone. Born in the UK. Both parents are from Somalia and Somali is the main language at home. Speaks English with a London accent.
Erion (Year 10, male)	Recorded as “White Other” and has “Caucasian” features. Born in Albania, then came to the UK during the early years of primary school. Both parents are from Albania and Albanian is the main language at home. Speaks English with a London accent.

Key: **Jamaican accent, LMEV**

- 1 Vinício who’s it? (1) do you know this guy?
- 2 Samaan hah?
- 3 Vinício do you know him?
- 4 Samaan no (1)
- 5 Vinício shu’up
- 6 Samaan who’s this? (.) who’s it? (.) who’s it? (.) what?
- 7 Vinício do you know who’s this?
- 8 Samaan no no who’s it? (.)
- 9 Vinício are you serious? you don’t know who’s this?
- 10 (1) ay, Erion? (2) ay...
- 11 Erion d’you wanna listen to him? listen to him
- 12 (.) so he may be Albanian yeah
- 13 Vinício do you know who’s this? guess who’s this (3)
- 14 Erion who’s that?(1) I won’t listen to this without my
- 15 earphones you know (.) I listen to this ( ) too noisy
- 16 (.) he’s Albanian **bruv**

- 17 Vinício don't you know who's this Samaan?  
 18 Samaan no  
 19 Vinício are you serious? (1) look (.) do you know who's this?  
 20 Samaan who? oh Snoop Dogg<sup>94</sup> **shame** sorry  
 21 Vinício ( ) I'm telling Mohammed as well (.) Mohammed'll be  
 22 like (.) Mohammed'll be like what (.) **bumbaclart** (.)  
 23 **slap you 'n da face bruv** (3)

The exchanges in this episode centred around Vinício showing Samaan a picture of the rapper Snoop Dogg which Samaan initially failed to recognise, thus incurring some moderate ridicule from Vinício. This was first apparent in line 5 when Vinício responded to Saaman's profession of ignorance with the words "shu'up"<sup>95</sup>. By explicitly rejecting Saaman's utterance with this "shu'up" Vinício was presenting the idea that Saaman might not recognise Snoop Dogg as ridiculous. This was reinforced not only by Vinício repeating his question four times over the exchange but also through his repetition of "are you serious?" (lines 9 and 19). However, Vinício's tone throughout this exchange did not imply genuine surprise or uncertainty about Samaan's seriousness. Rather he sounded unimpressed at and even mocking of Samaan's ignorance. The drawn out nature of Vinício's repeated questioning of Samaan served to emphasise Samaan's ignorance, and Vinício's attempt in line 9 to bring in Erion on this point (albeit unsuccessfully) also suggested an agenda of spotlighting Samaan's lack of popular culture knowledge. The effect of this was to highlight Vinício's superior recognition of popular culture references, casting himself as more of a social insider than Samaan. Samaan's embarrassed apology "oh Snoop Dogg shame sorry" (line 20) when the penny finally dropped also suggests Samaan saw some justification in Vinício ridiculing him. Vinício again raised the prospect of emphasising this ignorance in front of a wider audience saying "I'm telling Mohammed as well" (line 21), referring to another boy in their friendship group with significant social status. He then went on to predict Mohammed's reaction with "Mohammed'll be like what (.) **bumbaclart** (.) slap you'n da face bruv (3)" (lines 19-20). Before unpacking the significance of this snatch of stylised speech it is useful to look more closely at the boundary policing which underpinned Vinício's utterances throughout this extract.

<sup>94</sup> An internationally renowned American rapper.

<sup>95</sup> "shu'up" is a contraction of "shut up". The replacement of the final "t" of "shut" with a glottal stop is typical of the working-class London speech which forms the bedrock of LMEV.

I have set out in the paragraph above how Vinício exploited the situation of Samaan's failure to recognise a picture of Snoop Dogg in order to emphasise that this lack of popular culture knowledge was socially unacceptable within the local context. Vinício raised commonly recognised rules of "coolness" and in enforcing them asserted his own insider status. The fact that he directly or indirectly brought in two other peers (Erion and Mohammed), served to emphasise the collective, widely established nature of the boundaries he was policing and therefore further reinforced his insider status. When he uttered his crowning put-down of Samaan, "what (.) bumbaclart (.) slap you'n da face" (lines 21-23), he used the Jamaican term "bumbaclart" as well as attempting to render a Jamaican accent. This fits a pattern which emerged several times across my data where Jamaicanness served as indexical of a general street-tough stance (explored in more detail in Chapter 7). Here Vinício avoided direct ownership of the utterance, projecting the voicing onto his friend Mohammed, even though Mohammed himself is of Somali descent as opposed to Jamaican. When questioned during a retrospective interview about using these Creole phrases Vinício stated it is "Black people" who can legitimately use these terms but added that he uses them to "play around". In contrast to the Creole phrase, the term "bruv" was spoken in Vinício's natural voice, underlining its status as a common part of his vocabulary, as evidenced several times in my data. Vinício was explicit then that Jamaican Creole was not "his" language but, unlike other Lusondoners (explored in the next section), he did feel comfortable to make use of it in order to draw on its connotations of social prestige.

In this section I described asserting insider status as a preeminent preoccupation for Vinício, and set out the main strategies employed in this endeavour. Performances of a prized masculinity were key, emphasising sporting prowess, popularity with girls, heterosexuality (and a concomitant homophobia), toughness and rebelliousness, all supported by a regular peppering of LMEV. Alongside this ran a distancing from the figures of the neek and the freshie, again emphasised through Vinício's command of LMEV as a local prestige linguistic variety. However, this confidence to make use of LMEV and adopt the insider and generally assertive positionings associated with it, was not shared by all Lusondoners. In the next section, I outline how other key participants in my research "stepped around" LMEV, making use of it very rarely and in carefully selected contexts. I outline a range of positionings adopted by Lusondoners in relation to LMEV, emphasising

that some Lusondoners were more successful than others in establishing a comfortable positioning as Lusondoners in the locality.

### **6.3 Other Lusondoners “stepping around” LMEV**

In the previous section I described Vinício’s use of LMEV as part of his endeavour to assert insider status. This was often bound up with positionings related to gender and ethnicity, specific to the particular contexts Vinício operated in and the peers he interacted with. I explained how, despite the strong associations between LMEV and “Blackness”, Vinício was able to employ LMEV in verbal sparring with “Black” peers without coming up against gatekeeping practices. In this section I explore how other Lusondoners related to LMEV, setting out the various reasons why, although it was a present and recognised feature of their environments, LMEV was either less relevant, or less accessible to them.

#### **6.3.1 Danilo and LMEV**

In Section 6.2 I explained how LMEV was often bound up with performances of a prized masculinity. Vinício (Year 10, male, “White Portuguese – Madeiran”) was confident in adopting the working-class “laddish” positionings (Francis, Skelton & Read, 2010) with which LMEV was associated, and so was able to employ LMEV successfully as part of bids for prestige within the mainstream peer group. Danilo (Year 11, male, “White Portuguese – Madeiran”), on the other hand, appeared much less comfortable in more masculine aggressive contexts, particularly around “Black” male peers. Instead, he gravitated towards girls, often other Portuguese speakers, making only occasional, and usually ironic use of LMEV, although like other Lusondoners he was fully able to recognise and understand LMEV when used by peers. In this section I will explain how Danilo’s lack of connection with the locally dominant understanding of masculinity impacted on his access to LMEV. While Danilo was comfortable to engage in limited use of LMEV and Jamaicanisms with female friends, amongst non Portuguese-speaking (and in particular “Black”) boys, he was much more reserved and avoided the kind of assertions of masculinity with which LMEV was associated.

During the months I spent observing Danilo, I found him to be very talkative and flamboyant amongst his friends, but markedly quiet when not around girls or other

Portuguese speakers. During one Science lesson when the teacher moved him from his friendship group to go and sit amongst some other boys I observed “he goes reluctantly – stays silent in new seat away from Portuguese speakers” (field notes 19/3/13). Field notes from a Maths lesson highlight Danilo’s preference for sitting next to girls where I recorded “Bernadete tells me Danilo doesn’t normally sit next to her - it’s only because Manjola is not in” (field notes 25/3/13). Bernadete (Year 11, female, “White Portuguese – Mainland”) is a Portuguese-speaker whereas Manjola (Year 11, female, “Albanian”) is not; in this lesson at least then, being next to a Portuguese speaker was not usually Danilo’s number one priority. During another Maths lesson Danilo arrived late and chose a seat at an empty table. He then moved one seat along a few minutes later without being asked when Deshane (Year 11, male, “Black – Jamaican”), the usual occupant of his original seat, arrived. Danilo ended up sat next to Deshane, who engaged in a loud and animated conversation with Lloyd (Year 11, male, “Black – Jamaican”) at an adjacent table. My field notes record: “Danilo watches but does not participate” (field notes 8/5/13). I also noted that “class conversation is dominated by a group of 5 or 6 boys, all friends, all “Black” – Danilo is not a member of this group”. Danilo’s distancing from “Black” male young people was highlighted in a Science lesson when the following exchange took place.

**Episode VII** (audio recording of naturally occurring speech, 14/5/13)

Speaker	Ethnolinguistic background
Danilo (Year 11, male)	“White Portuguese”, according to the criteria I set out in Chapter 4, with “Mediterranean” features. Born in Madeira, lived in London aged 8-9, then moved back to Madeira. Returned to London age 10. Wider family have lived in several Lusophone and non-Lusophone countries. Fluent in English which he speaks with a London accent, and Portuguese which he speaks with a Madeiran accent.
Denise (Year 11, female)	“White Portuguese”, according to the criteria I set out in Chapter 4, with “Mediterranean” features. Born in Madeira, lived in London briefly aged 9, then moved back to Madeira. Returned to London age 14. Wider family have lived in Madeira and Portugal. Fluent in English which she speaks with a London accent, and Portuguese which she speaks with a Madeiran accent.

Key: Portuguese

- 1 Danilo *ele agora tá a passar os papéis*  
((Translation: ‘now he’s handing out the sheets’))
- 2 (2) *ele agora tá a passar os papéis (.)*  
((Translation: ‘now he’s handing out the sheets’))
- 3 *ele agora tá a passar os huh?*  
((Translation: ‘now he’s handing out the huh?’))
- 4 ((classroom noise))
- 5 Danilo *agora é os pretos entrando dentro da classe como sempre*  
((Translation: ‘now it’s the blacks coming into the class as always’))
- 6 Denise stop being racist
- 7 Danilo *no I’m not (.) eu usei pretos (.) que a seguir ( )*  
((Translation: ‘I used black (.) as it follows’))
- 8 *eles não são brancos ((laughing)) não ia dizer os brancos*  
((Translation: ‘they aren’t white’ ‘I wasn’t going to say the whites’))

In this episode Danilo was performing for the microphone and had decided to provide a running commentary on the lesson. This is reinforced by the fact that he intermittently addressed me by name into the microphone. When a group of “Black” young people arrived late to the lesson Danilo remarked “*agora é os pretos entrando dentro da classe como sempre*” (*now it’s the blacks coming into the class as always*) as part of his commentary. Danilo contested Denise’s subsequent accusation of racism, saying “*eles não são brancos*” (*they aren’t white*) and “*não ia dizer os brancos*” (*I wasn’t going to say the whites*) (line 7), but his laughter suggests that he was enjoying being provocative. My sense from observing Danilo during the months of field work and over several years working in his lessons is that his use of the term “os pretos” (*the blacks*) does point to a certain distancing from “Black” young people. Unlike Vinício, Danilo very rarely interacted with “Black” boys, and the examples above suggest he was not completely relaxed within the more masculine and aggressive contexts with which they were commonly associated (see Chapter 7 for an account of local discourses of “Blackness”). Instead, he sought the comfort and relative freedom of feminine and Lusophone spaces, and the extract above demonstrates the leeway this gave him. It would be difficult for him to have made this comment about “os pretos” (*the blacks*) in English as it would then have been accessible to other members of the class, including the “Black” young people themselves. Danilo therefore uses Portuguese for a different kind of positioning from Vinício, as he is the kind of Lusondoner who finds it less easy to carve out a comfortable place in the dominant local ethnic and linguistic ecology. Dara (Year 10, female, “Black Portuguese”) and Márcia (Year 10, female, “Black Portuguese”) also struggle in this respect, as I outline in the following section.

In contrast to Danilo’s reticence around “Black”, male peers, he tended to be very comfortable in female company. This often manifested itself in reciprocal physical contact with his close female friends and there are numerous references to this within my field notes. The following all refer to contact with Portuguese-speaking girls: “Danilo massaging Alícia’s wrist” (field notes 8/3/13); “Danilo and Alícia poke paintbrushes in each other’s ears” (field notes 14/3/13); “Danilo flicks Lara’s hair with a ruler” and “Denise’s head on Danilo’s shoulder poking her hair in his face” (field notes 8/3/13). However, there are also several examples involving non Portuguese-speaking girls, such as “Mirlinda massages Danilo’s neck” (field notes 26/3/13) and “Ariana comes to talk to Danilo - he has a hair in his hand – he tries persuading her to let him pull one of hers out - both are laughing – Danilo eventually gets a hair from Ariana” (field notes 8/5/13). My sense from observing Danilo during



the field work, as well as from seeing his friendships develop over the years since his arrival at the school, is that he shared a closeness and understanding with many of his female friends which went beyond just joking and flirting. During the Art lesson referred to above where he and Alícia were poking paint brushes in each other's ears, the teacher was giving an explanation to a small group of students which these two were part of. The teacher used the word "imagination" then checked with Alícia "do you know what imagination means?" (field notes 14/3/13). Danilo immediately replied "she knows", showing both an automatic tendency to support Alícia as a less fluent student, but also an understanding of where her needs were (and were not) in this domain. This supportiveness was also evidenced in a Science lesson when Denise arrived extremely upset about an issue at home (field notes 22/4/13). For the first part of the lesson Denise was crying while Lara hugged her and Danilo sat next to her holding her hand. The teacher noticed this but did not intervene, and this reaction on his part suggests he recognised the group's role in supporting one another.

When Danilo was amongst girls and/or Portuguese speakers then, his behaviour was very different to that of the quiet observer depicted in some of the examples above. During a Science lesson when he was sitting near Mirlinda (Year 11, female, "Albanian") and wearing the lapel microphone he kissed his teeth at her and said "Why you screwin<sup>96</sup>? Fuckin punch your face in, watch what will happen" (audio recording, 14/5/13). Mirlinda laughed at this, signalling it was part of a bantering exchange, on the surface similar to the kind of banter Vinício engaged in with his male peers. However, what marks this out is the rarity of such LMEV tokens in Danilo's speech. Whereas Vinício used LMEV regularly and as part of his "natural" speech, Danilo made very little use of it, and when he did it was therefore accentuated and marked as unusual, typically for comedic effect. There was another example of this in a Maths lesson the following day where Danilo was joking about taking drugs and said "give me that shit<sup>97</sup> blood<sup>98</sup>" to the girls he was sitting with. Within the Lusondoner discursive space this use of LMEV played a particular role. In his retrospective interview Danilo described how Paulo (Year 10, male, "White Portuguese – Madeiran") often said "bruv<sup>99</sup>" and that, because the other Portuguese-speakers were used to hearing Paulo speak Portuguese, they all found this funny.

---

<sup>96</sup> An LMEV term meaning "giving someone a 'dirty look'"

<sup>97</sup> An LMEV term for drugs.

<sup>98</sup> An LMEV term of address for a close friend.

<sup>99</sup> An LMEV term of address for a close friend.

While Vinício used LMEV to signal his membership of the mainstream social group, within the Lusondoner discursive space LMEV could be used to refer to, or even satirise this mainstream group. Ironic use of LMEV could therefore serve to signal membership of an alternative discursive space for Lusondoners. What was common to both Vinício and Danilo though was an understanding of LMEV and a recognition of the connotations it carried in the local context. In the following section I show how these connotations made LMEV particularly inaccessible to Dara and Márcia, at least within the school context.

### **6.3.2 Dara, Márcia and LMEV**

In section 6.1 I explained how LMEV was heavily tied to a locally dominant “Blackness”, making its use problematic for Dara and Márcia. As I detail in Chapter 7, these girls struggled to carve out a space for themselves in the restrictive conditions of the local ethnic ecology where their “Black Portuguese-ness” was not recognised. Local understandings of “Blackness” were dominated by notions of a working-class “Jamaicanness”, and an emergent “West Africanness”. Dara and Márcia’s forays into “Black”-indexed language, and other pronouncements on “Blackness”, were therefore contested through the boundary policing of “Black” peers with more “legitimate” claims to locally recognised “Blackness”. Consequently, there were almost no examples of Dara and Márcia using either LMEV or Jamaican Creole in interactions with other peers. One feature linked to both LMEV and “Black” speech more generally which they did employ was kissing their teeth. This is referenced a number of times in my field notes, including the following note I made whilst observing the two girls during a Maths lesson: ‘Dara plays with kissing teeth – she does this *a lot*’ (field notes 19/6/13, original emphasis). My phrasing ‘Dara plays with kissing teeth’ indicates the ludic way Dara employed this feature. Rather than expressing the sincere annoyance which kissing teeth is widely recognised as denoting, my sense was that Dara used this feature in an exaggerated, ironic way. She was overtly referencing “Black” speech for the amusement of her friend Márcia, as opposed to making unmarked use of it. This is similar to how Danilo employed LMEV, as described in the previous section. Although LMEV was not available to Dara and Márcia in straightforward ways due to its associations with local “Blackness”, they could reference it ironically as this did not involve positioning themselves as “legitimate” LMEV speakers. Another strategy adopted by these girls to get around the difficulties inherent in employing “Black”-indexed language in the presence of “Black” peers, was to use it outside of

the school context. During a retrospective interview I conducted with Dara and Márcia (28/6/13), they make references to using “Jamaican” language at home. While “Jamaican” language is not interchangeable with LMEV, there are strong crossovers in terms of their association with positionings of local insiderness, making these references useful in understanding why LMEV was not a regular feature of Dara and Márcia’s linguistic practices within the school context.

During the retrospective interview mentioned above, Dara and Márcia explained that that they enjoyed teasing their parents by sometimes employing “Jamaican” language at home. Both girls described their mothers’ reaction with the same phrase: “my mum just looks at me”, giving the impression that such language was both noteworthy and unwelcome from their mothers’ perspectives. Dara then went further, quoting her mother saying “yeah yeah develop that accent and you will see what will happen yeah” implying that employing “Jamaican” language was likely to lead to negative or delinquent consequences. Dara elaborated on this, highlighting her mother’s worry that this usage would lead Dara to “develop that accent”, suggesting that there was a danger of Dara’s speech style becoming in some way fixed as fully Jamaican/London Jamaican. My understanding was that Dara’s mother associated this “Jamaican” language with local ways of “doing Black”, and that speaking “Jamaican” meant adopting local “Black” positionings bound up with street toughness and low aspirations<sup>100</sup>. The girls’ accounts suggest that they were very comfortable doing Jamaican accents at home, and to some extent revelled in their parents’ exasperation or disapproval. Unlike at school where more skilled and “legitimate” speakers kept Dara and Márcia’s use of a Jamaican accent in check (detailed in Chapter 7), at home they could indulge as rebels and relative experts. A similar barrier prevented the girls from making use of LMEV at school. As I suggested above, Vinício’s use of LMEV could be interpreted by peers as an assertion of insider status in the local multiethnic context. However, for Dara and Márcia with their “mixed race”<sup>101</sup> appearance, use of LMEV could be interpreted by peers as an attempt to assert an ethnic positioning as “Black”. Dara and Márcia’s exclusion from local understandings of “Blackness” also excluded them from unchallenged use of LMEV within the school context.

---

<sup>100</sup> A fuller account of this locally circulating discourse of “blackness” is given in Chapter 7.

<sup>101</sup> Both girls have a medium brown skin tone commonly associated with the term “mixed race” in the UK, and this is how they reported being labelled by “black” peers at school (retrospective interview, 28/6/13).

### 6.3.3 Alícia and LMEV

In the previous section I explained how Dara and Márcia's problematic relationship with local understandings of "Blackness" meant that their ability to make use of LMEV within the school context faced restrictions. In this section I describe how Alícia's (Year 11, female, "Brazilian") use of LMEV was also very restricted but due to a different set of limitations on the positionings she felt able to adopt. Alícia socialised almost exclusively with other Lusondoners and spent the vast majority of her school day operating in Portuguese. Whereas Vinício used LMEV to emphasise his local insiderness usually with non-Lusondoner peers, Alícia operated in a Lusondoner friendship group and did not feel the same pressure to distance herself from the figure of the "freshie" which could be associated with use of Portuguese. Instead, in this context her "Brazilianness" was a more accessible and valuable lever of prestige insider status (as discussed in Chapter 2) than use of LMEV. However, although this friendship group provided a safe space for Alícia's use of Portuguese, her use of English (both LMEV and more standard forms) was inhibited by her fear of judgment on the part of her more fluent Lusondoner peers. This meant that where Alícia did use English (including LMEV), this tended to be in more stylised interactions where the sense of role-playing meant her own prestige was not so much at stake. In the three subsections below, I set out these factors behind Alícia's limited use of LMEV (and English more generally) in detail.

#### *(a) Difficulty in following colloquial English interactions with peers*

During a retrospective interview (13/5/13) Alícia mentioned feeling judged in relation to her competency in English by more fluent speakers in her Lusondoner friendship group. She therefore felt more comfortable speaking English when away from this group, citing her Brazilian church as a key context where she felt freer to engage in playful use of English with friends. The barrier to local insiderness that Alícia's less developed competency in English represented at school was highlighted during a Health and Social Care lesson when Alícia was sitting with a mixed group of girls, both Lusondoners and non-Lusondoners. The following episode took place when Alícia was wearing the microphone.

**Episode VIII** (reconstructed from field notes and an audio recording, 10/5/13)

<b>Speaker</b>	<b>Ethnolinguistic background</b>
Alícia (Year 11, female)	“Brazilian” according to the criteria I set out in Chapter 4, with “Mediterranean” features. Born in Brazil and came to the UK age 13. Speaks Brazilian Portuguese and is developing fluency in English.
Adriana (Year 11, female)	“White Portuguese”, according to the criteria I set out in Chapter 4, with “Mediterranean” features. Born in Madeira and came to the UK as a baby, then returned to Madeira before settling in the UK again aged 9. Fluent in English which she speaks with a London accent, and Portuguese which she speaks with a Madeiran accent, with the occasional Brazilian influence.

Alícia is sitting with a group of girls and they have been set the task of discussing ways to reduce stress during the exam period. One girl in the group offers “fingering<sup>102</sup>” herself as a strategy. This prompts laughter and commentary from the others. Alícia does not follow what is being said and asks her friend Adriana (Year 11, female, “White Portuguese – Madeiran”) for an explanation several times. Adriana eventually translates for her. (reconstructed from field notes and an audio recording 10/5/13)

This example shows the difficulty Alícia could face in engaging in colloquial English interactions. She was not always able to understand what was being said and therefore had to rely on her Lusondoner friends to translate for her. Without their support she could find herself excluded from interactions. Her less developed fluency fits into a wider pattern of Brazilians having a lower average fluency stage due to their more recent arrival in the country (as explored in Chapter 4). However, as I will show in the following section, this did not mean that LMEV was completely unavailable to Alícia, but that its use was confined to limited and usually ironic references.

*(b) Ironic reference to LMEV*

During one break time when Alícia was wearing the microphone, Denise (Year 11, female, “White Portuguese – Madeiran”) was pulling on Alícia’s skirt and said “allow my hand, allow it” (audio recording 9/5/13). Alícia responded with “allow

---

<sup>102</sup> A slang term for female masturbation.

it”, and laughed, strongly emphasising the second syllable of “allow” and suggesting an overt LMEV stylisation. Instead of Denise and Alícia using the common LMEV term “‘llow it<sup>103</sup>”, dropping the initial syllable of “allow”, they offered this more pronounced version. Their laughter signalled the banter in which they were engaged, and this use of “allow it” appeared to be more a referencing of LMEV than a natural use of it. The girls were using LMEV to underline the mock-conflict involved in the skirt pulling, but there was a humour inherent to Alícia’s use of LMEV. While Denise often employed LMEV, and Alícia commented on this specifically during a retrospective interview (13/5/13), it was very rare to hear Alícia use it. Alícia was often (although not always) able to recognise LMEV, and when her English teacher offered “yeah fam” (field notes 13/3/13) during a lesson as an example of an inappropriate register in written work, Alícia smiled signalling she recognised this nuance. Alícia did not make regular use of LMEV, then, but she referenced it here ironically, foregrounding its unusualness in her repertoire by following it up with laughter. Alícia told me in a retrospective interview (13/5/13) that she tended to use slang like “innit” only with friends from her Brazilian church, or with Bruna (Year 11, female, “Brazilian”), suggesting that for her this was reserved for contexts where she shared her status of “illegitimate” user with other speakers present. It is also noteworthy that Alícia specifically mentions using “slang” (or LMEV) with other Brazilians. The broad biographical survey data I presented in Chapter 4 showed that lower fluency in English was particularly associated with Brazilians at the school, and this would fit with Alícia’s greater sense of ease in using LMEV amongst other Brazilians. Unlike Vinício then who used LMEV to mark his insider status as a savvy Londoner, Alícia employed it ironically, with a critical distance, sharing her outsider status with other Lusondoner peers.

*(c) Confident use of English when role-playing*

Alícia’s performance during an episode of role-play in an English lesson also supports the idea that she was more comfortable using English when she could adopt a positioning of some critical distance. During one lesson when the students were preparing and performing role plays as part of the speaking and listening assessment, Alícia’s performance brought praise from the rest of the class and the teacher. I wrote in my field notes:

---

<sup>103</sup> “‘llow it” is an LMEV exclamation of unwillingness or dislike (from “allow it”).

“Alícia plays an annoyed customer and maintains serious stance and stays in character although the audience and other actors are laughing. She argues with the waiter. She speaks perfectly fluently in character while arguing.” (13/3/13)

This was a very rare example of extended interaction in English on the part of Alícia and it is noteworthy both that she was playing a character and that none of her close Lusondoner friends were present in the lesson. As mentioned in subsection (a) above, Alícia explained to me during a retrospective interview (13/5/13) feeling inhibited about speaking English in front of her more fluent Lusondoner friends. This episode then suggests that Alícia experienced similar restrictions on her use of more standard forms of English as she did on her use of LMEV. In both cases, the presence of her close Lusondoner friends represented an inhibiting factor due to the fear of judgement she experienced, but the possibility of adopting a position of critical distance either through role-play or stylisation could make use of English (including LMEV) more accessible. The stark differences then between Vinício’s, Danilo’s and Alícia’s use of LMEV are not simply about competency, but the extent to which these Lusondoners feel able to adopt positionings deemed appropriate for LMEV speakers in specific contexts around particular peers, and to define a space for themselves within the local ethnic ecology.

#### **6.4 Chapter conclusion**

LMEV was a dominant feature of the locale within which my Lusondoner participants operated and was clearly recognised by all of them. However, access and orientations towards this form of speech were not uniform. Instead, each of my key Lusondoner participants had a different orientation in relation to LMEV, often tightly bound up with how their individual ethnolinguistic background played out in the local context. For Vinício, LMEV featured heavily in his struggle to move from “freshie” to high status insider, rooted in his experience as a boy arriving in a London secondary school with very little English. His use of LMEV was a marker of his situatedness in the locality, and he exploited the street-tough associations of LMEV which came from its connections to a locally dominant form of “Blackness”. For Dara and Márcia, their struggle was to stake out a space for themselves independent of this locally dominant “Blackness”. Their darker skin meant use of LMEV on their part would not necessarily just be interpreted by peers as enacting localness, but could instead be seen as aligning themselves with local “Blackness”. This was unacceptable to Dara and Márcia as they felt repelled by what they saw as the low

aspirations of their “Black” peers, but also distinctly unwelcome within the “Black” peer group. LMEV was therefore something they largely avoided at school.

The dynamics of immediate friendship groups could also be decisive factors in how LMEV was responded to by Lusondoners. For Danilo, the associations with masculine, street-tough positionings restricted the contexts in which he could make ready use of LMEV. Unlike Vinício, Danilo was not comfortable competing for insider status in overtly masculine peer contexts, and instead drew on LMEV playfully in interactions with female friends. Finally, for Alícia, LMEV was problematic but in the same way as Standard English. Her struggle was in asserting confident positionings with any variety of English in front of her more fluent Lusondoner friends. What ran through the experiences of all of these key participants was the importance of local, often very small-scale factors, in their linguistic practices. For these Lusondoners, being in a London school did not simply mean they spoke English. Instead, they had to contend with LMEV, a locally dominant set of linguistic features which was rooted in the specific ethnolinguistic history of the superdiverse locality. The particular ethnically inflected associations of LMEV meant it raised different challenges and opportunities depending on the individual ethnolinguistic backgrounds of different Lusondoners. Individuals’ actual linguistic practices then could not be accounted for by a simple model of standard languages. Instead, an ethnographic understanding of the local linguistic ecology was necessary, along with a nuanced appreciation of the ethnolinguistic background of each individual. Linguistic practices were rooted in the interplay between these two factors.



## Chapter 7

### “Blackness”, “Whiteness” and Lusondoners

*“I have to like tell people my whole life story to explain the fact that I’m black”*  
Márcia (retrospective interview 28/6/13)

#### 7.0 Introduction

In previous chapters I emphasised the importance of a nuanced awareness of local conditions in understanding the ethnic positionings and linguistic practices of my Lusondoner participants. I explained how Lusondoners’ transnational Lusophone ties were part of constituting a Lusondoner discursive space rooted in the specific, local ethnolinguistic ecology. Multiethnic conviviality and a Local Multiethnic Vernacular were dominant features of this local ethnolinguistic ecology, and also permeated interactions between Lusondoners. In this chapter I focus on another key aspect of the locality: the difficulty some individuals experienced in establishing ethnic positionings in the local space. I explain how two “Black Portuguese” Lusondoners, as well as a “White Portuguese” Lusondoner with African connections, were constrained in their positionings by existing dominant local discourses of “Blackness”. I set out how, in my field site in south London, the pre-eminence of “Black” linguistic and cultural sensibilities and practices had specific knock-on effects for different Lusondoners and the ethnic claims and positionings which were straightforwardly available to them. There were two main elements to this. Firstly, the dominance of “Blackness” lent it a gravitational pull which impacted on all young people. This was rooted both in the numerical significance of “Black” young people<sup>104</sup>, as well as the prominence of “Blackness” in popular culture discernible in phenomena such as the widespread popularity of African American Vernacular English. Secondly, the specifics of migration from Africa and the

---

<sup>104</sup> Groups with some claim to “blackness” make up 57.7% of the total pupil body, an absolute majority within the school: Black Caribbean (25.3%); Black African (22.4%); White and Black Caribbean (7.4%); Any other Black background (1.6%); White and Black African (1%). While it is problematic to see these groups as a coherent “bloc”, I set out in this chapter that “blackness” has a relevance and resonance amongst students who identify as “Black” which goes beyond particular origins or appearance, and can often serve as a preminent identifier. It is therefore worth pointing out the numerical significance of the combination of “Black”-related groups as this contributes a key feature of the peer context in which Lusondoners operate at school, and has implications for the space in which “Black Portuguese” pupils struggle to establish a coherent discourse for themselves.

Caribbean to the UK, and in particular to south London, contributed to dominant understandings of what “Black” meant in the south London context. This explains Márcia’s (Year 10, female, “Black Portuguese”) words above. They come from a retrospective interview where Dara (Year 10, female, “Black Portuguese”) and Márcia were complaining that “Black” young people always insisted on labelling them as “mixed race” because they were light-skinned, and would not accept their self-ascription as “Black”. Márcia’s words suggest that, despite her African descent and brown skin, there was something problematic about her claim to be “Black”. This was also highlighted by her official status as ‘White European Portuguese’ according to the school’s ethnic monitoring system, although she referred to herself as “Black European” during a retrospective interview I conducted with her (28/6/13). This mismatch lays bare the predicament that both Márcia and Dara found themselves in: there was no appropriate box for them to tick. This was not just in the literal sense of finding an adequate category to describe them on the ethnic monitoring form. It was also mirrored in the absence of any widely circulating discourse which accounted for brown-skinned, Portuguese-born Londoners of African descent. Márcia’s words highlight the struggle that both she and Dara experienced in order to stake out a space for themselves within the apparently rigid ethnic ecology of their south London locale.

In this chapter I explore how different Lusondoners struggled to find ethnic positionings which were compatible with dominant discourses of “Blackness” and “Whiteness” in south London. In section 7.1, I describe Dara and Márcia’s struggle to carve out a space for their “Black Portugueseness” within the rigid ethnic ecology of south London. I explain their distinct but overlapping “Black Portuguese” trajectories and affiliations, then set out how these girls felt excluded from local understandings of “Blackness” which were dominated by discourses of “Jamaicanness”, and to a lesser extent “West Africanness”. In section 7.2, I explore locally dominant representations of “Blackness” which emerge from my data, setting out a “Jamaicanness”, with working-class, street-tough connotations, and associated with low academic aspirations but high social status, enhanced through its prominence in popular culture. I also describe local representations of “Africanness”, associated with poverty, lower social currency and a lack of urban savvy. In section 7.3, I explain how these discourses are policed by gatekeepers who exclude Dara and Márcia. Finally, in section 7.4 I set out how Danilo, a “White Portuguese” young person with ties to Africa, is drawn in by the local gravitational pull of “Blackness”, but struggles to assert his claim of “Africanness” due to his pale skin. The cases of

these three Lusondoners then show that there are particular contours to south London's multiethnic landscape which have to be negotiated. Locally prevalent discourses of "Blackness" and "Whiteness" have a policing effect on the ethnic claims and positionings which Lusondoners can straightforwardly adopt. This highlights how superdiverse contexts are not just constituted by a multiplicity of ethnic ties, languages and migration trajectories, but also by the particular historically-rooted discursive landscape which emerges from these. While I have identified Lusondoners as a particular group, it is early in its formation and people are still struggling to make space for it in a local ethnic ecology where the ground has already been carved out by dominant "Black" identities. This causes difficulties for certain types of Lusondoners, and one of the major themes running through this thesis is the struggles they therefore find themselves engaged in.

### **7.1 Lack of space for "Black Portugueseness" within dominant discourses of "Blackness" in south London**

As I suggested above, "Blackness" had a particular dominance in my south London field site. In the introduction to this chapter I outlined the high proportion of young people at the school where my research took place who fell under one of the "Black" ethnic categories, highlighting the numerical significance of "Blackness" in the local context. In this section I look beyond official categorisations to set out the dominant discourses circulating in relation to being "Black" in south London, and the gravitational pull these exerted on all young people. Although Dara (Year 10, female, "Black Portuguese") and Márcia (Year 10, female, "Black Portuguese") were not officially recorded as "Black", it is a term which featured prominently in their verbal interactions. However, as I show below, Dara and Márcia's Lusophone African descent was not accounted for within local discourses of "Blackness". As I explained in Chapter 4, data from my own study as well as existing research suggests that even on the part of other Lusondoners there was a general blind spot towards "Black Portuguese". This was further corroborated by Dara and Márcia when they explained to me during a retrospective interview I conducted with them (28/6/13) that they could eavesdrop on other Portuguese-speakers on the bus without being suspected as Lusophones. Recognition of "Black Portugueseness" was minimal within the Lusondoner discursive space, and distinctly lacking in the broader multiethnic context of south London. Instead, local

understandings of “Blackness” were dominated by “Jamaicanness”, in tension with a lower status “West Africanness”. Dara and Márcia’s struggle to position themselves as “Black” must be understood both in the context of this local tension and, as I set out below, in relation to the specifics of their own family migration trajectories.

### **7.1.1 Dara and Márcia’s claims to “Blackness”**

During an activity in a Drama lesson when I was observing Dara, she stood back against the black-painted wall, her arms stretched out to the sides, and declared that she was “blending in” (field notes 10/6/13). The fact that I immediately recognised this as a joke about her skin being camouflaged against the colour of the wall gives a sense of just how common this kind of comment was in her talk. References to being “Black”, or to what “Black people” are like were not only ubiquitous within my audio data involving Dara and Márcia, they also evoked more consistently animated responses from the two, whether in amusement or resentment, than any other topic. The accounts both girls gave during the retrospective interview (28/6/13) suggested this apparent preoccupation with “Blackness” was very much linked to the struggle they experienced in asserting claims of “Blackness” in south London, as I outlined above. Dara and Márcia’s persistent focus on “Blackness” also stood out for being unusual amongst young people at the school. Other young people did not share their fixation on this topic. This reinforces the sense of “Blackness” as a locally dominant discourse and therefore normally part of the unacknowledged background to everyday activity. For Dara and Márcia however, the tension between locally dominant understandings of “Blackness” and their own situation, meant the issue of their positioning in relation to “Blackness” was persistently brought to the fore.

Although both girls shared a local experience of grappling with ethnic boundary policing in relation to “Blackness” in south London, their claims to “Blackness” were not rooted in identical migration trajectories and affiliations. Dara’s mother comes from Cape Verde and her father from Angola. They met in Portugal, where Dara was born, then came to the UK when Dara was 10. Neither Dara nor her mother had been to Angola and a trip was planned in order for them to meet Dara’s paternal grandparents for the first time. Despite working in low-paid jobs, her parents saved up for the tickets, only for the cash to disappear on the day of purchasing somewhere between the bank and the travel agents. Undeterred, Dara’s parents began saving up again, testimony to the importance for them of this trip to Angola. Although Dara rarely brought up the topic of this heritage, she clearly had a significant fund of

knowledge and references related to it. This surfaced twice within the audio data: on one occasion she defended Angola as “my dad’s country” (audio recording 21/6/13) when teased about it by her friend Stephanie (Year 10, female, “Jamaican”); on another occasion she referred to a particular Angolan song her father listened to (retrospective interview 28/6/13). Márcia’s parents are both of Cape Verdean descent but born in Portugal. During a retrospective interview Márcia mentioned taunting her parents with the possibility that she might have a relationship with “a *black* person from Africa” (28/6/13). The implication that this would displease them suggested a negative estimation of “Black Africa” on their part. This may have linked to their sense of themselves as Portuguese, but also to broader ambiguities about the status of Cape Verde as African outlined in Chapter 2. In describing Cape Verdean migration to Portugal, Batalha (2008) distinguishes between an assimilated lighter-skinned elite of “Portuguese-Cape Verdeans”, and darker-skinned Cape Verdeans. Hamilton (1975) emphasises the long-standing privileging of lighter skin tones in Cape Verdean culture, encapsulated in the popular saying “‘quem não tem paciência não terá filho branco’ (he who lacks patience cannot expect to have a white son)’ (p316-7). In any case, the reported displeasure of Márcia’s parents contrasted with the impression gained from Dara of attitudes towards Africa in her family. During the same retrospective interview mentioned above Dara explained that her father disliked Jamaicans because he believed that “Jamaican people don’t think that they’re Africans”, suggesting pride in African origins was very important to him. Although both girls self-identified as “Black” within the school context, they clearly drew on contrasting experiences in terms of their families’ migration trajectories and attitudes to “Black Africanness”.

Despite these differences at home, both girls bore strong similarities at school in terms of the ways they negotiated ethnic identification. As I highlighted above, they shared a preoccupation with the notion of “Black” which manifested itself in frequent jokes and comments about what this term meant, both in relation to themselves and other young people. The other marked point of commonality between Dara and Márcia was their profile as students. They both attained top grades and made no secret of their high academic aspirations. This was something Dara explicitly contrasted with the typical behaviour of “Black people” (retrospective interview 28/6/13 – discussed in detail in section 7.1.2 below). Interactions I had with their parents at school parents’ evenings suggested they shared these aspirations, and both Dara’s mother and father attended ESOL classes at the school. Having known and worked with Dara and Márcia for over four years, my strong

impression of these girls was that they were extremely keen to be (and be seen as) high achieving. I show in section 7.1.2 below how these high aspirations were a key area in which they felt squeezed out by local understandings of “Blackness”. Despite clear divergence in their family backgrounds then (Dara’s parents come from Africa while Márcia’s were born and brought up in Europe), the girls had a largely overlapping experience of being “Black” in south London. This was characterised by a struggle to set out a space for themselves, particularly in relation to the “Jamaicanness” which dominated discourses of “Blackness” in south London, as I set out below.

### **7.1.2 Dara and Márcia’s sense of exclusion from London “Blackness”**

During a retrospective interview (28/6/13), both Dara and Márcia expressed a vehement resentment of “Jamaicans” in the school which appeared to align with negative estimations of this group on the part of their parents. In the girls’ accounts, “Jamaican” appeared at times to be used interchangeably with “Black”, and both terms were applied disparagingly, drawing heavily on a discourse of “Blackness” as urban, working-class, uneducated and lacking aspiration. As I mentioned above, this was particularly at odds with the high-achieving status which Dara and Márcia were keen to maintain, and Dara was vehement on this point, stating “I ain’t going out with no black person”, and justifying this on the grounds that “there’s not many black people that can achieve that much”. This aversion to a perceived lack of aspiration within locally dominant “Blackness” was a major reason these girls found it difficult to carve out a comfortable space in the local racial/ethnic ecology.

In this section I give a detailed account of some of the opinions Dara and Márcia expressed in the comparatively uncensored context of this retrospective interview I conducted with them (28/6/13). During this interview, away from the gatekeeping practices of “Jamaican” peers<sup>105</sup>, Dara employed a number of Jamaican-indexed words. Both Dara and Márcia expressed strong resentment at how they, as “Portuguese” young people, were viewed within the school. In outlining the dominant perception of “the Portuguese group”, the girls were drawn into defining where this perception came from, pinpointing the grouping which constituted this dominant gaze. Within their account was a conflation of “Black” and “Jamaican” which echoed the Jamaican pre-eminence within conceptualisations of “Black” in

---

<sup>105</sup> In Chapter 6 I set out how Dara and Márcia report using “Jamaican” language playfully in the home environment, away from “Jamaican” peers.

London (explained in more detail in section 7.1.3 below). In grappling with the restrictive ethnic boundaries they came up against then, the girls imbibed the notion that “Blackness” was in some way synonymous with “Jamaicanness”. Their taking up of this notion shows the limitations of the rigid ethnic ecology in which they operated, and the limited current possibilities for a space for “Black Portuguese” Lusondoners.

**Episode IX** (reconstructed from retrospective interview audio data, 28/6/13)

<b>Speaker</b>	<b>Ethnolinguistic background</b>
Dara (Year 10, female)	“Black Portuguese” according to the criteria I set out in Chapter 4, and has a skin tone that would commonly be associated with “mixed race” in the UK. Born in Portugal, of Angolan and Cape Verdean descent. Arrived in the UK during Year 6. Fluent in English which she speaks with a London accent with an occasional Portuguese influence, and Portuguese which she speaks with a mainland Portuguese accent.
Márcia (Year 10, female)	“Black Portuguese” according to the criteria I set out in Chapter 4, and has a skin tone that would commonly be associated with “mixed race” in the UK. Born in Portugal, of Cape Verdean descent. Arrived in the UK at age 5. Fluent in English which she speaks with a London accent, and Portuguese which she speaks with a mainland Portuguese accent.
Me (Age 31, male)	Recorded as “White British”, with an olive skin tone. Born and grew up in UK. Generally speaks a fairly standard variety of English. Fluent in Portuguese which he speaks with a Brazilian accent.

I ask the girls “what do you think other people in the school think of the Portuguese group in the school?”. Márcia starts to talk about “the popular like ethnic groups”, and Dara immediately offers “black people”. Márcia then describes an incident where another girl complained that “there’s so many Portuguese people in this school and they don’t even know how to speak English”. Both Márcia and Dara are indignant at this suggestion, and Dara stresses “*I* know how to speak English, *I’m* Portuguese”. Márcia goes on to outline a wider pattern of other students criticising Portuguese speakers, saying “and they’re like, ahh there are so many Portuguese people in this school and they can’t speak English yeah, but they forget that like, black people are in this school as well the majority of the school is black”. Dara then adds

“Jamaican people they can’t speak properly man, that’s why I don’t understand them, I don’t understand a word they say”. Dara exclaims “it’s disgusting!”, then Márcia explains: “I think people in this school they think that just because they’re Jamaican like they have like a higher like status or something like that”. She goes on to outline how this can leave her feeling excluded in situations such as PE lessons, saying: “you see like, when they’re doing PE, yeah, and you see all them Jamaican people, I’m just like, and we have to pick groups yeah, I’m just like I don’t want to be in that group yeah coz they have too many Jama, Jamaican people”. Dara adds “their group start speaking Jamaican, their little bumbaclarts and stuff”, and Márcia follows this with “I hate them people yeah”. Márcia then goes on to outline typical interactions with these students in the school canteen: “black people yeah, when they’re like, you’re eating food, they don’t, they’re not your friend, they don’t know you, and then they come ask you for food, like what the hell, but when they have food yeah, they don’t offer you a little piece, that’s just so mean”. Dara responds to this, saying “I’d be like but if someone touched my food, if you touch it I’ll bruck<sup>106</sup> your face down”.

In the episode above, Dara and Márcia described coming up against negative accounts of “Portuguese people” voiced by “Black” peers. My sense from the girls’ accounts was that Dara and Márcia experienced a widely circulating “anti-foreigner” rhetoric as interlinked with a more local phenomenon of “Jamaican” dominance. While Dara and Márcia’s foreignness was flagged by their use of Portuguese language, the gatekeepers of “localness” were not just English speakers, but “Black” or more specifically “Jamaican” peers. I first address Dara and Márcia’s response to the “anti-foreigner” rhetoric directed at their “Portugueseness”. Both responded to the criticism that “Portuguese people” cannot speak English by pointing to themselves as examples of English speakers. Márcia stated “I know how to speak English, I’m Portuguese”, not just defending “Portuguese people” in general, but also highlighting the unacknowledged diversity within this grouping. Her repeated stressing of “I” sidestepped the need to account for the English language fluency of all “Portuguese people”. Rather, by pointing out her own clear English language proficiency, and stating her membership of this grouping, she elevated its status through association. The fact that her membership needed stating is another reminder of the lack of any established notion of “Black Portugueseness”. However, Dara and Márcia’s struggle was not just for recognition of “Black Portugueseness” as an abstract concept, but to carve out a space for themselves as “Black Portuguese” within the south London context. This meant coming up against locally dominant understandings of “Blackness”.

---

<sup>106</sup> A Jamaican Creole term for which Reynolds (2006) gives the following definition: ‘to inflict serious injuries during a fight or accident’ (p19) – when used in the phrase “bruck up”, which Dara’s words “I’ll bruck your face down” appear to be a variation of.



Within this retrospective interview, Dara and Márcia began to sketch out the locally dominant understandings of “Blackness” they came up against. My question “what do you think other people in the school think of the Portuguese group?”, referred to two groupings: the “Portuguese group” and “other people in the school”. The conversation leading up to this point had clearly established Dara and Márcia as part of this “Portuguese group”, therefore this “other” grouping was, by default, also “other” to them. Who was imagined under this term “other people in the school”, and the attitudes they held, was first hinted at when Márcia referred to a discussion of “the popular like ethnic groups”. Although some element of group categorisation and concomitant valorisations could be seen as inherent to my question, it appears from Márcia’s account that these processes were already at play in everyday interaction amongst young people at the school. Once “popular” ethnic groups had been mentioned, and before Márcia had a chance to point out any specific individual, Dara volunteered “black people”. Márcia employed the same term just afterwards, saying “black people are in this school as well, the majority of the school is black”. While I initiated this discussion with a question about “other people in the school”, both girls defined their focus specifically as “black” people. At this point Dara cut in to say “Jamaican people can’t speak properly man”. This appears to be a response to the criticism in Márcia’s account that Portuguese people “can’t speak English”. This could be read as an attempt to divert a general attack on “Portuguese people” onto another named group. Later in this retrospective interview the girls outlined another similar instance where their accusers are specifically signalled as speaking “dutty<sup>107</sup> Jamaican”, aligning this “Black” majority in the school with “Jamaicanness”.

Throughout this episode, it was noticeable that Dara and Márcia used the terms “black people” and “Jamaicans” interchangeably. It appears then that they specifically associated criticism of “Portuguese people” for not speaking English with “Jamaicans”. As the episode progressed, the girls became more specific about their grievances with “Jamaicans” and the dominant position they enjoyed within the school. Dara described this Jamaican dominance as “disgusting”, and Márcia complained: “I think people in this school they think that just because they’re

---

<sup>107</sup> Dara used a Jamaican accent here to pronounce “dirty” as “dutty”. Cassidy and Le Page (1967), in their *Dictionary of Jamican English*, also define “dutty” as ‘Earth, soil; the ground’ (p166), but Dara appears to be using it as an adjective here with an equivalent meaning to “dirty”. This fits with Reynolds’ (2006) definition of “dutti” / “dotti”: ‘not clean; used to mark an inappropriate or unnecessary act or behavior’ (p44).

Jamaican like they have like a higher like status”. The fact that she referred generally to “people in this school”, and not more specifically to “some people”, reinforced her earlier point that “the majority of the school is black”. This “Black/Jamaican” contingent was not only numerically but also socially dominant. Márcia touched on this, expressing a prejudice against people of Jamaican descent, when she outlined her dislike of being put in the same group as these students in PE lessons. One of the aspects of this complaint was young people of Jamaican descent and their friends heavily using Jamaican language. Following on from Márcia’s complaint, Dara expressed resentment that “their group start speaking Jamaican”. Dara then characterised this Jamaican speech as “their little bumbaclarts and stuff”, the “their” emphasising who owned this language while “little” marking an attempt to deflate some of the social prestige it carried. The social standing of this “Black/Jamaican” group was also presented through Márcia’s account of an unequal power distribution in canteen etiquette, with “black people” asking for her food but not sharing their own. These examples point to an underlying resentment which Dara and Márcia feel due to their experience of marginalisation by a predominantly “Jamaican” form of locally dominant “Blackness”, which does not accommodate any notion of “Black Portugueseness”.

In this extract, then, Dara and Márcia outlined their sense of exclusion from what they regarded as a fairly monolithic “Black/Jamaican” group which enjoyed a dominant position within the school. In response to this disenfranchisement, Dara specifically attacked the speech patterns of this group saying “Jamaican people they can’t speak properly man” and referring dismissively to “dutty Jamaican”. However, this last example encapsulates an ambiguity in Dara’s behaviour. At the same time as vehemently criticising “dutty Jamaican” she also made repeated use of certain Jamaican-indexed features: “bumbaclarts”, kissing her teeth (at various points during the retrospective interview) and “bruck. Elsewhere in the interview both girls made reference to regularly using a Jamaican accent at home, away from the gatekeeping processes at work in the school (explored in section 7.3.1 below). The retrospective interview itself may have presented a similar safe space for the girls to voice opinions and experiment with linguistic features which they would tend to censor in mainstream school contexts. This is supported by the fact that both girls were reluctant to end the interview (despite having stayed after school for an hour and fifteen minutes) and volunteered that they had enjoyed having an opportunity to talk about the issues covered. The dominance of “Jamaicanness” within local understandings of “Blackness” then represented a major area of identification-

related struggle for Dara and Márcia. In the following section I set out locally dominant understandings of “Blackness” in south London in more detail, explaining how neither the dominant discourse of “Jamaicanness”, nor the less dominant discourse of “West Africanness” accommodated Dara and Márcia’s “Black Portugueseness”.

### **7.1.3 Dominant discourses of “Blackness” in south London**

Dara and Márcia have brown skin and family trajectories linked to Africa, but they found that these did not automatically fulfil the criteria for “Blackness” according to local understandings in south London. As I alluded to in the introduction to this chapter, the relationship between origins or appearance and the label “Black” is not a straightforward one. Phillips and Phillips (1998) cited the experience of the Notting Hill Riots of 1958 as a key milestone in the formation of a ‘black community’ in Britain, suggesting that the idea of a “Black” British identity was rooted in the common experience of resistance as opposed to simply colour or heritage. Modood (1994) described the development of a political use of ‘black’ which saw it applied also, for a period, to those of South Asian descent in the UK. He outlined the lack of resonance this found amongst perhaps the majority of Asians themselves, but also pointed out that contestation of this term had already been a ‘recurring topic of debate’ (p862) in *The Voice*, described as ‘Britain’s most successful black newspaper’ (Chrisafis, 2002). Even without the complicating factor of whether “Black” can be applied to British Asians, Alexander (2002) questions the all-encompassing nature of this term, pointing out the dominance of ‘the version of “black British” as an exclusively African-Caribbean experience (with grudging African add-ons)’ (p558). Lam & Scott (2009) take up this point but also identify certain shifts, writing that ‘[t]he relatively recent and larger-scale migration from Africa has meant that not only the ‘black’ label but its communities and identities have taken on more nuanced meanings, even though this is often overlooked by out-groups’ (p1251). These ‘nuanced meanings’ can be masked by a looseness in popular understandings with the categorisation “Jamaican” taken as synonymous with, or emblematic of “Caribbean”, and “Nigerian” playing a similar role in relation to “African”, as evidenced by audio data explored in this chapter. The notion of “Black” is therefore complex (and problematic) both in the diversity of groups it encompasses but also in the suggestion of a common experience in the UK which it carries. As I show in this chapter, for Lusondoners with claims to “Blackness” or “Africanness”, the complexity described above means that these young people often have to engage

in significant struggle when their claims are not recognised by peers in the local context.

For Dara and Márcia arriving in south London, the local history of “Blackness” described above meant that the label “Black” already carried with it a complex web of meanings. These did not just stem from the diverse origins of the groups it was applied to, but also from the specific, locally rooted discourses which circulated around them. As suggested by Alexander’s (2002) article cited above, African-Caribbeans constitute the largest of these groupings and play a predominant role in notions of what “Black” means in the UK. Alexander builds on Gilroy (2000) to link this to their status as ‘the incumbents of a global, creative, cutting-edge and infinitely marketable culture-of-desire’ (p557). This high currency within popular culture is coupled with a discourse of educational underachievement, reflected in and reproduced by a number of studies (see Taylor: 1981; Sewell: 1997; Youdell: 2003) and policy initiatives (see DES: 2003; McKenley et al.: 2003; National Union of Teachers: 2007). Lam & Scott (2009) draw a direct contrast between this largely negative discourse surrounding the education of Caribbeans in Britain and a correspondingly positive account of Africans (p1251). Daley (1998) details a long history of African migration to the UK for educational reasons, writing ‘[a]mong Africans there continues to be a strong emphasis on professional qualifications as the main route to higher social status’ (p1708). Knowles (2013), focusing specifically on Nigerians, states that ‘Nigerian London is educated, employed and earning better than the UK median wage’ (p660) but precisely because of this it ‘lies below the radar of public notoriety, official data and social policy’. Knowles links this notion of visibility to ‘settled ideas of ethnic territories in the city’ (p652), explaining that these can be disrupted by superdiversity, writing that ‘[u]nderstanding places like Brixton in London as African Caribbean are subverted by new migrations, which are not apparent on the surface of place: Brixton is African as well as Caribbean’. In London then, the term “Black” links to different established groupings associated with particular profiles and locations but these are also prone to the distorting effects of asymmetrical visibilities. Alleyne (2002) highlights the work this leaves for individuals as they negotiate identification in relation to this term. In describing Alexander’s (1996) study of “Black” British youth, he writes:

While her respondents were aware that for many white British they were all alike in their blackness, they were also aware that blackness had to be constituted and negotiated even among themselves, between genders and

among different Caribbean and African ‘origins’. Being black for these young Londoners was a state of becoming, an art, as Alexander put it.’ (p619)

Even for those young people then who have a more straightforward claim to a specific strand of “Black Britishness”, this involves a complex process of artful construction. For Dara and Márcia it was a creative task of a still higher order, and involved negotiating the dominant “Jamaican” and “African” strands within south London “Blackness”, as well as the tension between them. In section 7.2 below I examine these strands in more detail, and show how they left limited scope for Dara and Márcia to establish “Black Portuguese” positionings.

## **7.2 Representations of “Jamaicanness” and “Africanness”**

In section 7.1 I outlined Dara and Márcia’s sense of exclusion from a local understanding of “Blackness” associated with positionings and practices rooted in “Jamaicanness”, and to a lesser extent “Africanness”. In this section I analyse episodes of naturally occurring speech where such “Jamaican” and “African” positionings and practices were referenced. Through this, I highlight both the pre-eminence of “Jamaicanness” in relation to other local understandings of “Blackness”, and the working-class, street-tough connotations it carries. Although of great interest to Dara and Márcia, this Jamaicanness was not something they identified with. While they did identify as “Black”, the Jamaican-led “Blackness” which is locally dominant did not accommodate their sense of themselves as hard-working and aspirational individuals. Similarly, they had little regard for local understandings of “Africanness”, largely associated with poverty and a lack of urban savvy.

### **7.2.1 Street-tough “Jamaicanness” in opposition to simple “West Africanness”**

As outlined above, notions of “Jamaicanness” are preeminent within conceptualisations of “Black” in south London. A less visible notion of “Africanness” is also recognisable as an element within the south London “Black” ecology. Episode X below contains references to both of these strands, pointing to specific connotations each one carries as well as highlighting a hierarchical relationship between the two. I give significant attention to this episode as it vividly captures these locally dominant understandings of “Blackness”. In section 7.1.2 above I set out how Dara and Márcia expressed, in a retrospective interview

(28/6/13), the struggle they engaged in to assert claims of “Black Portugueseness”. As I explain throughout this thesis, this was because the category “Black” was already occupied by people of Jamaican descent, and it is therefore important to give a strong flavour of the nature of this dominance. In Episode X below, reference is made to the kind of recognisable incident that happens in the locality through which this “Jamaican” dominance is manifested. It involves a dominant (“Jamaican”) “Black” person having little respect for people from Africa. In the incident recounted, “Jamaicanness” is associated with street-tough positionings, in contrast to a more bourgeois West Africanness. This episode, then, provides evidence to substantiate the claims about “Jamaicans” made by Dara and Márcia in the retrospective interview (28/6/13) detailed in section 7.1.2.

The episode shows part of a conversation between Stephanie (Year 10, female, “Jamaican”), Dara and Márcia which took place during a lunch break when Dara was wearing the microphone. During the previous lesson Stephanie had alluded to an anecdote which involved her Jamaican mother arguing with an “African lady” on the bus. She described how her mother’s bag had hit this woman as she passed her, leading to a confrontation, but her telling of the story was cut short by the teacher. The conversation below took place as the three girls were eating their lunch in the canteen, and the extract starts with Stephanie referring back to this anecdote which she had begun in the English lesson prior to the lunch break.

**Episode X** (audio recording of naturally occurring speech, 20/6/13)

Speaker	Ethnolinguistic background
Stephanie (Year 10, female)	Recorded as “Black Caribbean”, with a dark brown skin tone. Born in Jamaica but mostly grew up in UK. Speaks English with a London accent and rarely uses Jamaican pronunciation or Creole.
Dara (Year 10, female)	“Black Portuguese” according to the criteria I set out in Chapter 4, and has a skin tone that would commonly be associated with “mixed race” in the UK. Born in Portugal, of Angolan and Cape Verdean descent. Arrived in the UK during Year 6. Fluent in English which she speaks with a London accent with an occasional Portuguese influence, and Portuguese which she speaks with a mainland Portuguese accent.
Márcia (Year 10, female)	“Black Portuguese” according to the criteria I set out in Chapter 4, and has a skin tone that would commonly be associated with “mixed race” in the UK. Born in Portugal, of Cape Verdean descent. Arrived in the UK at age 5. Fluent in English which she speaks with a London accent, and Portuguese which she speaks with a mainland Portuguese accent.

Key: *Nigerian intonation*; **Jamaican accent**

**Part I**

- 1 Stephanie so, shall I tell you what happened with the African lady?
- 2 Dara oh, yeah, yeah, yeah, yeah
- 3 Stephanie uh yeah
- 4 she was like *eh eh*<sup>108</sup>, *Jesus*<sup>109</sup>, *excuse me oh*
- 5 Dara ((*girls laugh*)) excuse me oh ((*laughing*))

<sup>108</sup> My sense from from hearing “eh eh” used by students around the school was that it was widely recognised as a distinctive feature of West African English. Although I have not been able to find academic sources which refer to this linguistic feature, it is widely referenced in popular, online sources. For an indicative example, see ‘How To - West African Accents’ (Your Boy Mcleon, 2014).

<sup>109</sup> Knowles (2013) emphasises the integral role Christianity plays in the West African communities she studied in London. She writes, for example, that ‘the church provides a mechanism for living as Igbo-Nigerians-in-London’ (p658). Religiosity can therefore be seen as in some sense emblematic of “West Africanness”.

- 6 Stephanie *I think your bag just hit mæ* ((Stephanie laughs))  
 7 and then my mum's like **what the bloodclart** (2)  
 8 no  
 9 Dara your mum's Jamaican [innit  
 10 Stephanie [she, she just gets angry and shit yeah  
 11 I had to back, I had to back up, I had to back up  
 12 I had to move to the next chair, over der  
 [deəʔ]  
 13 in case punches were gettin' thrown and shit  
 14 and then (.) my mum's like (1) who you talkin to (.)  
 15 you dirty African woman  
 16 you don't even have a bath  
 17 Dara ahhhhhh ((whoops with laughter))  
 18 your mum is  
 19 Stephanie you smell like Brixton market<sup>110</sup> when they haven't cleaned it  
 20 properly  
 21 Márcia oooh  
 22 Dara your mum [is bad man  
 23 Stephanie [you, you little toilet  
 24 what you talkin' about  
 25 don't come to my face with your nonsense  
 26 I told you to move,  
 27 I asked you politely to move and you didn't move so I pushed  
 28 it over you  
 29 simple  
 30 and she's like *how are you doing this in front of your kids,*  
 31 *eh?*  
 32 *you don't havæ no remorse*  
 33 **now shut up before I smack you in your**  
 34 **bumbaclart**<sup>111</sup> (1.5)  
 35 Dara ahhhhhh ((whoops with laughter)) bumbaclart

<sup>110</sup> Brixton Market is a busy and popular market well known in the locality. The refuse generated, as well as several butchers and fishmongers shops along the road, make bad odours a regular feature of the market.

<sup>111</sup> "Bumbaclart" is also a Jamaican Creole exclamation or curse meaning more or less the same as "bloodclart".



Two main points emerge from the section above: the very clear juxtaposition in Stephanie's account between her mother as a "Jamaican", and the other lady as "African"; and the interest these stylisations generated amongst Dara and Márcia. The anecdote was introduced with Stephanie's line "so, shall I tell you what happened with the African lady?" (line 1). It is understandable that Stephanie should choose to label this lady in terms of her "Africanness" considering the focus on this aspect of her within the events recounted. However, it is also pertinent that the anecdote itself was tagged in this way. Stephanie was eliciting the interest of her listeners, two friends she spent almost all her time with in school, and she chose to do so by using "African" as a hook. Apparently she knew her audience well, as her first stylised offering "*eh eh, Jesus, excuse me oh*" (line 4) gained the approval of laughter from both, with Dara repeating "excuse me oh" (line 5) to emphasise just how funny she found it. These girls were clearly interested in, or at least amused by, the topic of "African". Following a pattern seen in other parts of my data, Stephanie made use of the stereotypical "*eh eh*" as a clear marker that this was a speaker of West African English, part of the juxtaposition she created between this lady and her own mother. While the African lady's opening words were "*eh eh, Jesus, excuse me oh*" and "*I think your bag just hit me*" (line 6), her mother's response was "what the bloodclart" (line 7). This contrast between the mild mannered African lady and Stephanie's feisty mother began to be drawn, and the ethnic dimension was raised by Dara's immediate response "your mum's Jamaican innit" (line 9). Rather than Dara noting this for the first time, Stephanie's mother being "Jamaican" was common knowledge between the girls, and was being raised here as it was directly relevant to what had just been said. In other words, the utterance "what the bloodclart" was being read as indexical of her "Jamaicanness". As the extract developed, it became clear that it was not just the use of Creole which indexed this, but the aggressive style often employed alongside it. These features were evidenced in line 30 when Stephanie reported her mother saying "now shut up before I smack you in your bumbaclart", again in direct contrast to the African lady's non-aggressive tone "*how are you doing this in front of your kids, eh? you don't have no remorse*" in lines 28-9. In this first part of the episode then, stereotypical representations of "Jamaicanness" and "Africanness" were drawn on, suggesting common recognition of these "ethnicities", as well as an interest in them on the part of the three girls.

**Part II** (continues directly from Part I)

36 Márcia then what did you do

- 37 Stephanie then I was like, mum, calm d...  
 38 don't tell me to calm down, I'll box this bitch on the bus (1)  
 39 she's getting on my [fuckin nerves  
 40 Dara [your mum is Jamaican like  
 41 Stephanie like rare<sup>112</sup> rare rare rare rare  
 42 don't tell her, tell her not to fuck with me  
 43 and I was like, mum, calm down, you're making a scene (1.5)  
 44 and she took off her earrings (1)  
 [eə<sup>r</sup> rɪŋz]  
 45 Dara earrings  
 46 Márcia and she took it from you innit  
 47 Stephanie and then my, and then, then,  
 48 her friend who was there was like calm down, calm down  
 49 it's alright, just forget it, just forget it  
 50 no (.) this **dutty**<sup>113</sup> **bloodclart** African bitch yeah  
 51 is trying to tell me that ah, that I run over her  
 52 I should have run over her face, stupid monkey

Once the altercation had been introduced (in Part I), Stephanie began to quote a range of insults directed at the African lady by her mother. She called her “you dirty African woman” (line 14) and said “you don't even have a bath” (line 15). In these lines, “Africanness” was specifically referenced within an insult. This pattern was repeated in Part II above as the invective increased with the lines “this dutty bloodclart African bitch” (line 50) and “stupid monkey” (line 52). There was an explicit racial tone, and the insults linked to a discourse of poor, primitive Africans, which could also be discerned in other parts of my data (explored in section 7.2.2 below).

**Part III** (30 seconds later)

- 53 Stephanie and then yeah, the woman was like *may god blæss you,*  
 54 *may god, may god blæss you*  
 55 like bless yourself!  
 56 you need to go and have a bath

<sup>112</sup> “Rare” is an LMEV exclamation used to show that something is unusual or unexpected.

<sup>113</sup> A Jamaican Creole pronunciation of “dirty”.

57 do you not know there's Poundland<sup>114</sup> is open today  
 58 Dara ahhh haaa [*((whoops with laughter))*] Poundland!  
 59 Stephanie [do you know yeah, you can get three for a pound  
 60 for soap? do you not know that?  
 61 if you got to the ( ) you might even be able to have a bath  
 62 don't come to my face with your stupidity about (.) god  
 63 bless you, and I was like, mum, can you calm down? (2)  
 64 she just, she just, she just got angry like  
 65 and I couldn't even control her  
 66 I just went to the next seat so I didn't get boxed when the  
 67 fight started and then, the woman had to eventually leave off  
 68 the bus coz my mum was cussin her too much  
 69 and then the whole bus went quiet  
 70 even the white lady was trying to look out of the window like  
 71 nothing happened

In Part III above, the “Jamaican”/“African” contrast was emphasised still further. The religiosity of the African Lady was highlighted by her repetition of “may God bless you<sup>115</sup>” (lines 53-4) in response to the verbal onslaught of Stephanie’s mother. The discourse of poor, primitive Africans was also raised again by the line “you need to go and have a bath” (line 56) and the recommendation of a soap deal at Poundland (line 59). Diane Abbott, a Labour MP with Jamaican heritage, has referred to divisive and stereotyped accounts of each other held by Africans and Caribbeans in the UK. She describes being fed the notion growing up that ‘Caribbean people were infinitely superior to Africans, who lived in mud huts and did not know how to comb their hair’ (quoted in BBC, 2006), while, at the same time, ‘African children were being taught how superior they were to Caribbean people, who had been stupid enough to get sold into slavery and were all thieves anyway’. Lola Ayonrinde, a former Conservative mayor of Wandsworth in south London, has described how African-heritage schoolchildren still suffer from such stereotypes as they are excluded from dominant ways of being “Black” in the UK, what she refers to as ‘the straitjacket of blackness’ (quoted in Millward, 2000). Stereotypes of Africans surfaced again in Part IV below.

---

<sup>114</sup> Poundland is a high street retail chain where most items are sold for £1 each. It is therefore associated with low-end products and bargains.

<sup>115</sup> As I explained in footnote<sup>114</sup>, due to the integral role Christianity plays in West African communities in London, religiosity can be seen as in some sense emblematic of “West Africanness” (see Knowles, 2013).

**Part IV** (45 seconds later)

- 72 Márcia have you seen those people yeah  
 73 there's two African people or whatever when they fight yeah  
 74 and then someone always says something under their breath  
 75 like you **raasclart**<sup>116</sup> or something something yeah  
 76 and then the African puss... (1) ((*laughs*))  
 77 Stephanie oh yeah, I'm not [gonna go there, I'm not gonna go there  
 78 Márcia [and then the African person is al[ways like,  
 79 Dara [*eh-eh,*  
 80 *eh-eh, eh-eh,*  
 81 Márcia and what you saying, what you saying  
 82 ( )  
 83 Dara all Nigerian people, yeah  
 84 when they have argument,  
 85 they're always like *eh-eh, eh-eh, eh-eh, [eh-eh* ((*kissing*  
*teeth*))  
 86 Stephanie [and my mum was  
 87 like, uh, she was talking about her um (1.5)  
 88 she was like, my mum was like **oh your pussy**<sup>117</sup> **stink**  
 89 **yeah** and then I'm like what the fuck  
 90 mum, why you going there, you're not even in Jamaica  
 91 like why you gonna go there for?  
 92 and then she said *excuse me?*

Throughout this episode, the figure of Stephanie's mother raised a different discourse to the religiosity of the "African Lady". In Part II, her comments "I'll box this bitch on the bus" (line 38) and "she's getting on my fuckin nerves" (line 39) prompted Dara to remark "your mum is Jamaican like" (line 40), again suggesting this aggressive stance was interpreted as indexical of her "Jamaicanness". Stark evidence of this discourse came in this final part of the extract in Stephanie's reaction to her mother's crowning insult "oh your pussy stink yeah" (lines 88-9). Stephanie was a bit hesitant to introduce these words, phrasing her introduction to them three

<sup>116</sup> "Raasclart" is also a Jamaican Creole exclamation or curse meaning more or less the same as "bumbaclart" and "bloodclart".

<sup>117</sup> "Pussy" is a slang term for "vagina".

times, separated by pauses. After she finally delivered the line she immediately foregrounded her own shocked reaction with the words “and then I’m like what the fuck” (line 89). Her follow-up “mum, why you going there, you’re not even in Jamaica” (line 90) explicitly linked this kind of behaviour to “Jamaicanness”. Once again, an aggressive stance was aligned with “Jamaican” which contrasted to the weaker response “*excuse me?*” (line 92) provided by the African lady. Analysis of Episode X highlights a level of complexity and tension behind the notion of “Black” in south London. Firstly, Stephanie’s juxtaposition between her “Jamaican” mother and the African lady suggests at least two distinct strands within “Black”. In a multiethnic context, part of telling your story vividly is styling the various ethnically indexed voices involved. This extract includes stark stylisations which link “Jamaicanness” to a verbally explicit aggressive assertiveness (cf. Hewitt, 1986 and Rampton, 1995b) and “Africanness” to a discourse of poverty and a lack of urban savvy. Secondly, there is evidence of the conflation of “African” and “Nigerian”, or of “Nigerian” standing in as emblematic of “African”, as “Jamaican” often does for “Caribbean”. For example, when Márcia described how “Africans” always use “what you saying, what you saying” (line 81) when arguing, Dara added “*eh-eh, eh-eh*” (lines 79-80) as a key feature, then specified this is what “all Nigerian people” (line 83) do. While “*eh-eh*” was a marker for the African lady at the start of the anecdote, it became a marker of “Nigerianness”. This episode then points to the existence of widely circulating discourses related to “Africanness” and “Jamaicanness” in south London which were clearly familiar to “Black Portuguese” Lusondoners such as Dara and Márcia.

Something which marks this episode is the lack of any definitive ethnic alignment on the part of Dara or Márcia. The girls were interested in and amused by both the “African” and “Jamaican” stylisations, but gave no indication that either of these forms of “Blackness” resonated with them. This is despite the fact that, as I stated above, references to being “Black” were ubiquitous both within my field notes and audio recordings of these girls. Two of the strong ethnic positionings available for these “Black Portuguese” Lusondoners are those illustrated here, with a working-class Jamaican-inflected “street-toughness” dominant. However, neither “Africanness” nor “Jamaicanness” provided these Lusondoners with accessible ways into being recognisably “Black” in south London. In section 7.1 I outlined Dara and Márcia’s sense that their high aspirations set them apart from “Jamaicanness”, and in section 7.2.2 below I set out further connotations to “Africanness” which contributed to a generally negative estimation of this discourse on the part of these

girls. Whether Dara and Márcia were attracted to these discourses or not though, “Jamaican” and “African” positionings are not readily available to them, and in section 7.3 I provide examples from my data of “Jamaican” and “African” peers acting as gatekeepers when Dara does make rare attempts to comment on “Jamaicanness” and “Africanness”.

### **7.2.2 Further connotations to “Africanness”: poverty and a lack of modern urban savvy**

The juxtaposition between high status “Jamaicanness” and lower status “Africanness”, presented through Stephanie’s anecdote explored in the previous section, finds echoes in other parts of my data. In Chapter 5 I referenced an incident where a British born “Black Caribbean” boy raised a discourse of African poverty, teasing his Ghanaian-born classmate about Ghana’s lack of development (audio recording 27/6/13). In another encounter during a Science lesson, a British born “Nigerian” boy used stylised Nigerian intonation<sup>118</sup> to impersonate a Nigerian-born classmate, and cast him as a hard-working “freshie”<sup>119</sup> (audio recording 9/7/13). A similarly derisory stance towards “Africanness” was evident elsewhere in my data when Dara joked about “fufu”<sup>120</sup> as a potential prize in the school’s punctuality and attendance awards (audio recording 21/6/13), its African origin lending the food an automatically comical status. These examples contain evidence of widely circulating discourses connecting the idea of “African” to notions of poverty and a lack of modern urban savvy or sophistication. The discursive space for “Black Africanness” in London then was already densely populated, and by a set of stereotypical representations unlikely to appeal to Dara and Márcia. In addition, this was not a space that their “Black African” peers necessarily saw them as having legitimate access to, as I outline in section 7.3 below.

---

<sup>118</sup> Although I have used the label “Nigerian intonation”, I outlined above how, in the south London context, “Nigerian” could be used as a tag for a wider sense of “West African”. On the ground then, this intonation could be used by or associated with other groups such as Gambians, Ghanaians and Sierra Leoneans. However, Nigerians are the biggest single group, and therefore the most dominant, amongst West Africans in the UK (just as Jamaicans are the biggest single group amongst Caribbeans). Within this, Yoruba speakers are the biggest single group amongst Nigerians, and therefore dominate within conceptualisations of Nigerianness and Nigerian intonation.

<sup>119</sup> A recently arrived immigrant who stands out for their lack of familiarity with local practices – explored in Chapter 6.

<sup>120</sup> Fufu is a cassava-based dish common in West Africa. It is usually eaten with the fingers and hence could be referenced as emblematic of “primitive” African practices.

The majority of references to Africa within the audio data involving Dara and Márcia show these girls taking up the kind of negative discourses of African poverty outlined above, particularly when interacting with peers. However, on the few occasions when their own parents' West African origins were invoked there was also evidence to suggest an element of ambivalence and also divergence between the two girls in their treatment of "Africanness", as explored in section 7.1.1. The following extract exemplifies Dara and Márcia's taking up of the African poverty discourse. It occurred as Dara was joking around with Márcia and Stephanie during a fairly relaxed Maths lesson. Just before this extract Dara and Márcia had been teasing Stephanie about "killing" a joke (making so much out of it that it was no longer funny).

**Episode XI** (audio recording of naturally occurring speech, 19/6/13)

Speaker	Ethnolinguistic background
Stephanie (Year 10, female)	Recorded as “Black Caribbean”, with a dark brown skin tone. Born in Jamaica but mostly grew up in UK. Speaks English with a London accent and rarely uses Jamaican pronunciation or Creole.
Dara (Year 10, female)	“Black Portuguese” according to the criteria I set out in Chapter 4, and has a skin tone that would commonly be associated with “mixed race” in the UK. Born in Portugal, of Angolan and Cape Verdean descent. Arrived in the UK during Year 6. Fluent in English which she speaks with a London accent with an occasional Portuguese influence, and Portuguese which she speaks with a mainland Portuguese accent.
Márcia (Year 10, female)	“Black Portuguese” according to the criteria I set out in Chapter 4, and has a skin tone that would commonly be associated with “mixed race” in the UK. Born in Portugal, of Cape Verdean descent. Arrived in the UK at age 5. Fluent in English which she speaks with a London accent, and Portuguese which she speaks with a mainland Portuguese accent.

- 1 Dara every time you kill a joke, you kill a<sup>121</sup> elf ((*mock mournful tone*))
- 2 Márcia ((*laughs*))
- 3 Dara or a leprechaun (1)
- 4 or a leprechaun coz they’re funny
- 5 Stephanie or ( [ ] )
- 6 Márcia [Dara, d’you remember? (1.5)
- 7 ((*quietly*)) every time (2) a child in Africa dies ((*laughs*))
- 8 Dara ((*laughing*)) Stephanie (1) wait
- 9 Márcia Stephanie
- 10 Stephanie no, not the advert, not the advert ((*Dara and Márcia laughing*))
- 11 Dara ((*laughing*)) oi ( )

<sup>121</sup> Dara used “a” as opposed to “an” in this utterance. This practice of using “a” before nouns starting with a vowel was something I often observed amongst young people at the school where I conducted my research.



- 12                    ((*mock impersonation of aid advert*)) every time you fart  
 13                    a child in Africa dies  
 14   Márcia        ((*laughs*))  
 15   Stephanie    shut up  
 16   Dara           please donate one poun<sup>122</sup> ((*starts laughing*))  
 17   Stephanie    they should stop having babies  
 18   Márcia        ((*laughing*)) they're like call this number o-eight-hundred (.)  
 19                   two four something like that (1.5)  
 20   Stephanie    you guys have to get over yourself ( )

This extract exemplifies a feature typical of Dara, Márcia and Stephanie's interactions: the recycling of jokes and impressions which were very familiar to them. These established jokes only needed to be referred to in order to prompt laughter, and there are numerous such examples in my data. In this instance the joke invoked raised a discourse of African poverty and the three girls shared in their amusement at this. As mentioned above, this episode came after some teasing of Stephanie for "killing" a joke. It started with Dara building on this teasing with the words "every time you kill a joke, you kill a elf" (line 1). This appeared to be a reworking of the idea in Peter Pan that 'every time a child says "I don't believe in fairies," there is a fairy somewhere that falls down dead' (Barrie, 1904/2011, p74). Dara was making ludic use of a common cultural reference in order to further her comic endeavour. Her facility for this was again demonstrated as she adapted the joke still further with the words "or a leprechaun coz they're funny" (line 4). Márcia then took up this idea, bringing in another established joke which, as will be explained, was already an adaptation of a common cultural reference. She dropped her voice to say to Dara "every time ... a child in Africa dies", (line 7) suggesting she was feeding this idea to Dara in order for her to perform it. This is reinforced as Stephanie caught on, exclaiming "no, not the advert, not the advert" (line 10), and as Dara then went onto deliver the punch line "every time you fart, a child in Africa dies" (line 12). This joke clearly had a history with the three girls. Márcia's initial hinting at it was understood by both Dara and Stephanie. When Dara then gave the main lines, Márcia was able to follow up with "they're like call this number o-eight-hundred" (line 18), her contribution emphasising the shared nature of the joke.

---

<sup>122</sup> Dara dropped the final "d" of "pound" in this utterance.

The line “every time you fart, a child in Africa dies” (line 12) appears to reference the established pattern in international aid fundraising campaigns of employing startling examples of mortality rates divided by the second<sup>123</sup> (Alexander, 2013). This pattern had clearly become mundane enough for Dara’s parodic use to be easily recognisable. This joke rested on the recognisable seriousness of “every [...], a child in Africa dies” being juxtaposed with the incongruent vulgarity of “you fart”. This suggests two things. Firstly, “Africa” played the role of the quintessential “location in need of aid” for the purposes of this joke. Secondly, this established discourse of African poverty, far from automatically evoking the pity envisaged by international fundraising campaigns, could actually provide an ingredient for humour. Dara was quite comfortable to joke about African poverty and Stephanie was unchallenged when she responded with “they should stop having babies” (line 17). So, while the discourse of African poverty was widespread, there was no apparent sense of taboo in joking about it or offering negative evaluations associated with it. For example, during a retrospective interview Dara gave an extended account of a group of young people eating stale cake because it was free, referring to them disdainfully as “them African people” (28/6/13). This replaying of negative stereotypes of Africans appears to be a strong disavowal on Dara’s part of any identification with the “African” strand within south London “Blackness”. However, it may also mark a claim to another kind of “Blackness”. It is hard to imagine a “White” young person so casually making the kind of comments described above, but both Stephanie and Dara’s ease with this rhetoric suggests a certain sense of legitimacy in speaking about “Africans”. This fits in with the description in section 7.1 of established discourses about “Africans” circulating within the “Black British” community. For Dara and Márcia though, despite their West African descent there was no clear space for “Black Portuguese” Lusondoners within local discourses of “Blackness”. References to “Africanness” which emerged tended to relate to negative stereotypes about poverty and famine and link to a very general discourse of Africa. Also, as I show in the following section, positionings in relation to “Africanness” and “Jamaicanness” were restricted, policed by gatekeepers seen as more “legitimate” according to local understandings.

---

<sup>123</sup> This may also echo a widely known joke about the musician Bono starting a slow clap during a concert in Glasgow. He is supposed to have said that every time he clapped a child in Africa died, to which an audience member responded by telling him to stop clapping then (Monbiot, 2013).

### 7.3 Gatekeepers to local discourses of “Blackness”

As I have explained in this chapter, “Black Portugueseness” enjoyed very limited recognition, both within and beyond the Lusondoner discursive space. This meant that Dara (Year 10, female, “Black Portuguese”) and Márcia (Year 10, female, “Black Portuguese”) had difficulty at times both positioning themselves as “Black” and as “Portuguese” when locally recognised forms of “Blackness” were restricted to a dominant “Jamaicanness” and a less dominant “Africanness”. In this section I set out examples where Dara attempted to assert knowledge of “Jamaicanness” and “Africanness”, but was rebuffed by young people with more “legitimate” status as arbiters of these local discourses. Through these examples I show that, in addition to Dara and Márcia’s “Black Portugueseness” being crowded out of the local discursive space, they were also barred entry to the discourses of “Blackness” that were locally dominant.

#### 7.3.1 “Jamaicanness” and gatekeepers

As I set out in Chapter 2, Jamaican Creole exerts a gravitational pull on the speech patterns of many who come into contact with it. This is not just for individuals of Caribbean or African descent, and Jamaican influence in the locality then can be seen as a kind of unmarked norm, a default amongst working class youth of all ethnicities (as explored in Chapter 6 in relation to LMEV). However, as I explained in Chapter 6, Dara and Márcia made scant use of LMEV, nor did the catalogue of stock impersonations they shared with Stephanie (Year 10, female, “Jamaican”) appear to include a regular “Jamaican” element. While Vinício (Year 10, male, “White Portuguese – Madeiran”) could ‘cross’ into Jamaican Creole from a position of “Whiteness”, Dara and Márcia’s somewhat ambiguous “Blackness” made such language use less straightforward. During a retrospective interview (28/6/13), Dara and Márcia made it clear they felt uncomfortable around “Jamaican” young people using Creole, and I never observed them joining in such interactions. Beyond a smattering of single-word examples of Jamaican Creole in the audio data, one of the only forays either girl made into this repertoire was the following interaction between Dara and Stephanie during an English lesson. While Stephanie was a close friend and not generally identified with the “Jamaicans” Dara and Márcia took particular exception to (described in section 7.1), the extract shows how even she could still act as a gatekeeper restricting the girls’ access to Jamaican Creole.



13 Márcia tell me how they speak then (4)

After this, conversation moved back to the classwork.

In this extract Dara responded to Stephanie raising the subject of Jamaica by offering her own attempt at a Jamaican accent (line 5). This appeared to be perceived as teasing as it elicited laughter from Márcia (line 6), and the bantering rebuttal “shu’up yellow” from Stephanie (line 7). Here Stephanie was making reference to Dara’s skin colour which fitted with the regular pattern of banter between the girls, and the wider multiethnic conviviality of the field site, but also foregrounded “race”, and therefore highlighted Dara’s non-“Jamaicanness”. Although Stephanie did not make particularly frequent use of Jamaican Creole, her performance in Episode X highlighted that she was quite capable of doing so when she chose to. Also, the clear Creole attributed there to her mother, and Stephanie’s personal experience of Jamaica alluded to here, reinforce a claim to legitimacy as a user of this variety. Dara, on the other hand, was neither particularly accurate in her rendition of a Jamaican accent here, nor well equipped to counter Stephanie’s criticism of it. Unlike Stephanie she had no “legitimate” experience or heritage to support any claims she might make. When Stephanie said “no (.) they don’t do that (.) they don’t speak like that” (line 9), rather than imply error or ignorance on Stephanie’s part, Dara stated “that is such a lie” (line 11). Stephanie’s honesty was questioned but not her expertise in matters relating to Jamaica or Jamaican. In the following section, I set out how Dara experienced a similar rebuff from a more “legitimate” peer when making pronouncements about “Africanness”.

### **7.3.2 “Africanness” and gatekeepers**

The following episode shows a rare incidence of Dara raising a negative discourse of “Africanness” with a classmate of African descent and implicitly positioning herself as “Black”. It exemplifies the gatekeeping practices which Dara and Márcia could come up against in these situations. The conversation took place during a Graphics lesson where young people were using images to create montages. Dara was at a table with one other young person, Diola (Year 10, female, “Nigerian”) and at the beginning of the episode Dara was holding an image printed from the internet of a dishevelled looking “Black” man holding a gun.

**Episode XIII** (audio recording of naturally occurring speech, 20/6/13)

Speaker	Ethnolinguistic background
Dara (Year 10, female)	Recorded as “White Portuguese” but has a skin tone that would commonly be associated with “mixed race” in the UK. Born in Portugal, of Angolan and Cape Verdean descent. Arrived in the UK during Year 6. Speaks English with a recognisable London accent and is fluent in Portuguese.
Diola (Year 10, female)	Recorded as “Black African” with a dark brown skin tone. Both Diola’s parents are from Nigeria, but she was born in the USA and came to the UK during primary school. Her home language is English, which she speaks with a London accent.

- 1 Dara he’s black and he has a gun ((*referring to image she is*  
2 *holding*)) that means he’s from Africa that means they won’t  
3 learn English
- 4 Diola because he’s black and he has a gun that means he’s from  
5 Africa? (1)
- 6 Dara where is he?
- 7 Diola what about the Jamaicans? (1) what about them?
- 8 Dara are they in war? (.) that guy looks like he’s in war
- 9 Diola well obviously their country’s too small to go into a war (1)
- 10 Dara and there’s not ( ) ((*trails off*)) (1.5)
- 11 Diola what? (1) what (1)
- 12 Dara nuttin, just forget [about it
- 13 Diola [what d’you say?
- 14 Dara nuttin

Dara keyed into an established trope when she linked “he’s black and he has a gun” (line 1) with “that means he’s from Africa” (line 2), raising a recognised association between Africa and war. However, rather than passing as the kind of convivial banter explored in Chapter 5, Dara’s comment was refuted by Diola (line 4). Diola’s next contribution “what about the Jamaicans?” (line 7) hinted at the tension between African and Caribbean elements within the “Black British” community explored in section 7.1. Diola is from a Nigerian background and not only refused the traditional associations with “Africanness”, but also adopted a critical perspective towards “Jamaicanness”. Dara did attempt some defence with “that guy looks like he’s in

war” (line 8) but quickly trailed off and backed down with “nuttin, just forget about it” (line 12). While the contestation in this episode was fairly low-key it does point to a significant area of challenge for Dara, as I explain below.

This extract highlights spaces for, and limitations to, how Dara could *do* “Black” in London. When Diola asked “what about the Jamaicans?” (line 7), Dara found herself perhaps inadvertently associated with the “Jamaican” side of an “African”/“Jamaican” divide in local understandings of “Blackness” explored in this chapter. Having staked out her disavowal of “Africanness”, the obvious space for someone of her appearance within the London context was, by default, under the “Jamaican” banner. In fact, Dara’s use of the Jamaican-indexed pronunciation of “nuttin” (line 12), appeared to mark at least some level of alignment with this on her part. Dara’s forthright pronouncements on “Africans” rested on her ability to speak as in some way “Black”, as such statements from a “White” young person would be very likely to incur accusations of racism. Here Dara felt comfortable in making negative comments about “Africans” directly to a young person of African descent, apparently not fearing such accusations. When she did come up against resistance it was framed in terms of an “African”/“Jamaican” tension well established within the London context. So, Dara was recognised as “Black” and could therefore make comments unlikely to be tolerated from a “White” young person, but her “Blackness” was read through the lens of established ways of being “Black” in London. These did not stretch to any widely recognised notion of “Portuguese Blackness”, or “Black Portugueseness”. This example, and Episode XII explored in the previous section, show that while Dara did attempt to reference both “Africanness” and “Jamaicanness” in low-key and playful ways, this was often delegitimised by gatekeepers with stronger claims to these labels.

So far in this chapter I have set out how the notion of “Blackness” in south London is dominated by a “Jamaican” strand from which Dara and Márcia are generally excluded. This is partly due to boundary policing on the part of their “Jamaican” peers, but also bound up with a lack of alignment on the part of the girls with some of the negative stereotypes associated with this group. Still somewhat in the shadow of this “Jamaican” strand there is a gradually emerging “African” strand which also fails to draw in Márcia and Dara. Although they can claim West African descent, they are again put off by the negative stereotypes associated with this group as well as the tendency for it to be dominated by “Nigerianness”. One element of relative stability for Dara and Márcia is their shared status as “Black” Lusondoners. This

brings broad commonalities of experience in south London despite being rooted in different migration trajectories. While ethnicity may be viewed within institutional monitoring regimes as something which young people simply bring with them, Dara and Márcia's struggle suggests that it can involve significant work *within* the school context. Rather than being neatly inherited from parents, ethnic identification also takes place with and against key peers and groupings in the school against a backdrop of locally dominant ethnic discourses. In the following section I show how these locally dominant ethnic discourses worked to channel the ethnic positionings of another Lusondoner, Danilo. While Dara and Márcia struggled with the policing of what "Black" could mean in the south London context, Danilo's struggle was with established local understandings of "African" as exclusively "Black" and not "White".

#### **7.4 Being both "White Portuguese" and "African" in south London**

In this section I examine an interaction between Danilo (Year 11, male, "White Portuguese – Madeiran") and two non-Lusondoner peers in order to set out how his claims to "Africanness" could meet with contestation in a similar way to Dara and Márcia's claims to "Blackness". As I have explained in this chapter, dominant understandings of "Africanness" in south London are channelled by the existence of a large West African (and specifically Nigerian) population, meaning that "African" and "Nigerian" can often be used interchangeably. In this section I show that this discourse of "Africanness"/"Nigerianness" includes an assumption that those who "belong" to this grouping will have a dark skin tone, commonly referred to as "Black". Danilo's light skin therefore made his claims of "Africanness" problematic, and he came up against boundary policing on the part of one particular "Nigerian" young person. This interaction provides another example of how dominant understandings about "Blackness" and "Whiteness" in south London created a specific discursive landscape within which Lusondoners had to carve out a niche for themselves. In Danilo's case, other people in the landscape did not apprehend that it was possible to be both "White" and "African". For those Lusondoners then whose "racial" appearance combined with their ethnic background in ways which chimed with dominant understandings, this was fairly straightforward. However, those Lusondoners who confounded dominant expectations about "racial appearance" and ethnic background could find themselves engaged in an ongoing struggle to adopt



ethnic positionings which were accepted as coherent by their peers. In the section below I explain how Danilo responded to this.

#### 7.4.1 A “White Portuguese” young person claiming to be “African”

As I outlined in Chapter 4, Danilo’s father and paternal grandmother were born in Mozambique, and his paternal grandfather in Cape Verde, making his family migration trajectory different to the general pattern of “Madeirans”, also outlined in Chapter 4. Although Danilo does have African heritage, his combination of “Africanness” and light skin do not comfortably fit within locally dominant understandings of “Africanness” as “Black”. In this section I set out how Danilo struggled to have his “Africanness” recognised in the south London context.

Danilo’s family migration trajectory is summarised in the table below:

*Table XIX: Danilo’s family migration trajectory*

<b>Danilo’s relatives</b>	<b>Country of birth</b>	<b>Other countries lived in</b>
Mother	Madeira	UK
Father	Mozambique	Madeira, UK, Cape Verde, Brazil, Madeira
Maternal Grandmother	Madeira	Brazil
Maternal Grandfather	Brazil	Madeira
Paternal Grandmother	Mozambique	Madeira, UK, France, Jersey
Paternal Grandfather	Cape Verde	Mozambique, Angola, Venezuela, Madeira

Although Danilo has ties to Africa then, within the south London context there was no widely recognised discourse of “White Portuguese African”. In this section I set out an attempt by Danilo to assert a claim of “Africanness” in conversation with a “Nigerian” peer. The episode during which this claim was made took place in an English lesson when Danilo was wearing the microphone, sitting at a table with two classmates, Brianna (Year 11, female, “Jamaican”) and Chinyere (Year 11, female, “Nigerian”). Although there was familiarity between him and the girls, these were not close friends of his. The lesson was focused on practice questions in preparation for the GCSE English exam the following day. I first set out a summary of

interactions between the three leading up to Danilo’s claim and justification, and then detail the conversation around Danilo’s claim itself.

**Episode XIV** (reconstructed from field notes and audio recording of naturally occurring speech, 14/5/13)

Speaker	Ethnolinguistic background
Chinyere (Year 11, female)	Recorded as “Black African” and has a dark brown skin tone. Born in Nigeria but moved to the UK at a young age, both parents Nigerian. Speaks English with a London accent.
Brianna (Year 11, female)	Recorded as “Black Caribbean” and has a medium brown skin tone. Born in Jamaica but moved to the UK at a young age, both parents Jamaican. Speaks English with a London accent.
Danilo (Year 11, male)	“White Portuguese”, according to the criteria I set out in Chapter 4, with “Mediterranean” features. Born in Madeira, lived in London aged 8-9, then moved back to Madeira. Returned to London age 10. Wider family have lived in several Lusophone and non-Lusophone countries. Fluent in English which he speaks with a London accent, and Portuguese which he speaks with a Madeiran accent.

Chinyere teases Danilo, calling him “Jesus” as that is part of his surname. Brianna is interested in this and both girls get Danilo to explain the various parts of his name<sup>125</sup> and how they are pronounced. Chinyere teases Danilo that he has “some looong arse<sup>126</sup> name”. They then discuss how Danilo has part of the same surname as Adriana as they are cousins. At this point the teacher gives an explanation, then the class work fairly quietly for the next 37 minutes. After this Danilo uses a few utterances of Portuguese with Adriana, then with me, which prompts Chinyere to say she would be embarrassed to speak “her language” with a teacher. Danilo and Chinyere discuss how they learned and how well they can speak their respective languages. Danilo asks Chinyere “Are you African?” and, when she says “yes”, he laughs. Chinyere then responds in an aggrieved tone with “what’s so funny about being African though?”, following this with “exactly, so you can shu’up”. Brianna interjects saying “why are you getting so offended?”

<sup>125</sup> Portuguese surnames tend to have at least two parts, one taken from the mother’s name and one from the father’s.

<sup>126</sup> The elongated pronouncement of “long”, and the addition of the word “arse”, are both intended to comically accentuating the apparent length of Danilo’s name.

and Chinyere replies “no because he laughed”, adding “OK so what’s so funny about being African?”. At this point the teacher gets the class quiet and gives instructions for the next few minutes. During these instructions, Danilo says quietly to Chinyere “I’m African too”, to which she responds “no you’re not fam<sup>127</sup>”. He then says “I am. Ask Adriana”

The tone in this interaction appeared to stray, albeit it momentarily, from the multiethnic conviviality described in Chapter 5. Although Danilo felt comfortable to ask Chinyere if she was African and to laugh when she said she was, Chinyere was not amused when she snapped back “what’s so funny about being African though?”, adding “exactly, so you can shu’up”. The strength of this response, and the break it marked from the usual good-natured exchange, was highlighted by Brianna’s question “why are you getting so offended?”. Chinyere’s reply “no because he laughed”, and her repetition of “what’s so funny about being African?” suggest that there was something she found unacceptable in the idea of her “Africanness” being represented as comical. Earlier in this extract Chinyere had teased Danilo about Portuguese naming practices (“some looong arse name”) and also implied that it was embarrassing for him to be openly speaking Portuguese with a teacher, all without any break in the sense of conviviality. However, Danilo’s laughter provoked genuine protest. This reaction is more understandable when looked at within the broader context of widely circulating discourses of “Africanness”. The various episodes examined in this chapter have pointed to a commonly understood notion of “African” as “uncool” or inherently comical. In her reaction, then, Chinyere was defending more than just herself against more than just Danilo’s laughter. It appears that she was responding to the wider discourse of “Africanness” which this encounter raised. Danilo, on the other hand, appeared to have a more personal focus. His response to Chinyere’s protest was to claim “I’m African too”, attempting to deflect the suggestion he was belittling her as “African” by aligning himself as “African” too. When Danilo made this claim, two minutes had passed since his previous interaction with Chinyere but the issue was still clearly on his mind and pressing enough for him to risk a reprimand by speaking beneath the teacher’s instructions. Chinyere replied with “no you’re not fam”, expressing both her certainty, and her apparent authority to pronounce upon whether he was “African” or not. Her use of the term “fam” though marked a softening, defusing tension and re-establishing convivial

---

<sup>127</sup> “Fam” is an LMEV term derived from “family” meaning used in a similar way to “mate”.

relations, at the same time as reinforcing her authoritative tone through the use of LMEV. Danilo, on the other hand sought to back up his claim by calling in a third party with the words “ask Adriana”. He did not present himself as having the same authority to pronounce on questions of “Africanness”, nor compete with Chinyere’s use of vernacular terms, instead relying on external verification to support his case. As stated above, although Danilo does have African heritage, this combination of “Africanness” and light skin did not comfortably fit within the locally dominant discourses of “Africanness”. This was made clear in Episode XV below where Danilo struggled to assert his claim to “Africanness”. This episode followed on from the interactions described in Episode XIV above after a pause of two minutes.

**Episode XV** (audio recording of naturally occurring speech, 14/5/13)

<b>Speaker</b>	<b>Ethnolinguistic background</b>
Chinyere (Year 11, female)	Recorded as “Black African” and has a dark brown skin tone. Born in Nigeria but moved to the UK at a young age, both parents Nigerian. Speaks English with a London accent.
Brianna (Year 11, female)	Recorded as “Black Caribbean” and has a medium brown skin tone. Born in Jamaica but moved to the UK at a young age, both parents Jamaican. Speaks English with a London accent.
Danilo (Year 11, male)	“White Portuguese”, according to the criteria I set out in Chapter 4, with “Mediterranean” features. Born in Madeira, lived in London aged 8-9, then moved back to Madeira. Returned to London age 10. Wider family have lived in several Lusophone and non-Lusophone countries. Fluent in English which he speaks with a London accent, and Portuguese which he speaks with a Madeiran accent.
Adriana (Year 11, female)	“White Portuguese”, according to the criteria I set out in Chapter 4, with “Mediterranean” features. Born in Madeira and came to the UK as a baby, then returned to Madeira before settling in the UK again aged 9. Fluent in English which she speaks with a London accent, and Portuguese which she speaks with a Madeiran accent, with the occasional Brazilian influence.

Key: *Portuguese*

**Part I**

- 1 Danilo *professor, eu preciso de água ((addressed to me))*  
*((Translation: ‘sir, I need some water’))*
- 2 Chinyere yeah, how? you know what, just shut your mout<sup>128</sup> yeah?  
[maut]
- 3 don’t, don’t even try speaking your Portuguese thing
- 4 Adriana, is he African? *((turning to Adriana))* (1.5)
- 5 Adriana yeah
- 6 Chinyere what part then?
- 7 Danilo *Moçambique*

<sup>128</sup> Chinyere uses a Jamaican accent to pronounce “mouth” as “mout” [maut].

- ((*Translation: 'Mozambique'*))
- 8 Chinyere what now?
- 9 Danilo *Moçambique* ((*laughing*))
- 10 Chinyere ((*laughs*)) oh, you're not from there
- 11 Brianna from Mozambique? are you ((*to Adriana*)) from
- 12 Mozambique
- 13 Danilo no

It was another two minutes after Episode XIV before the issue was raised again. Danilo used a short phrase of Portuguese with me “professor, eu preciso de água” (*sir, I need some water*, line 1), which potentially prompted Chinyere to refocus her attention on the question of his origins. She broached the topic with the words “yeah, how? you know what, just shut your mout yeah?” (line 2). This equivocal opener appears caught between wanting to hear Danilo’s reason so she can shoot it down and stamp her authority on “Africanness”, but at the same time not wanting to give him a voice which might lend him any credence at all. She used the Jamaican pronunciation “mout” [maut] to reinforce her authority, as well as othering his repertoire with the words “don’t, don’t even try speaking your Portuguese thing” (line 3). Not only did this attempt a kind of banning of Portuguese but her phrasing “your Portuguese thing” even went as far as de-officialising Portuguese as a language at all. Despite all of this, Chinyere did turn to Adriana and ask “is he African?” (line 4). Although Adriana supported Danilo’s claim, Chinyere sought further proof asking “what part then?” (line 6). In section 7.1.3 I outlined the discursive construct of a generic overarching notion of Africa, often represented by Nigeria. Chinyere was testing the authenticity of Danilo’s claim by seeing whether it had a specificity to it which could go beyond this. Danilo said “Moçambique” (line 7) using the Portuguese pronunciation, probably because he was much more used to talking about Mozambique in Lusophone contexts where the country had a much higher profile. Chinyere’s response “what now?” suggests she may not have immediately understood this word as it was pronounced in the Portuguese fashion, or that she saw Mozambique as an unusual, random, or low-profile place of origin. This choice of expression appears to borrow from a Jamaican repertoire again, here emphasising the sense of surprise expressed. It was interpreted as comical, eliciting laughter from Danilo which Chinyere then shared in, suggesting a sense of conviviality. Despite this apparent conviviality, Danilo was still being called on to justify his claim to “Africanness”, something not readily recognised in the local

context. This justification required some persistence, as is shown in Part II below as the interaction continued.

**Part II** (continues directly from Part I)

- 14 Chinyere how are you from there?  
 15 let me hear this stupidity (.) go on  
 16 (.) how are you from there?  
 17 Danilo my dad is (.) African  
 18 Brianna is your dad black?  
 19 Danilo Yeah (.) kind of (.) [he's like...  
 20 Chinyere [so so why d'you come out like that?  
 21 Danilo he's like (1) he's [got  
 22 Chinyere [nooo I I refuse to believe this rubbish  
 23 Brianna what colour is [he?  
 24 Chinyere [this is all rubbish  
 25 Danilo like Cain's colour  
 26 Brianna Oh (.) like mixed race  
 27 Chinyere OK (1) he just might (.) but then again yeah the sun is  
 28 attacked that (.) that skin of yours

Now that a specific country had been identified, Chinyere demanded to know “how are you from there?” (line 14), implying an element of disbelief which required further justification from Danilo. This question raised the notion of different ways of “being from somewhere”, such as birth or descent, instead of a straightforward definitive attribute. However, although Chinyere asked this question, she also sought to limit the space given for Danilo’s voice by prefacing his response with “let me hear this stupidity, go on, how are you from there” (line 15). This appears to be an attempt to predefine Danilo’s explanation as a comic performance as opposed to a reasoned account and so limit the legitimacy conferred on his voice within this discussion of “Africanness”. Danilo offered “my dad is (.) African” (line 17), the slight pause before “African” conveying a sense of qualification to this adjective. It did not come in an easy straightforward manner, implying that there might be grounds for contesting this assignation. Brianna immediately probed “is your dad black?” (line 18) and Danilo quickly responded with “yeah” (line 19) before qualifying again with “kind of” (line 19). The impossibility of this colour mismatch was stressed by Chinyere: “so so why d’you come out like that?” (line 20), “nooo, I I refuse to believe this rubbish” (line 22), “this is all rubbish” (line 24), and her stance

only began to soften when Danilo said “like Cain’s<sup>129</sup> colour” (line 25) and Chinyere conceded “he just might” (line 27). This focus on skin colour, and the invoking of other peers as examples, shows how established understandings about “racial appearance” limited the ethnic positionings readily available to Lusondoners. This is further exemplified in Part III below.

**Part III** (continues directly from Part II)

- 29 Brianna he has olive skin
- 30 Chinyere Nah (.) nah ( ) you know who tans ( )
- 31 Danilo hmm?
- 32 Chinyere don’t lie
- 33 Danilo no I’m (.) I’m olive skinned (.) olive (.) yeah (3)
- 34 Brianna where are you from?
- 35 Danilo uhh Madeira
- 36 Brianna where’s that? where’s Madeira? in Africa as well?
- 37 Danilo yeah
- 38 Chinyere huh?
- 39 Danilo Madeira’s in Africa as well
- 40 Teacher RIGHT (.) YEAR 11 (.) I’M NOT SURE WHY WE’RE
- 41 TALKING WE HAVE 10 MINUTES LEFT OF THIS
- 42 LESSON AND I’M QUITE HAPPY TO KEEP BEHIND
- 43 ANYONE WHO DOESN’T [FINISH ((*Danilo laughs*))
- 44 Chinyere [he might be you know (.) but
- 45 no he’s not (.) he’s not bruv (2)
- 46 Brianna do you believe him?
- 47 Chinyere I dunno I’m ( ) up now I really don’t know (5)
- 48 ((*addressed to Brianna*)) my sister’s nearly got the same
- 49 skin colour as you

The conversation then started to focus on the notion of mixedness, and this troubled the clarity of comfortable colour distinctions. This necessitated both careful examination of skin tone but also a greater stress on honesty. Brianna stated “he has olive skin” (line 29), and it became clear that this label was more than simply a physical description. When Chinyere instructed “don’t lie” (line 32) Danilo

---

<sup>129</sup> A member of the class with a light brown skin tone recorded as “Black Caribbean” in official school data.



responded with “no I’m, I’m olive skinned, olive, yeah” (line 33). As they were all sitting in plain sight of one another there should have been no need to debate visible skin tone. The claim to being “olive skinned” then appears to be more than simply a statement of visible appearance, instead taking on the sense of a more meaningful label, in the same way that “Black” carried more connotations than simply physical appearance. Chinyere then asked “where are you from?” (line 34) and this was interpreted unproblematically as very different to the earlier question “how are you from there?”. Danilo said he was from Madeira (line 35) suggesting the question had been interpreted more specifically as “Where were you born?” or “Where did you grow up before coming to the UK?” Danilo’s claim that “Madeira’s in Africa as well” (line 39) is another example of his bricolage. Madeira is closer to mainland Africa than mainland Europe, although politically it is part of the European state of Portugal. Danilo had made a point of this earlier in the day when interviewing Adriana about where she was from when he first put on the microphone. When Adriana stated that Madeira was near Portugal, he corrected her, stating that it was near Africa. However, the girls were not yet entirely convinced by this, and Brianna asked “do you believe him?” (line 46) to which Chinyere replied “I really don’t know” (line 47).

Danilo’s struggle to assert his claim to “Africanness” highlights the complex ethnic landscape which Lusondoners inhabit in south London. Existing discourses of “Blackness” and “Whiteness” contribute to dominant ethnic understandings which it is difficult to challenge. Although Danilo does have family links to Africa his perceived “Whiteness” prevented his claims of “Africanness” being accepted by other “African” young people. Like Dara and Márcia, he came up against a gatekeeper recognised as having a more “legitimate” claim to the label according to local understandings of “Africanness”. While the multiethnic conviviality I described in Chapter 5 facilitated comfortable interaction and exchange between Lusondoners and individuals with a diverse range of ethnic ties, the dominant discourses of “Blackness” and “Whiteness” outlined in this chapter highlight restrictions on the ethnic positionings available to certain Lusondoners. Despite the interethnic exchange and hybridity I have described, the south London context is not some kind of ethnic free-for-all. Instead it is permeated by dominant ethnic discourses which constrain the ethnic claims and positionings which individuals can easily make.

## 7.5 Chapter conclusion

In Chapter 4 I detailed the different ethnic fractions within the Lusondoner discursive space, and in Chapter 5 I explained how these were bound up with a local multiethnic conviviality. Although this conviviality enabled individuals with diverse ethnic ties to “rub along” without serious conflict, it was by no means a wholly egalitarian phenomenon. As I have detailed in this chapter, the south London context is populated by dominant ethnic discourses which inform popular understandings. This meant that Dara and Márcia struggled to be recognised as “Black Portuguese” as this conflicted with local understandings of “Blackness”, while Danilo had a similar difficulty in claiming a “White Africanness”. Despite the parallels in these young people’s struggles, the locally dominant ethnic discourses in south London did not impact on all Lusondoners in the same way. Aragao (2013) writes:

‘The Portuguese-speaking community in London provides an essential site to illuminate the issue of what is at stake for the identity politics of simultaneous sameness and difference, with Portuguese, Brazilian, and Luso African cultural members occupying economically and culturally marginal positions as ‘outsiders’ but navigating cultural life in radically different ways based on different claims to citizenship and widely varying experiences of ethno/racial privilege.’ (p13)

While there are plenty of common reference points and friendship ties between a diverse range of Lusondoners, there are also key differences in how they experience operating in the south London context. Dara and Márcia may identify themselves as “Portuguese” (amongst other things) but this is unlikely to be their primary identifier in the eyes either of other Lusondoners or non-Lusondoners. Because of their skin colour, the existing web of “Black”-related discourses in south London draws them down channels not enforced on their “White Portuguese” peers. While Danilo did come up against dominant understandings of “Whiteness” and “Africanness”, this only surfaced occasionally, whereas Dara and Márcia were engaged in an apparently perennial struggle to assert their “Black Portugueseness”. Of the three Lusondoner ethnic fractions then, “Black Portuguese” young people suffer disproportionately from the fact that popular understandings lag far behind the actual complexity of configurations thrown up by the superdiversity in south London which they exemplify.

## Chapter 8

### Conclusion

*‘One has to think of people, not as the intersection of vectors of age, sex, race, class, income, and occupation alone, but also as beings making sense out of disparate experiences, using reason to maintain a sphere of integrity in an immediate world.’*

(Hymes, 1996, p9)

#### 8.0 Introduction

In Chapter 1 I explained that this thesis seeks to investigate the biographical-linguistic trajectories and linguistic practices and affiliations of Lusondoners at school, examining how these intersect (or not) with dominant discourses of ethno-linguistic categorisation. In line with Hymes’ warning above, I have made no assumptions of straightforward correlations between the ethnolinguistic backgrounds of my Lusondoner participants and the positionings and practices they adopt. This thesis is not an attempt to map the backgrounds of individuals or groups, isolating essential components so that linguistic practices and ethnic positionings can be neatly explained as simple products of these elements. Instead, throughout the previous chapters I have emphasised the complex interplay between biographical-linguistic trajectories and *local* conditions in the practices and positionings of individuals. While each Lusondoner brings particular transnational ties and linguistic resources rooted in their family’s migration trajectory, these interact with locally circulating discourses in specific peer contexts to inform practices and positionings. As I explained in Chapter 2, dominant discourses of ethno-linguistic categorisation are underpinned by notions of essential ethnicities and bounded languages and, although these were part of local understandings amongst my participants, they did not account for the complex practices and positionings discernible through empirical observation which I have set out in this thesis. The Lusondoners I studied drew on diverse, Lusophone-inflected, transnational ties but shared access to a locally rooted discursive space. Their practices and positionings can only be adequately understood through attendance both to their particular biographical-linguistic trajectories, and to how these interacted with local conditions.

The interplay between biographical-linguistic trajectories and local conditions outlined above raises implications for accounts of Lusophone ethnicity in Britain, as well as the wider sociolinguistic theorisation of superdiversity. The Lusondoners I studied fell into different broad ethnic fractions (as described in Chapter 4) but shared access to a common local discursive space. I explained in Chapter 2 how existing studies of Portuguese-speaking young people in the UK tend to focus on particular ethno-national groupings and do not investigate the local interrelations between Lusophones of different backgrounds<sup>130</sup>. My study highlights the need for more explicit theorisation of the interconnectedness of different Lusophone groupings living amongst each other in the UK. My description of a local Lusondoner discursive space accounts for this interconnectedness amongst my participants, and this notion could have wider application for other ‘complex diasporas’<sup>131</sup> (Werbner, 2004). As outlined in Chapter 4, superdiverse contexts can give rise to emergent groupings with an ‘*extremely low degree of presupposability*’ (Blommaert & Backus, 2012, p5, original emphasis), and my study shows that the notion of a local discursive space can provide a useful way of conceptualising how such groupings draw on both diverse transnational ties and local conditions.

In this chapter, I start in section 8.1 by examining the immediate friendship groups of my five key participants. Through this I highlight that the immediate peer context is key in understanding ethnic positionings and linguistic practices, showing how individuals with commonalities in their ethnolinguistic backgrounds can engage in contrasting positionings and practices. I also show that such positionings and practices can vary depending on the mix of peers present. In section 8.2 I summarise the main findings of this thesis, building on the point emphasised in section 8.1 that attendance to locality is vital in understanding ethnic positionings and linguistic practices amongst my Lusondoner participants. I explain that ethnolinguistic background and migration trajectory provide resources in the form of linguistic repertoires, transnational ties and experiences, and even “racial” appearance, but that these are activated in particular ways in a context of locally dominant discourses, which in turn are affected by the specific ethnolinguistic makeup of the peer group. In section 8.3 I set out the broader implications of these findings for the study and understanding of youth, language and ethnicity in a superdiverse, global city such as London. I explain that the complexity highlighted in my study calls into question the

---

<sup>130</sup> Aragao (2010) does investigate such Lusophone dynamics in London but focuses on adults as opposed to children and young people.

<sup>131</sup> See Chapter 2 for a fuller account of ‘complex diasporas’.

neat assumptions underpinning dominant discourses of ethno-linguistic categorisation. Instead of mapping predefined groups, approaches to understanding linguistic practices and ethnic affiliations amongst youth in superdiverse contexts need to be alert to the complexity outlined above. This means being less focused on “ethnicity” as a primary identifier, and more open to locally grounded factors. Instead of assigning predetermined labels to individuals, this can mean facilitating explorative approaches which the young people concerned engage in themselves.

### **8.1 Lusondoners and the impact of immediate friendship groups**

In this thesis, I have described the emergence of a new ethnic formation which I have called Lusondoner. The invocation of this group was achieved by paying close attention to five key informants and recording detailed observations of everyday interactions. I have emphasised that it is vital to understand this formation as constituting, and constituted by, the locality in which it is embedded. I have emphatically not characterised Lusondoners as some separate group, but instead stressed that they are part of the wider groups that constitute the locality, and that their experience of Lusondonerness is shaped by the friendship groups they adopt with other Lusondoners. In Chapter 7, I detailed the struggle experienced by Dara and Márcia to adopt “Black” positionings which were recognised as “legitimate” by their wider “Black” peer group. However, they were much freer to engage playfully with ideas of “Blackness” in interactions with each other, when other “Black” peers were not within earshot. This highlights the importance of immediate friendship groups in the practices and positionings adopted by Lusondoners. In this section I take each of my key informants in turn and draw out some of the ways their immediate friendship group impacted on the practices and positionings they were able to adopt. Throughout this thesis, I have stressed the importance of locality in framing the affiliations and practices of Lusondoners. In the descriptions below, I show that this is not just about the broader peer group, but the very specific friendship groups which Lusondoners are part of.

### 8.2.1 Alícia

Alícia (Year 11, female, “Brazilian”) spent almost all of her time at school in the company of a mixed gender friendship group of 4-8 other Lusondoners<sup>132</sup>. While this friendship group provided a receptive context for Alícia’s “Brazilianness” where she could draw on Portuguese language and Lusophone references not recognised by non-Lusondoner peers, it also involved an element of restriction. In Chapter 6 I explained how Alícia used Portuguese in social interaction throughout the school day, usually only employing English when classroom activities specifically demanded it. I described Alícia’s ability to engage in fluent exchanges in English when she chose to, but also referred to her fear of being judged by more fluent Lusondoner peers which she voiced during a retrospective interview I conducted with her (13/5/13). For Alícia, being surrounded by Portuguese-speaking friends did not just mean she had the option of speaking Portuguese, it also meant she felt reticent about speaking English. This could at times put her at the mercy of these more fluent friends, such as when she failed to follow a joke about “fingering”<sup>133</sup> during a Health and Social Care lesson (audio recording 10/5/13 – explored in Chapter 6) and had to ask repeatedly for it to be explained to her. Alícia’s reliance on speaking Portuguese, and the fact that she spoke a distinctly Brazilian variety, was a double-edged sword in terms of how this was treated within the friendship group. On the one hand, a general fascination with Brazilian popular culture within the global Lusophone space (described in Chapter 4) meant that Alícia’s friends were interested in her speech and adopted features such as “tipo assim” (sort of like - also explored in Chapter 4). However, as Alícia herself pointed out in a retrospective interview I conducted with her (13/5/13), this fascination with all things Brazilian was often rooted in stereotypes. The fact that Alícia was speaking (Brazilian) Portuguese almost all the time served as a constant marker of her “Brazilianness” and this was commented upon by her Lusondoner friends far more frequently than their “Madeiranness” or “Portugueseness”. The extent to which Alícia’s engagement with “Brazilianness” was facilitated or *enforced* by her Lusondoner friendship group then is something of a grey area.

### 8.2.2 Danilo

Danilo (Year 11, male, “White Portuguese – Madeiran”) largely divided his time at school between the same Lusondoner friendship group as Alícia (described above),

---

<sup>132</sup> Most of the friends were “White Portuguese – Madeiran”, but there was one other “Brazilian” and one “White Portuguese/Brazilian” in the group.

<sup>133</sup> A slang term for female masturbation.

and other female Lusondoner and non-Lusondoner friends. In Chapter 6 I explained how Danilo appeared uncomfortable around non-Lusondoners, and particularly “Black”, boys, working in uncharacteristic silence during a Science lesson when moved from sitting with his Lusondoner friend Denise, and placed amongst a group of “Black” boys (field notes 19/3/13). Instead of seeking mainstream insider status through competing in the stakes for prized masculinity (described in Chapter 6), Danilo stuck to the “safe spaces” of female and Lusondoner friendship groups. As I explained in Chapter 6, while Vinício used LMEV as part of competitive and at times aggressive banter, usually with male peers, Danilo’s rare and ironic uses of LMEV took place amongst female friends and were not positioned as serious assertions of masculine insiderness. Similarly, Danilo generally kept his assertions about “Blackness” and “Africanness” for the “safe space” of his Lusondoner friendship group where he was unlikely to come up against gate-keeping practices from peers with more “legitimate” claims to these labels. For example, on one occasion Danilo made a comment to his friend Denise (Year 11, female, “White Portuguese – Madeiran”) about “os pretos” (the blacks) arriving late to a Maths lesson (audio recording 14/5/13) which he would have been unlikely to voice in English to the wider peer group. He was also able to joke amongst his Lusondoner friends about being “completamente africano” (completely African) (audio recording 14/5/13) due to his Mozambican heritage combined with Madeira’s proximity to Africa, a joke he would have struggled to convey to peers lacking these Lusophone references. While Danilo did assert a positioning as “African” with two “Black” female peers (explored in detail in Chapter 7), my sense is that he would not have been comfortable to engage in a similar interaction with “Black” male peers, in light of his reticence around them described above. For Danilo, then, his Lusondoner friendship group represented one “safe space” alongside other non-Lusondoner female friendship groups, where he could engage in positionings not accessible in more mainstream peer contexts.

### **8.2.3 Dara and Márcia**

Dara (Year 10, female, “Black Portuguese”) and Márcia (Year 10, female, “Black Portuguese”) were in almost every lesson together and also usually spent their break and lunch times in each other’s company. As I explained in Chapter 7, discussion and jokes about being “Black” were routinely shared by the girls, and this also extended to their friend Stephanie (Year 10, female, “Jamaican”) who was also very often to be found with them. This focus on “Blackness” was bound up with the ongoing struggle Dara and Márcia experienced in establishing “Black” positionings

which were recognised by their peers. Dara and Márcia's friendship then provided a context where they could articulate their specific, shared grievances, and engage with notions of "Blackness" more freely in playful (and sometimes serious) ways, away from the gate-keeping practices of their "Black" peers. However, the inclusion of Stephanie in many of these interactions shows that she was not seen by Dara and Márcia as aligned with the "Jamaican" gate-keepers to "Blackness" outlined in Chapter 7, despite her Jamaican heritage. Although Stephanie did reject an attempt on Dara's part at a Jamaican accent (discussed in Chapter 7), she clearly distanced herself from the stereotypical "Jamaican" street-toughness with which she characterised her own Jamaican mother (also discussed in Chapter 7). My sense of Stephanie from the two years when I was her French teacher, and from the months I spent observing lessons she was in during my field work, was of a fairly quiet young person who kept a low profile in class. I did not tend to see her socialising with other "Jamaican" girls, and it is possible that she shared Dara and Márcia's sense of not aligning with locally dominant understandings of "Blackness". Although Dara and Márcia's struggle for local recognition as "Black Portuguese" appears to be a significant feature of their shared experience, elements of this struggle may also overlap with Stephanie, despite her Jamaican descent. Also, two years after completing my field work I returned to the school and found that Márcia had left to attend a different college and Dara had lost touch with her. Although their friendship provided a useful space of mutual recognition during challenging times then, the fact Dara and Márcia lost touch highlights how such alliances can be fairly transient – contingent on specific and shifting circumstances – and end up being overtaken by other complexities in the lives of young people.

#### **8.2.4 Délia**

Délia's (Year 8, female, "White Portuguese – Madeiran") regular friendship group consisted of 4-7 Year 8 girls from a range of backgrounds, including "Albanian", and "Jamaican", as well as other Lusondoners. In Chapter 4 I detailed a conversation between Délia and two other "White Portuguese – Madeiran" girls where holidays to Madeira were discussed in Portuguese, but this kind of specifically Portuguese/Madeiran-focused interaction was rare for Délia. More often she would be with both Lusondoner and non-Lusondoner friends, and conversation would often touch on the different languages and national ties they brought with them. As I outlined in Chapter 5, this overlapping experience of migration and multilingualism was a constituent feature of local multiethnic conviviality. For Délia, her Madeiran ties and fluency in Portuguese were part of what gave her access to her multiethnic



friendship group, rather than just being a point of commonality with other Lusondoners. Délia and her friends were quite focused on high academic attainment, often discussing their latest grades, and the multilingualism which most of them shared was often referenced as an academic asset. For example, when Délia was asked by a friend why she had been chosen to participate in my research, she replied proudly “because I speak multiple languages” (audio recording 9/7/13). For Délia then, her immediate friendship group was a space where experiences of migration and multilingualism were valued in general, rather than a specifically Lusondoner space.

### **8.2.5 Vinício**

As I detailed in Chapter 6, Vinício’s (Year 10, male, “White Portuguese – Madeiran”) social standing within in the school underwent a transformation, from his early days as a bullied new arrival socialising only with other Portuguese-speakers, to a vocal user of LMEV, keen to demonstrate local insider status. Like Délia, within Vinício’s social circle his Madeiran ties functioned as a ticket into a broader multiethnic conviviality. As I described in Chapter 5, Vinício readily engaged in banter with classmates of different backgrounds where national stereotypes were traded amicably as part of convivial “rubbing along”. Vinício often referred to his Portuguese or Madeiran background as a badge of prestige, but this did not mean he sought out the company of other “Madeirans”. While he was happy to engage in similar convivial banter with Lusondoners in the context of his Portuguese GCSE class, Vinício did not particularly gravitate towards Lusondoners during other lessons or break times. Instead, Vinício socialised with other popular boys, apparently regardless of their ethnic background. For Vinício then, his Madeiran heritage was drawn on more as part of accessing the multiethnic conviviality of his diverse friendship group than accessing the Lusondoner discursive space.

In this section I have set out some of the complex ways in which close friendship groups can influence linguistic practices and how ethnic affiliations are drawn on. This kind of nuanced interplay between Lusophone peers of contrasting and overlapping ethnolinguistic backgrounds is not accounted for in the existing literature on Portuguese speakers in the UK which I critiqued in Chapter 2. In section 8.2 below I summarise the broader findings of my thesis which were facilitated by this close attention to practices and interactions amongst Lusondoners within the context of their immediate friendship groups.

## 8.2 Thesis findings

By taking an ethnographic approach in my research, I have been able to go further than existing studies of Portuguese speakers in the UK and examine the interconnectedness of young Londoners with both contrasting and overlapping Lusophone ties. In particular, by paying close attention to speech practices and interactions, I have been able to move beyond the reductive conceptualisations underpinning dominant discourses of ethno-linguistic categorisation, and identify instead the emergence of a Lusondoner discursive space. In this section, I summarise the key findings of my study which this linguistic ethnographic approach has made possible.

### *i) Lusondoners and locality*

The vignettes presented at the opening of Chapter 1 highlighted how superdiverse contexts such as south London are populated by individuals who bring a complex combination of transnational ties, often playing out in unpredictable ways. Despite this, dominant discourses of ethno-linguistic categorisation are underpinned by limited conceptualisations of language and ethnicity which privilege inheritance over locally rooted practices. As I stated in the introduction above, ethnic affiliations and linguistic practices are not simply inherited. Instead, they are interrelated phenomena which draw on inherited resources but are grounded in the specifics of locality and peer group. It follows that an individual's ethnic and linguistic affiliations, and related practices, cannot be neatly predicted from their responses to the tick box taxonomies employed within institutional monitoring regimes. In order to unpick such affiliations, a focus on practices themselves is necessary. Attention to the actual practices of the Lusondoner participants in my study revealed that the ethnic positionings they adopt, while often drawing on the transnational ties they bring, were significantly affected by locally dominant discourses circulating within the peer group, as well as the conditions of specific friendship groups. The superdiverse conditions within which my participants operated contributed to a particularly multi-layered local environment, throwing up friendships, affiliations and practices which cut across the bounded ethnic and linguistic groups envisaged by dominant discourses of ethno-linguistic categorisation. Existing literature on Portuguese speakers in the UK lacks an account of how such superdiverse conditions contribute to shaping the practices and affiliations of individuals. As I explained in Chapter 3, this is a gap I have addressed in this thesis through adopting a linguistic

ethnographic approach which affords a privileged perspective on ethnic affiliations, and is particularly alert to the nuances and complexities of superdiverse contexts.

*ii) A Lusondoner discursive space*

Through adopting this empirical, linguistic ethnographic approach, I was able to discern levels of complexity in the affiliations and practices of my Lusondoner participants which were not accounted for by the notions of bounded languages and essential ethnicities underpinning dominant discourses of ethno-linguistic categorisation. Rather than a common Lusondoner identity, or a set of completely discrete ethnolinguistic groupings, what I identified was a Lusondoner discursive space. Constituted by the broad ethnic fractions of “White Portuguese” (with both “Mainland” and “Madeiran” strands), “Brazilian” and “Black Portuguese”, this discursive space facilitated the local interplay of partly overlapping transnational ties. It was not an “ethnic identity” in itself, but a space of interaction based on commonly recognised references. Each of the fractions mentioned above had particular discourses which circulated in relation to them, and it was Lusondoners’ shared recognition of these discourses that constituted a common discursive space. However, within the Lusondoner discursive space there were disparities in the recognition enjoyed by different fractions which were rooted in the dynamics of the global Lusophone space. Specifically, “Brazilians” were the focus of a particular fascination amongst their Lusondoner peers, while the “Black Portuguese” were largely overlooked. Also, although such discourses were a factor within the interactions of different Lusondoners, they did not provide a simple matrix for predicting the positionings that Lusondoners would adopt towards one another. As I explain in the following sections, the Lusondoner discursive space was a locally grounded phenomenon and other key features of the local environment contributed to shaping the practices and positionings of Lusondoners. For example, “Madeirans” enjoyed a high profile due to their numerical significance within the locality where I carried out my study. Future researchers may find Lusondoner groupings in other areas with different contours in relation to the ethnic fractions I identified. It would be particularly interesting to see if in areas with larger “Black Portuguese” populations, this fraction enjoyed greater recognition.

*iii) Lusondoners and Local multiethnic conviviality*

As I stated above, the Lusondoner discursive space did not simply replicate the discourses of the global Lusophone space. Instead, it was a distinctly locally grounded phenomenon. A key feature of the local environment was a sense of

multiethnic conviviality, the amicable “rubbing along” of individuals from different ethnic backgrounds. This conviviality drew on overlapping experiences of migration and multilingualism, and often manifested in a mutual trade in emblematic ethnic and linguistic representations between individuals with different ethnic affiliations. This kind of trading in emblematic representations also characterised interactions between Lusondoners of different ethnic fractions. While a broader multiethnic conviviality was part of the way local belongingness was signalled, Lusondoners could reference a specifically Lusondoner conviviality as part of signalling their access to a common Lusondoner discursive space. As I mentioned above, recognition of different Lusondoner fractions was unevenly distributed, and “Black Portugueseness” held a particularly low profile. This made it difficult for “Black Portuguese” Lusondoners to engage in convivial interactions, due to the lack of a locally recognised discourse of “Black Portugueseness” from which to draw emblematic ethnic representations. On the other hand, the high profile of “Portugueseness” in general made it difficult at times for Lusondoners to retain full ownership of their discursive space. Some non-Lusondoners were familiar enough to “cross” into Portuguese, exemplifying the unpredictability of how ethnic and linguistic discourses can be taken up by individuals.

*iv) Lusondoners and Local Multiethnic Vernacular (LMEV)*

LMEV functioned as a prestige linguistic variety amongst young people in the local context and its use emerged as another key element of signalling local belongingness. However, the strong associations between LMEV and the locally circulating “Jamaican”-dominated understanding of “Blackness” made its use problematic for some Lusondoners. From a recognisable position as “White Portuguese”, Vinício was able to make extensive use of LMEV as part of asserting claims of local insiderness. However, Dara and Márcia’s position as “Black Portuguese”, a somewhat ambiguous “Blackness” in the eyes of their peers, meant use of LMEV could be fraught with unwanted connotations. It could be seen as an attempt to assert a “Black” positioning which was not “legitimate” for these girls. Just as dominant ethnic understandings affected the access that different Lusondoners had to conviviality, it also affected the access they had to LMEV. The local dominance of LMEV meant it was something that all Lusondoners had to take account of, but this was done in contrasting and not easily predictable ways, and depended on how the resources and ties individuals brought with them played out in specific local contexts.

*v) Lusondoners and the local ethnic ecology*

I explained in the two previous sections how local understandings of “Blackness” restricted the access of “Black Portuguese” Lusondoners such as Dara and Márcia to LMEV and local multiethnic conviviality. These understandings were part of a particular local ethnic ecology, rooted in the specific history of migration to south London. This local ethnic ecology provided the context for the interplay of Lusondoners’ transnational ties, with dominant understandings of “Blackness” and “Whiteness” largely dictating the ethnic positionings and claims which could be adopted. For many Lusondoners this posed few challenges, but for others, particularly Dara and Márcia, it was very problematic. This highlights the importance of locality, but also how local conditions were experienced differently depending on the ties and resources which individual Lusondoners brought with them.

### **8.3 Implications**

At the beginning of Chapter 2, I charted a shift in educational policy in England in relation to ethnic and linguistic diversity, from assimilationism to multiculturalism. I then outlined how a further shift was needed in order to recognise the superdiverse conditions which now characterise many areas of England and the rest of the UK. While multiculturalism’s commitment to meeting the needs of different groups is welcome, the widespread reliance on prescriptive and discrete ethnic and linguistic categories undermines this endeavour. The analysis presented in this thesis shows that linguistic practices and ethnic affiliation are not simply inherited attributes. Instead, they are complex phenomena which emerge from the interplay between the ties and resources which individuals bring, with the specifics of the local context. To gain an adequate understanding of linguistic practices and ethnic affiliation requires attention to the wider peer group, locally circulating discourses, and even to the intricacies of individual friendship groups. In this section I set out the implications of this in two key areas. Firstly, I examine how dominant discourses of ethno-linguistic categorisation can be reassessed in the light of superdiversity and, secondly, I outline the potential which exploratory approaches hold for engaging with the complexity which superdiversity throws up.

### **8.3.1 Reassessing dominant discourses of ethno-linguistic categorisation**

In Chapter 2 I explained how dominant discourses of ethno-linguistic categorisation support the notion that each young person can be tied to a specific “ethnicity” with associated practices, and to a standard, bounded language. The analysis I have presented throughout this thesis shows that young people in superdiverse conditions can often draw on multiple ties and linguistic varieties, and that their sense of belongingness is tightly bound up with the unpredictable complexities of local conditions, and specifically the composition of their wider peer group. The institutional ethnic and linguistic labels which individual young people carry, then, do not provide a reliable shorthand for a specific set of practices and affiliations. However, this is not to suggest that nothing useful can be learned from survey approaches. My own survey, carried out as part of this study, identified broad trends in the migration trajectories of young people, contributing to my identification of the empirically grounded categories of “White Portuguese”, “Black Portuguese” and “Brazilian”. The descriptions of close friendship groups given in section 8.1 above though, show that the ethnic ties and linguistic resources of individuals within these categories can play out in unpredictable, locally specific ways. The dynamics of friendship groups and the nuances of personalities are key in the ethnic positionings and linguistic practices which individuals employ for particular purposes. As I explain below, this suggests that investigations of language and ethnicity focused on young people need to engage with the actual perspectives and priorities of those being studied.

Wortham (2001) writes that ‘[I]inguistic anthropology of education studies speakers as social actors, not as repositories of linguistic competence’ (p254). This perspective enables young people to be seen not simply as embodiments of wider social structures, but as agents with their own priorities. In the descriptions of close friendship groups given in section 8.1, there are significant differences in how the young people draw on their transnational ties and linguistic repertoires, but there is a common thread to their intentions: all seek out positionings of local belongingness. While for Alcía this can mean speaking Portuguese, and for Vinício this can mean employing LMEV, both are orienting towards local practices from the perspective of their immediate friendship group. Similarly, Délia’s pride in her Portuguese language fluency and Vinício’s banter about Portuguese sporting prowess link to the value such positionings have within their particular multiethnic friendship groups. Vinício’s transition, mentioned above, from Portuguese-speaking new arrival to social insider making confident use of LMEV shows that linguistic repertoires and

ethnic affiliations, and the way these are drawn on, evolve over time and are heavily influenced by an ongoing process of embedding in the local. Investigating language and ethnicity without accounting for the agency of individuals and their engagement with the gravitational pull of local superdiverse conditions produces an extremely lopsided account of ethnic affiliations and linguistic practices.

The work I have done in this thesis has led me to reconceptualise how people described as “Portuguese-speaking” might be approached with regard to educational initiatives and social programmes. Traditional institutional responses to linguistic diversity amongst young people maintain a bounded, standardised model of language. For instance, the school where I carried out my study invested in EAL support to promote development of “Standard English”, as well as offering a GCSE course focused on “Standard Portuguese”. Similarly, outside of the mainstream setting, a number of my participants attended supplementary schools where they studied “Standard Portuguese”. Not only do all these initiatives privilege “standard” languages, they also focus on one language in isolation. However, the implications of the way I have researched Lusondoners leads in a different direction. By taking an ethnographic approach which critically examines dominant discourses of ethno-linguistic categorisation, I have been able to describe complex and interlinked linguistic practices and ethnic affiliations. These do not conform neatly to dominant categorisations, as individuals maintain multiple ethnic ties, and draw on linguistic repertoires which span multiple “languages”, including non-standard varieties. In light of this, as I explain below, explorative approaches which enable individuals to investigate and even forge their own practices and affiliations represent a useful resource both for young people and the institutions which cater to them.

### **8.3.2 Explorative approaches to ethnic affiliation and linguistic practices**

In this thesis, I have set out in detail how superdiverse conditions in a south London school throw up complex linguistic practices and ethnic affiliations which are not accounted for by dominant discourses of ethno-linguistic categorisation. Without nuanced understanding of this complexity, institutional responses to diversity can be ineffective. This was the case with the Portuguese GCSE course offered to young people categorised as “Portuguese-speaking” in the school where I carried out my research, many of whom turned out to have very limited knowledge of Portuguese language and very varying levels of affiliation to “Portugueseness”. Engaging with this complexity does not mean generating a proliferation of ever more specific ethnic and linguistic categories to be imposed from above. Instead, schools can facilitate

activities where young people explore their own practices and affiliations. Such activities can enable young people to gain more awareness of their own practices and affiliations and can form a useful part of the process of local embedding described in the previous section. In addition, these initiatives can also bring out useful information for schools about the resources and affiliations which young people bring and how these can be engaged with positively. Below I set out three key principles for explorative approaches to linguistic practices and ethnic affiliation drawn from a review I carried out into projects engaging with ethnic and linguistic hybridity amongst young people in London (see Holmes, 2015).

*i) Encouraging young people to reflect on their own practices and affiliations*

In Chapter 2 I explained how the reliance on discrete ethnic and linguistic categories within institutional monitoring regimes contributes to shaping dominant discourses of bounded languages and essential “ethnicities” which do not reflect the complexity of actual practices and affiliations. Rather than asking young people to tick boxes to identify “their language” and “their ethnicity”, getting them to reflect on their actual practices can generate much more nuanced accounts. In ‘Promoting multilingual creativity: Key principles from successful projects (Holmes, 2015), I wrote about a workshop I designed as part of a multilingual creative writing course for a group of young people labelled as “Mandarin speakers”. I was developing a practice which started from the biographical trajectories of individuals as opposed to “standard” languages. Following these trajectories led participants and workshop leaders to see that more productive dimensions to language and ethnic affiliation could be engaged with beyond just broad labels.

The young people were presented with a Venn diagram on the board, the left-hand circle labelled “English” and the right-hand circle labelled “汉语” (Mandarin). They were asked to write the names of close family members, friends, favourite foods, music and other categories on a series of coloured post-it notes, then stick these on the diagram according to the language they most closely associated with each one, leaving any associated with other languages around the edge of the board. The young people had all arrived fairly recently in the UK, and were interested to see that they had all placed a number of their post-it notes in the cross-over “English and 汉语 (Mandarin)” section. What was interesting for me as a teacher and researcher was that a significant proportion of the post-its had been placed outside of the circles, associated with other languages. The young people explained that they all came from



Fujian in China, and spoke what they referred to as “Fujian dialect” with family members. The young people were also fluent in Mandarin and had opted to take the Mandarin GCSE course which the creative writing sessions were attached to, but this was not necessarily their “community language” as the staff organising the GCSE course had assumed. This activity then allowed the young people to reflect on how their practices and affiliations contributed to a process of local embedding, but also provided useful information for the school about the particular resources and ties these young people brought with them. I have used this same approach with groups of Lusondoners during multilingual creative writing courses, and achieved similar results in terms of engaging participants through helping them reflect on the complexity of their linguistic practices and affiliations. This kind of approach does not start from the false premise that individuals have simple roots, and as such has wider application for both studies and educational projects which engage with young people in superdiverse contexts.

*ii) Facilitating creative endeavours which are open to linguistic and cultural hybridity*

Another project I review in the report mentioned above (Holmes, 2015) is ‘Critical Connections’<sup>134</sup>, a multilingual digital storytelling initiative organised by Goldsmiths, University of London. This involves young people from mainstream and supplementary schools producing short films on topics of their choice (within an overarching theme) which can draw on more than one language. For example, one young person attending an Arabic supplementary school in London produced a short film on his passion for a particular dance style, using subtitles and narration which incorporated both English and Arabic. The open format of this project meant that the young person could choose a topic of genuine interest, not necessarily something tied to a specific language or culture, and bring in English and Arabic in ways which felt comfortable for him. This enabled the young person to use Arabic within the kind of creative endeavour which he would normally only be exposed to in English-medium settings. As well as facilitating new orientations towards his Arabic skills, the project also provided a useful insight for his teachers into the young person’s interests and linguistic repertoire. Again, this kind of approach is directly relevant to the Lusondoners I studied, who draw on varied linguistic repertoires and engage in hybrid practices. Facilitating creative endeavours which actively

---

<sup>134</sup> See Goldsmiths, University of London’s ‘Critical Connections II’ website (<https://goldsmithsmdst.wordpress.com/>)

accommodate the kind of hybridity I observed amongst Lusondoners therefore carries wider potential for engaging with other young people in superdiverse contexts.

*iii) Engaging with the local multiethnic and multilingual context*

One final project, also mentioned in my report (Holmes, 2015) is ‘Translation Nation’<sup>135</sup>, which involves primary school pupils bringing in a story from home in another language, and working with a mixed group of classmates to translate it into English under the guidance of a professional translator. While the child who brings in the story is responsible for explaining the gist so that their classmates can understand it, the whole group then has a role in coming up with the best way to express it in English. A strength of this project is that it is not aimed at a predefined ethnic or linguistic group, but specifically draws on the communal linguistic resources of the class as a whole. While some young people act as interpreters of “home” languages, others contribute through editing and refining the English versions of stories, and it was often the multilingual young people who proved to be particularly adept at this, even without any knowledge of the original language of the story. This project then allowed pupils to reflect on their linguistic repertoires and situate these within the context of their multilingual and multiethnic peer group. It also enabled teachers to make links between pupils’ multilingualism and the linguistic skills they demonstrated through English. All these projects are the outcome of the theoretical stance that has governed my thesis – an openness to complex linguistic practices and ethnic affiliations which are not accounted for within dominant discourses of ethno-linguistic categorisation. While these projects are designed to engage with the kind of complexity and hybridity I observed amongst my Lusondoner participants, they are also potentially productive for other linguistic and ethnic groups too.

While the projects outlined above are not a direct alternative to the monitoring practices examined in Chapter 2, they provide an important counterweight. Rather than focusing on sorting young people into predefined groups with specific needs in order to facilitate “compensatory” initiatives, their explorative approach reveals both the complexity and the opportunities presented by superdiverse cohorts. In this thesis I have investigated the biographical-linguistic trajectories and linguistic practices

---

<sup>135</sup> See the ‘Translation Nation’ (2016) page of the Stephen Spender Trust’s website ([http://www.stephen-spender.org/translation\\_nation.html](http://www.stephen-spender.org/translation_nation.html))

and affiliations of a group of Lusondoners in one south London school and shown that the complexity revealed is not accounted for within dominant discourses of ethno-linguistic categorisation. What is missing is any acknowledgement of the importance of locality in dominant understandings of “ethnicity” and language, both in terms of the specific composition of the local peer group and how this contributes to shaping the dominant discourses circulating within the local ethnic ecology. The kinds of projects I have outlined above represent a step towards redressing this imbalance.

## Appendices

### Appendix I – Recorded “Home Language” of all students enrolled at the school where I conducted my fieldwork, according to official school data

“Home language”	Total students	Percentage of school
English	488	59.4
Portuguese	87	10.6
Somali	55	6.7
Classification Pending	38	4.6
French	26	3.2
Spanish	19	2.3
Albanian/Shqip	15	1.8
Polish	10	1.2
Yoruba	10	1.2
Urdu	9	1.1
Arabic	7	0.9
Bengali	7	0.9
Lingala	7	0.9
Dutch/Flemish	6	0.7
Akan/Twi-Fante	4	0.5
Amharic	4	0.5
Italian	4	0.5
Chinese	3	0.4
Persian/Farsi	3	0.4
Tamil	3	0.4
Turkish	3	0.4
Gujarati	2	0.2
Hindi	2	0.2
Panjabi	2	0.2
Twi	2	0.2
Igbo	1	0.1
Luganda	1	0.1
Romany/English Romanes	1	0.1
Russian	1	0.1
Serbian/Croatian/Bosnian	1	0.1
Tagalog/Filipino	1	0.1

**Appendix II – Wider peer group interacting with key participants  
(anonymised list of young people)**

<b>Year group</b>	<b>"Home language" according to official school records</b>	<b>"Ethnic group" according to official school records</b>
8	Portuguese	Black (other)
8	Portuguese	Black (other)
10	French	Black African
10	Somali	Black African
10	Somali	Black African
10	French	Black African
10	English	Black African
10	French	Black African
10	English	Black African
10	Arabic	Black African
11	French	Black African
11	English	Black African
8	English	Black African
8	English	Black African
10	English	Black Caribbean
10	English	Black Caribbean
11	English	Black Caribbean
11	English	Black Caribbean
11	English	Black Caribbean
8	English	Black Caribbean
8	English	Black Caribbean
10	English	Mixed (other)
10	Portuguese	Mixed (other)
10	French	Mixed (other)
8	Spanish	Mixed (other)
8	English	Mixed (other)
10	English	Mixed (White and Black Caribbean)
10	Urdu	Pakistani
10	Portuguese	White (other)
10	Spanish	White (other)
10	Classification Pending	White (other)
10	Polish	White (other)
10	Albanian/Shqip	White (other)
11	English	White (other)
11	Albanian/Shqip	White (other)
11	Spanish	White (other)
11	Spanish	White (other)
11	Portuguese	White (other)
11	Albanian/Shqip	White (other)



### Appendix III – Biographical questionnaire

#### 1.) Personal Details

Name:	
-name at school:	
-name at home:	
-name in other contexts:	
DOB:	Gender M/F:
Age now:	Tutor Group:
Religion:	

#### 2.) Migration Journey

Age	Location	Why moved etc?

#### 3.) Family Tree (key relatives incl. parents/grandparents)

Relative	Countries lived in	Languages spoken	Languages read	Languages written

4.) This page to be completed for each location lived in (including current one)

Age	Location

Who lived/lives at home?

Relative	They speak to me in...	I speak to them in...

Literacy activities at home	Languages used

Languages used at school

With teacher:
With friends:
Studied as MFL:

(if attended more than 1 school)

With teacher:
With friends:
Studied as MFL:

With teacher:
With friends:
Studied as MFL:

What do you spend time on out of school?

Location:	Activities:	Languages used:



## 5.) Current language habits

## Communication with other friends/relatives

Relative/Friend	Media used	Language(s) used

## Holidays taken

Where?	When/frequency?	Accommodation	Languages used

## People I talk to most from school:

	People	Languages
<b>In lessons</b>		
<b>At break/lunch</b>		
<b>Out of school</b>		

### Appendix IV – Summary of observations

Date	Period	Lesson	Young person(s) present	Audio recording?
05/03/2013	3	S+L	Vinício	No
05/03/2013	1+2	Portuguese	Vinício	No
08/03/2013	1	English	Alícia	No
08/03/2013	2+3	H+SC	Alícia and Danilo	No
11/03/2013	2	Science	Alícia	No
11/03/2013	3	Maths	Alícia	No
13/03/2013	5	Science	Alícia	No
13/03/2013	3+4	English	Alícia	No
14/03/2013	1	Textiles	Alícia	No
14/03/2013	3+4	Art	Alícia and Danilo	No
18/03/2013	1	Graphics	Dara and Márcia	No
18/03/2013	2	Science	Danilo	No
18/03/2013	3	Science	Délia	No
19/03/2013	3	Science	Danilo	No
19/03/2013	4	Art	Délia	No
19/03/2013	5	RS	Dara and Márcia	No
19/03/2013	1+2	Portuguese	Vinício	No
25/03/2013	3	Maths	Danilo	No
25/03/2013	1+2	Textiles	Vinício	No
26/03/2013	1	Portuguese	Vinício	No
26/03/2013	2	Maths	Délia	No
26/03/2013	3+4	French	Dara and Márcia	No
26/03/2013	5+6	English	Danilo	No
18/04/2013	2	Science	Alícia	No
18/04/2013	5	Graphics	Dara and Márcia	No
18/04/2013	3+4	English	Dara and Márcia	No
22/04/2013	1	Science	Danilo	No
22/04/2013	2	Science	Alícia	No
22/04/2013	5	Maths	Vinício	No
23/04/2013	4	RS	Danilo	No
23/04/2013	5	English	Danilo	No
23/04/2013	6	Science	Dara and Márcia	No
23/04/2013	1+2	Portuguese	Vinício	No
24/04/2013	3+4	English	Alícia and Danilo	No
26/04/2013	1	Science	Dara and Márcia	No
02/05/2013	1	Textiles	Alícia	No
02/05/2013	3+4	Art	Alícia and Danilo	No
03/05/2013	1	English	Alícia	No
03/05/2013	2+3	H+SC	Alícia and Danilo	No
08/05/2013	1	Maths	Danilo	No
08/05/2013	3	English	Alícia	No

08/05/2013	5	Science	Danilo	No
08/05/2013	6	Science	Alícia	No
09/05/2013	1	Textiles	Alícia	Yes
09/05/2013	2	Science	Alícia	Yes
09/05/2013	3+4	RS	Alícia	Yes
10/05/2013	1	English	Alícia	Yes
10/05/2013	2	H+SC	Alícia	Yes
10/05/2013	3+4	H+SC	Alícia	Yes
10/05/2013	5+6	H+SC	Alícia	Yes
14/05/2013	1	English	Danilo	Yes
14/05/2013	2	Art	Danilo	Yes
14/05/2013	3	Science	Danilo	Yes
14/05/2013	4	RS	Danilo	Yes
14/05/2013	5+6	English	Danilo	Yes
15/05/2013	1+2	Maths	Danilo	Yes
15/05/2013	3+4	English	Danilo	Yes
10/06/2013	6	English	Délia	No
10/06/2013	1+2	Graphics	Dara and Márcia	No
10/06/2013	3+4	PA	Dara and Márcia	No
11/06/2013	4	Art	Délia	No
11/06/2013	5+6	Science	Vinício	No
17/06/2013	1	Maths	Délia	No
17/06/2013	2	Spanish	Délia	No
17/06/2013	5	Maths	Vinício	No
17/06/2013	6	English	Délia	No
17/06/2013	3+4	PA	Dara, Márcia and Vinício	No
18/06/2013	1+2	Portuguese	Vinício	No
19/06/2013	1+2	Science	Dara and Márcia	No
19/06/2013	3+4	Maths	Dara and Márcia	Yes
20/06/2013	5	Graphics	Dara and Márcia	Yes
20/06/2013	6	History	Dara and Márcia	Yes
20/06/2013	1+2	Maths	Dara and Márcia	Yes
20/06/2013	3+4	English	Dara and Márcia	Yes
21/06/2013	5	PA	Dara and Márcia	Yes
21/06/2013	6	French	Dara and Márcia	Yes
21/06/2013	1+2	Science	Dara and Márcia	Yes
21/06/2013	3+4	English	Dara and Márcia	Yes
27/06/2013	5	Textiles	Vinício	Yes
27/06/2013	6	Portuguese	Vinício	Yes
27/06/2013	1+2	Maths	Vinício	Yes
27/06/2013	3+4	English	Vinício	Yes
28/06/2013	5	Drama	Vinício	Yes
28/06/2013	6	S+L	Vinício	Yes
28/06/2013	1+2	Science	Vinício	Yes

28/06/2013	3+4	English	Vinício	Yes
09/07/2013	1	Science	Délia	Yes
09/07/2013	2	Maths	Délia	Yes
09/07/2013	5	Spanish	Délia	Yes
09/07/2013	6	History	Délia	Yes
09/07/2013	3+4	Art	Délia	Yes
10/07/2013	1	English	Délia	Yes
10/07/2013	2	ICT	Délia	Yes
10/07/2013	3	Humanities	Délia	Yes
10/07/2013	4	Spanish	Délia	Yes
10/07/2013	5	Maths	Délia	Yes
10/07/2013	6	Geography	Délia	Yes

## Appendix V – Lambeth ethnicity categories and codes

<b>White</b>	<b>Codes</b>
φ British (English/Scottish/Welsh) <sup>1</sup>	WBRI
φ Irish	WIRI
φ Traveller of Irish Heritage	WIRT
φ Gypsy/Roma	WROM
φ Any other White background (specify) <sup>2</sup>	WOTW
φ Greek <sup>3</sup>	WGRE
φ Turkish <sup>4</sup>	WTUR
φ Portuguese	WPOR
<b>Mixed</b>	
φ White and Black Caribbean	MWBC
φ White and Black African	MWBA
φ White and Asian	MWAS
φ Any other mixed background (specify) <sup>5</sup>	MOTH
<b>Asian or Asian British</b>	
φ Indian	AIND
φ Pakistani	APKN
φ Bangladeshi	ABAN
φ Any other Asian background (specify) <sup>6</sup>	AOTH
<b>Black or Black British</b>	
φ Caribbean	BCRB
φ African <sup>7</sup>	BAFR
φ Any other Black backgrounds <sup>8</sup>	BOTH
<b>Chinese<sup>9</sup></b>	CHNE
<b>Any other ethnic background</b>	
φ Vietnamese	OVIE
φ Any other ethnic group <sup>10</sup>	OOEG

---

<sup>1</sup> Includes English, Scottish, Welsh and Other White British

<sup>2</sup> Includes Albanian, Bosnian-Herzegovinian, Croatian, Italian, Kosovan, Serbian, Russian, Latvian, Ukrainian, Polish, Bulgarian, Czech, Slovak, Lithuanian, Romanian, French, German, Spanish, Scandinavian

<sup>3</sup> Includes Greek and Greek-Cypriot

<sup>4</sup> Includes Turkish and Turkish-Cypriot

<sup>5</sup> Includes Asian and any other ethnic group, Asian and Black, Black and any other ethnic group, Black and Chinese, Chinese and any other ethnic group, White and any other ethnic group, White and Chinese, Other mixed background.

<sup>6</sup> Includes African Asian, Kashmiri Other, Nepali, Sinhalese, Sri Lankan, Tamil, Other Asian.

<sup>7</sup> Includes Angolan, Congolese, Ghanaian, Nigerian, Sierra Leonian, Somali, Sudanese, Other Black African.

<sup>8</sup> Includes Black European, Black North American, Other Black.

<sup>9</sup> Includes Hong Kong Chinese, Malaysian Chinese, Singaporean Chinese, Taiwanese, Other Chinese

<sup>10</sup> Includes Afghan, Arab (Palestinian, Kuwaiti, Jordanian, Saudi Arabian), Egyptian, Filipino, Iranian, Iraqi, Japanese, Korean, Kurdish, Latin/South/Central American, Lebanese, Libyan, Malay, Moroccan, Polynesian, Thai, Vietnamese, Yemeni, any other ethnic group

---

<sup>136</sup> “Vietnamese” is mentioned both as a distinct category with code “OVIE”, and as a subcategory of “Any other ethnic background” within the list under note 10. This appears to be an error within the categorisation system.

## Appendix VI – Transcription conventions

(adapted from Rampton: 2011a)

Fonts representing accents, intonations, lects and languages:

*Nigerian intonation*

**Jamaican accent**

*Portuguese*

[ ] IPA Phonetic Transcription (revised to 1979)

Conversational features

(.) pause of less than a second

(1.5) approximate length of pause in seconds

[ overlapping turns

[

CAPITALS loud

>text< more rapid speech

( ) speech inaudible

(text) speech hard to discern, analyst's guess

((text:)) „stage directions“

text emphasised syllable

### Appendix VII – Glossary of LMEV usage

<b>Example</b>	<b>Definition/Explanation</b>	<b>Speakers and (frequency)</b>
bad girl (n)	sexually active girl	Vinício (2)
bad man (n)	criminal/gangster/rebel	Vinício (1)
to bang (v)	to beat up/fight	Vinício (1)
bare (adj)	lots of	Vinício (1)
batty (adj)	gay (used as an insult)	Vinício (1)
beef (n)	conflict/aggravation	Danilo (1)
blick (adj)	very dark skin tone (from “black”)	Délia’s friend (1) Dara (1)
bruv (n)	term of address or exclamation similar to “mate” or “man” (from “brother”)	Erion (1) Mina (1) Danilo (1) Chinyere (1) Vinício (11)
to buckle (v)	to trip or fall	Délia (1)
butters (adj)	ugly	Vinício (3)
to chill (v)	to relax	Vinício (2)
to chillax (v)	to relax	Vinício (6)
cracky (n)	crack (cocaine)	Vinício (1)
dead (adj)	boring/uncool	Vinício (3)
dry (adj)	boring/uncool/unimpressive/unfunny	Vinício (1)
dyatty gall (n)	(dirty girl) insult equivalent to “slag” or “whore”	Vinício (2)
fam (n)	term of address or exclamation similar to “mate” or “man” (from “family”)	Alícia’s teacher (1) Dara (1) Danilo (1) Denise (1) Chinyere (1) Levon (1)
flower boy (n)	a boy/man who attempts to impress women through traditional romantic gestures and is seen as effeminate	Levon (1)
g (n)	abbreviation of “gangster”, term of address for a close friend	Vinício (1)
I beg you (v)	please (when making a request)	Vinício (1)
innit	(from “isn’t it”) used to express or seek agreement	Alícia (1) Dara (1)

		Márcia (1) Chinyere (2) Vinício (2) Marvin (2) Susana (1)
is	(dropping of auxiliary verb) as in “that bitch getting rude”	Vinício (1)
kissing teeth	sucking air through the teeth with pursed lips in order to produce a kind of elongated tut – used to show annoyance	Vinício (1)
man (pronoun)	used instead of “he” or “I”, as in “man said” or “man was”	Vinício (4)
man	used as an exclamation	John (1)
moist (adj)	uncool/idiotic/unimpressive/unamusing/embarassing	Vinício (6)
nah	no	Chinyere (1)
neek	a portmanteau term formed from and synonymous with “nerd” and “geek”	Davina (1) Vinício (1)
rare (adj)	can be used as an exclamation to show that something is unusual or unexpected	Stephanie (1)
safe (adj)	cool (also used as an exclamation)	Délia (1)
sick (adj)	cool/impressive	Vinício (2)
shame (n)	an exclamation used to show embarrassment	Samaan (1)
sket	slag/whore	Dara (1) Vinício (1)
to swear down (v)	to swear emphatically	Vinício (1)
trust (v)	believe me (used as an exclamation)	Denise (1)
walahi	I swear (from Arabic)	Vinício (1)
wannabe	someone who tries to fit in with a particular social group by pretending to be something they are not	Levon (1)
wet (adj)	uncool/idiotic/unimpressive/unamusing	Vinício (1)
you know (v)	exclamation used to express or seek agreement, similar to “innit”	Vinício (1)
younger (n)	a friend who is of lower status in the social hierarchy, usually due to younger age (originally used to describe more junior gang members)	Vinício (2)



## References

- Abreu, G. (2003) 'The Development of Cultural Identity(ies) of Portuguese Students in English Schools: Some Implications for Teacher Training' in Gómez-Chacón, I. (ed.) (2003) *European Identity: Individual, Group and Society*, Bilbao: University of Deusto pp. 205-221
- Abreu, G., Cline, T., & Lambert, H. (2003). *The Education of Portuguese Children in Britain: Insights from Research and Practice in England and Overseas*. Luton: Department of Psychology, University of Luton
- Abreu, G. & Lambert, H. (2003). *The Education of Portuguese Students in England and the Channel Islands Schools. Final Report*. Luton: Department of Psychology, University of Luton.
- Agar, M. (1980) *The Professional Stranger: an informal introduction to ethnography*, London: Academic Press
- Alexander, C. (1996) *The Art of Being Black: The Creation of Black British Youth Identities*, Oxford: Clarendon Press
- Alexander, C. (2002) 'Beyond black: re-thinking the colour/culture divide', *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 25:4, pp. 552-571
- Alexander, R. (2013) 'Does a Child Die of Hunger Every 10 Seconds', *BBC News Magazine* [online] 18 June. Available at: <<http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/magazine-22935692>> [Accessed 19 February 2017]
- Ali, N., Kalra, V. S. & Sayyid, S. (eds.) (2006) *A Postcolonial People: South Asians in Britain*, London: Hurst and Company
- Alleyne, B. (2002) 'An idea of community and its discontents: towards a more reflexive sense of belonging in multicultural Britain', *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 25:4, pp. 607-627
- Almeida, J. (2010) 'Citizens of the World: Migration and Citizenship of the Portuguese in the UK' *Portuguese Studies* vol. 26 no. 1 (2010), pp. 208–229
- Almeida, J. & Corkill, D. (2010) 'Portuguese Migrant Workers in the UK: A Case Study of Thetford, Norfolk' *Portuguese Studies* vol. 26 no. 1 (2010), pp. 27–40
- Anderson, B (1991) *Imagined communities: reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism*, London: Verso
- Aragao, S. (2013). Luso-London: Identity, Citizenship, and Belonging in 'Post-National' Europe. Student Research Reports. Paper 10. University of Massachusetts
- Archer, L. & Francis, B. (2007) *Understanding Minority Ethnic Achievement: Race, gender, class and 'success'*, London: Routledge
- Arksey, H. & Knight, P. (1999) *Interviewing for Social Scientists*, London: Sage

- Arnaut, K. & Spotti, M. (2014) 'Superdiversity discourse', *Working Papers in Urban Language & Literacies*, Paper 122
- Ash, L. (2011) 'Portugal's jobless graduates flee to Africa and Brazil'. BBC News [online] 1 September. Available at: <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-14716410> [Accessed 19 February 2017].
- Atkinson, P. & Hammersley, M. (1994) 'Ethnography and participant observation', *Handbook of qualitative research*, 1, pp. 248-261.
- Bacelar do Nascimento, M. F., Estrela, A., Mendes, A., Pereira, L. & Veloso, R. (2009) 'African Varieties of Portuguese: Corpus Constitution and Lexical Analysis' in Lyding, V. (ed.) *Proceedings of the Second colloquium on lesser used languages and computer linguistics*, Bolzano: Eurac Research. pp. 43-57
- Back, L. (1996) *New Ethnicities and Urban Culture: Racisms and multiculturalism in young lives*, London: Routledge
- Ballard, R. (1997) 'The construction of a conceptual vision: 'Ethnic Groups' and the 1991 UK Census', *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 20:1, pp. 182-194
- Barnard, F. M. (1969) 'Introduction' in Barnard, F. M. (ed.) *Herder on Social and Political Culture*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Barradas, O. (2004), *Portuguese Students in London Schools: Patterns of Participation in Community Language Classes and Patterns of Educational Achievement*, Unpublished PhD Thesis, Goldsmiths: University of London
- Barrie, J.M. (1904/2011) *Peter Pan*, London: Eurospan
- Bartlett, L. (2007) 'Literacy, speech and shame: the cultural politics of literacy and language in Brazil', *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 20:5, pp. 547-563
- Batalha, L. (2008) 'Cape Verdeans in Portugal', in Batalha, L. & Carling, J. (Eds.). *Transnational Archipelago: perspectives on Cape Verdean migration and diaspora*. Amsterdam University Press.
- BBC (2006) 'The African Caribbean debate', [online]. Available at: [http://www.bbc.co.uk/caribbean/news/story/2006/05/060526\\_black.shtml](http://www.bbc.co.uk/caribbean/news/story/2006/05/060526_black.shtml) [Accessed 19 February 2017].
- BBC News (2009) *Born Abroad, An Immigration Map of Britain: Portugal*. [online] Available at: [http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/shared/spl/hi/uk/05/born\\_abroad/countries/html/portugal.stm](http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/shared/spl/hi/uk/05/born_abroad/countries/html/portugal.stm) [Accessed 19 February 2017].
- Beswick, J. (2005) 'The Portuguese Diaspora in Jersey', in Preisler, B., Fabricius, A., Haberland, H., Kjærbeck, S. & Risager, K., (eds.) (2005) *The Consequences of Mobility*, Roskilde: Roskilde University pp. 93-105
- Beswick, J. & Dinneen, M. (2010) 'The Portuguese-Speaking Diaspora in Great Britain and Ireland' *Portuguese Studies* vol. 26 no. 1 (2010), pp. 5-9

- Beswick, J. & Pozo-Gutiérrez, A. (2010) 'Migrant Identities, Sociolinguistic and Sociocultural Practices: Portuguese and Spanish Migrations to the South Coast of England' *Portuguese Studies* vol. 26 no. 1 (2010), pp. 41–59
- Bhabha, H. (1990) *DissemiNation. Nation and narration*, New York: Routledge, pp. 291-322.
- Billig, M. (1995), *Banal Nationalism*, London: Sage Publications
- Blommaert, J. (2008). 'Multi-everything London.' *Journal of Language, Identity, and Education* 7: pp. 81-89.
- Blommaert, J. (2013a). 'Complexity, accent, and conviviality: Concluding comments.' *Applied linguistics*, amt028.
- Blommaert, J. (2013b) 'Language and the study of diversity', *Working Papers in Urban Language & Literacies*, Paper 113
- Blommaert, J. (2014) 'From mobility to complexity in sociolinguistic theory & method', *Working Papers in Urban Language & Literacies*, Paper 135
- Blommaert, J. & Backus, A. (2011) 'Repertoires revisited: 'Knowing language' in superdiversity', *Working Papers in Urban Language & Literacies*, Paper 67
- Blommaert, J., & Backus, A. (2012). Superdiverse repertoires and the individual. *Tilburg Papers in Culture Studies*, 24.
- Blommaert, J. & Jie, D. (2010) *Ethnographic Fieldwork: a beginner's guide*, Bristol: Multilingual Matters
- Blommaert, J. & Rampton, B. (2011) 'Language and Superdiversity: A position paper'. *Working Papers in Urban Language & Literacies*, Paper 70.
- Bokhorst-Heng, W. (1999) 'Singapore's *Speak Mandarin Campaign*: Language ideological debates and the imagining of the nation' in Blommaert, J. (ed.) *Language Ideological Debates*, New York: Mouton de Gruyter, pp. 171-199
- Bourdieu, P. (1991) *Language and Symbolic Power*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Bowling, B (2004) 'Foreword' in Chakraborti, N., & Garland, J. (Eds.). *Rural Racism*. Uffculme: Willan. pp. ix-x
- Boyle, R., & Monteiro, C. (2005). 'A Small Country with a Big Ambition' Representations of Portugal and England in Euro 2004 British and Portuguese Newspaper Coverage. *European Journal of Communication*, 20(2), pp. 223-244.
- Brandt, G. L. (2000) 'Caribbean Creole: The Politics of Resistance' in Acton, T. & Dalphinis, M. (eds.) *Language, Blacks and Gypsies: Languages without a written tradition and their role in education*, London: Whiting and Birch Ltd. pp. 227-36
- Briggs, C. (1986) *Learning How to Ask: a sociolinguistic appraisal of the role of the interview in social science research*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

- Brown, J., Ellingham, M., Fisher, J. & Hancock, M. (2010) *The Rough Guide to Portugal*, London: Rough Guides Ltd
- Brubaker, R. (2004) *Ethnicity Without Groups*, Cambridge, MA & London: Harvard University Press
- Brubaker, R. (2005) 'The 'diaspora' diaspora', *Ethnic and Racial Studies* Vol. 28 No. 1 pp. 1-19
- Burton, J., Nandi, A. & Platt, L. (2010) 'Measuring ethnicity: challenges and opportunities for survey research', *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 33:8, pp. 1332-1349
- Busch, B (2015) 'Linguistic repertoire and Spracherleben, the lived experience of language' *Working Papers in Urban Language & Literacies*, Paper 148
- Campbell, G. (1995) *Concise Compendium of the World's Languages*, London: Routledge
- Carvalho, A. M. (2004) 'I speak like the guys on TV: palatalization and the urbanization of Uruguayan Portuguese'. *Language variation and change*, 16 (02), pp. 127-151.
- Cassidy, F.G. & Le Page, R.B. (1967) *Dictionary of Jamaican English*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Çavuşoğlu, Ç. (2010). "The trouble with Turkishness?": (invisible) Turkish Cypriots in a Turkish school in London, University of London, Unpublished PhD thesis.
- Cekaite, A. & Evaldsson, A.C. (2008) 'Staging Linguistic Identities and Negotiating Monolingual Norms in Multiethnic School Settings', *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 5:3, pp. 177-196
- Chabal, P. (1981). National liberation in Portuguese Guinea, 1956-1974, *African Affairs*, 80 (318), pp. 75-99.
- Cheshire, J., Fox, S., Kerswill, P. & Torgersen, E. (2008a). *Ethnicity, friendship network and social practices as the motor of dialect change: Linguistic innovation in London*. Sociolinguistica. pp. 1-23
- Cheshire, J., Fox, S., Kerswill, P. & Torgersen, E. (2008b). Linguistic innovators: the English of adolescents in London. *Final report submitted to the ESRC*. Swindon: ESRC
- Cheshire, J., Kerswill, P., Fox, S. & Torgersen, E. (2011). Contact, the feature pool and the speech community: The emergence of Multicultural London English. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 15(2), pp. 151-196.
- Chrisafis, A. (2002) 'McCalla, publisher who gave black people a voice, dies', *The Guardian* [online] 24 August. Available at: <<http://www.theguardian.com/uk/2002/aug/24/arts.raceandreligion?INTCMP=SRCH>> [Accessed 19 February 2017]

Cintra Martins, M. S. (2008) 'Avanços e Retrocessos nas Propostas de Ensino de Língua Portuguesa: Questões de Ideologia e de Poder', *Linguagem em (Dis)curso*, v.8, n.3, pp. 519-539,

Commonwealth Immigrants Advisory Council (1964) *Second Report*, London: HMSO

Comunidade dos Países de Língua Portuguesa [CPLP] (2010) *Objetivos*. [online] Available at: < <https://www.cplp.org/id-2763.aspx> > [Accessed 19 February 2017].

Cwerner, S. B. (2001): 'The Times of Migration', *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 27:1, pp. 7-36

da Silva, E. A. (2011). *Sociolinguistic (re) constructions of diaspora portugueseness: Portuguese-Canadian youth in Toronto* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Toronto).

da Silva Coelho, G., & dos Santos Burigo, T. (2009). 'Comparação entre as dicções portuguesa e brasileira'. *Revista de Iniciação Científica*, 4(1).

Dalby, A. (1998) *Dictionary of Languages*, London: Bloomsbury

Daley, P. (1998) 'Black Africans in Great Britain: Spatial Concentration and Segregation', *Urban Studies*, Vol. 35, No. 10, pp. 1703-1724,

Delamont, S. & Atkinson, P (1995) *Fighting Familiarity: Essays on Education and Ethnography*, Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press

Demie, F. (2013) *Raising Achievement of Black African Pupils: Good Practice in Lambeth Schools*, London: Lambeth Council Research and Statistics Unit

Demie, F. & Lewis, K. (2008) *Raising the Achievement of Portuguese Pupils: Good Practice in Lambeth Schools*, London: Lambeth Council Research and Statistics Unit

Demie, F. & Lewis, K. (2010): Raising the achievement of Portuguese pupils in British schools: a case study of good practice, *Educational Studies*, 36:1, pp. 95-109

Demie, F. & Lewis, K. (2014) *Raising the Achievement of White Working Class Pupils: Barriers and School Strategies*, London: Lambeth Council Research and Statistics Unit

Demie, F., Lewis, K. & McLean, C. (2007) *Raising the achievement of Somali pupils: Challenges and School Responses*, London: Lambeth Council Research and Statistics Unit

Derrida, J. (1976) *Of Grammatology*. Baltimore & London: Johns Hopkins University Press

Department for Education [DfE] (2012) '2013 Secondary Schools Guidance', [online]. DfE. Available at: <<http://media.education.gov.uk/assets/files/pdf/2/2013%20secondary%20schools%20census%20guidance%20v1-0.pdf>> [Accessed 26 October 2012].

Department for Education [DfE] (2013) 'Key stage 4 qualifications counting in the English Baccalaureate', [online] DfE. Available at: <<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/english-baccalaureate-eligible-qualifications>> [Accessed 19 February 2017].

Department for Education and Skills [DfES] (2003). *Aiming High: Raising the Achievement of Minority Ethnic Pupils*. London: HMSO

Department of Education and Science [DES] (1975). *A Language for Life* (The Bullock Report). London: HMSO.

Department of Education and Science [DES] (1981). *West Indian children in our schools: Interim report of the committee of inquiry into the education of children from ethnic minority groups* (The Rampton Report). London: HMSO.

Department of Education and Science [DES] (1985). *Education for all: Report of the committee of inquiry into the education of children from ethnic minority groups* (The Swann Report). London: HMSO.

Diário de Notícias (2005) *Cabo Verde admite pedir adesão plena à União Europeia*. [online] Available at: <<http://www.dn.pt/arquivo/2005/interior/cabo-verde-admite-pedir-adesao-plena-a-uniao-europeia-598534.html>> [Accessed 10 August 2016].

Diário de Notícias (2010) *Cabo Verde não deveria ter sido independente*. [online] Available at: <<http://www.dn.pt/globo/cplp/interior/cabo-verde-nao-deveria-ter-sido-independente-1546049.html>> [Accessed 19 February 2017].

Duranti, A. (1997) *Linguistic Anthropology*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Edmonds, R. L. & Yee, H. S. (1999). 'Macau: From Portuguese Autonomous Territory to Chinese Special Administrative Region. *The China Quarterly*, 160, pp. 801-817

*Education Act 1996*. London: HMSO.

*Education Reform Act 1988*. London: HMSO.

Edwards, V. (2004) *Raising the achievement of mobile pupils in Lambeth schools: good practice guidance and recommendations for schools and other agencies*, London: Lambeth Council Research and Statistics Unit

Epstein, D. (1998) 'Are you a girl or are you a teacher? The 'Least Adult' Role in Research about Gender and Sexuality in a Primary School' in Walford, G. (ed) *Doing Research about Education*. London: Falmer Press. pp. 27-41

Ethnologue (2017a) *Lingala*. [online] Available at: <<https://www.ethnologue.com/language/lin>> [accessed 23 February 2017].

Ethnologue (2017b) *Kimbundu*. [online] Available at: <<https://www.ethnologue.com/language/kmb>> [accessed 23 February 2017].

Evans, Y., Wills, J., Datta, K., Herbert, J., McIlwaine, C., May, J., Osvaldo de Araújo, J., França, A. C., França, A. P. (2007) *Brazilians in London: A report for the*

*Strangers into Citizens* Campaign, London: Department of Geography, Queen Mary, University of London

Fanshawe, S. & Sriskandarajah, D. (2010) *'You Can't Put Me In A Box': Super-diversity and the end of identity politics in Britain*. London: IPPR

Feijó, R. (2008) 'Língua, nome e identidade numa situação de plurilinguismo concorrencial: o caso de Timor-Leste', *Etnográfica*, 12 (1): pp. 143-172.

Feldman-Bianco, B. (1992) 'Multiple Layers of Time and Space: The Construction of Class, Ethnicity, and Nationalism among Portuguese Immigrants' *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, Volume 645, July 1992, pp. 145–174.

Feldman-Bianco, B. (2007) 'Empire, postcoloniality and diasporas: The Portuguese case', *Papers* 85, pp. 43-56

Figuroa, J. (2000). *Assessment of the Health Needs of the Portuguese Speaking Community Living in North Lambeth Primary Care Group (NLPCG) Area in Lambeth*. Unpublished research report, copy provided by Portuguese Consulate

Fitzpatrick, M. (2000/2010) *Lonely Planet: Mozambique*, London: Lonely Planet Publications

Foucault, M. (1977) *Discipline and Punish*. London: Penguin.

Foucault, M. (1988) *Politics, Philosophy, Culture: Interviews and other writings 1977-1984*. London: Routledge.

Freyre, G. (1933) *Casa Grande e Senzala: formação da família brasileira sob o regime de economia patriarcal*. Rio de Janeiro: Maia & Schmidt

Freyre, G. (1946) *The Masters and the Slaves: a study in the development of Brazilian civilization*. Translated by Samuel Putnam. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

Gal, S. & Irvine, J. T. (1995) 'The Boundaries of Languages and Disciplines: How Ideologies Construct Difference', *Social Research*, Vol. 62, No. 4, pp. 967-1001

Garcez, P. (1995) 'The Debatable 1990 Luso-Brazilian Orthographic Accord' *Language Problems & Language Planning*, 19: 2. pp. 151-178

Ghose, A. (ed.) (2007/2010) *Eyewitness Travel: Brazil*, London: Dorling Kindersley

Gillborn, D. (1997) 'Ethnicity and Educational Performance in the United Kingdom: Racism, Ethnicity, and Variability in Achievement', *Anthropology & Education Quarterly*, Vol. 28, No. 3, Ethnicity and School Performance: Complicating the Immigrant/Involuntary Minority Typology (Sep., 1997), pp.375-393

Gilroy, P. (2000) 'The sugar you stir . . .', in Gilroy, P., Grossberg, L. & McRobbie, A. (eds), *Without Guarantees: In Honour of Stuart Hall*, London: Verso

- Gilroy, P. (2004). *After empire: melancholia or convivial culture?*. London: Routledge.
- Gilroy, P. (2006). Multiculture in times of war: an inaugural lecture given at the London School of Economics. *Critical Quarterly*, 48(4), pp. 27-45.
- Giralt, R. M. (2013). Negotiating Ethnic Recognition Systems in the UK: the soft pan-ethnic identifications of Latin American migrants in the north of England. *Third World Quarterly*, 34(10).
- Goldsmiths, University of London (no date) *Critical Connections II* [online] Available at: <<https://goldsmithsmdst.wordpress.com/>> [Accessed 26 February 2017]
- Government of Brazil (2010a) *Brazilian Way of Life*. [online] Available at: <<http://www.brasil.gov.br/para/visit-and-live/brazilian-way-of-life>> [Accessed 27 September 2012].
- Government of Brazil (2010b) *Idioma*. [online] Available at: <<http://www.brasil.gov.br/sobre/o-brasil/estado-brasileiro>> [Accessed 19 November 2012].
- Greater London Authority (2013) *Diversity in London*, London: Greater London Authority
- Green, J. L., Skukauskaite, A., & Baker, W. D. (2012) 'Ethnography as epistemology'. *Research Methods and Methodologies in Education*, London: Sage. pp. 309-321
- Grosvenor, I. (1997) *Assimilating Identities: Racism and Educational Policy in Post 1945 Britain*. Dagenham: Lawrence & Wishart.
- Hall, S. (1992) 'New Ethnicities' in Donald, J. & Rattansi, A. (eds), *'Race', Culture and Difference*, London: Sage. pp. 252-259
- Hall, S. (1996) 'Introsuction: who needs "identity"', in Hall, S., & Du Gay, P. (Eds.) *Questions of Cultural Identity*, London: Sage. pp. 1-18
- Ham, A., Lobeck Kane, K., Butler, S., Thomas, K., Ranger, H., Wheeler, D., Murphy, A., Corne, L., Armstrong, K., Firestone, M., Bewer, T., Filou, E., Karlin, A., Masters, T., Carillet, J. B., Fitzpatrick, M., Bainbridge, J., Simmonds, N., Clammer, P. & Luckham, N. (1977/2010) *Lonely Planet: Africa*, London: Lonely Planet Publications
- Hamilton, R. G. (1975). *Voices from an empire: A history of Afro-Portuguese literature* (Vol. 8). University of Minnesota Press.
- Hamilton, R. G. (1991) 'Lusofonia, Africa, and Matters of Languages and Letters', *Hispania*, Vol. 74, No. 3, Special Issue Devoted to Luso-Brazilian Language, Literature, and Culture, pp. 610-617
- Hammersley, M. (2007) 'Reflections on linguistic ethnography', *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 11/5: pp. 689-695



- Hammersley, M. & Atkinson, P. (1983) *Ethnography: Principles in Practice, Second Edition*, London: Routledge
- Hammersley, M. & Traianou, A. (2012) Ethics and Educational Research, British Educational Research Association on-line resource. [online] Available at: <<http://www.bera.ac.uk/category/keywords/ethics>> [Accessed 11 December 2012].
- Harris, R. (1997) 'Romantic Bilingualism: Time for a Change?' in Leung, C. & Cable, C. *English as an Additional Language: Changing Perspectives*, London: NALDIC, pp. 14-27
- Harris, R. (2006) *New Ethnicities and Language Use*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan
- Harris, R. (2008) *Multilingualism, Community & Diaspora: A Discussion Paper*, International UCSIA workshop in the frame of the European Year of the Intercultural Dialogue Urban Multilingualism and Intercultural Communication University of Antwerp March 11th-12th 2008
- Harris, R. & Rampton, B. (2009) 'Ethnicities Without Guarantees: An Empirical Approach' in Wetherell, M. (ed.) *Identity in the 21st Century*. Houndmills, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan. pp. 95-119
- Hayes, C. (1927) 'Contributions of Herder to the Doctrine of Nationalism' *The American Historical Review*, Vol. 32, No. 4 (Jul., 1927), pp. 719-736
- Heath, S., Charles, V., Crow, G., & Wiles, R. (2007) 'Informed consent, gatekeepers and go-betweens: negotiating consent in child- and young-orientated institutions', *British Educational Research Journal*, 33 (3), pp. 403-417.
- Heller, M. (2007) 'Bilingualism as ideology and practice' in Heller, M. (ed.) *Bilingualism: A Social Approach*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan. pp. 1-22
- Heller, M. (2010). *Paths to post-nationalism: A critical ethnography of language and identity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hennessy, A. (2016) 'Amir Khan can only embrace his Pakistani identity because he's climbed the greasy class pole', *Independent*. [online]. Available at: <<http://www.independent.co.uk/voices/amir-khan-can-only-now-embrace-his-pakistani-identity-because-he-s-climbed-the-class-totem-pole-a7063226.html>> [Accessed 5 February 2017].
- Hewitt, R. (1986) *White Talk Black Talk*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Hewitt, R. (2003) 'Language, Youth and the Destabilisation of Ethnicity' in Harris, R. & Rampton, B. (eds), *The Language, Ethnicity and Race Reader*, London: Routledge. pp. 188-198
- Hewitt, R. (2005) *White Backlash and the Politics of Multiculturalism*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Hey, V. (1997) *The company she keeps: an ethnography of girls' friendship*. Buckingham: Open University Press

- Holehouse, H. (2014) 'Children should learn British values such as freedom and tolerance, says David Cameron', *The Telegraph*. [online]. Available at: <<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/education/educationnews/10890776/Children-should-learn-British-values-such-as-freedom-and-tolerance-says-David-Cameron.html>> [Accessed 5 February 2017].
- Holloway, W. & Jefferson, T. (2000) *Doing Qualitative Research Differently: free association, narrative and the interview method*. London: Sage.
- Holmes, S. (2015) 'Promoting multilingual creativity: Key principles from successful projects', *Working Papers in Urban Language & Literacies*, Paper 182.
- Hymes, D. (1964) 'Introduction: Toward Ethnographies of Communication', *American Anthropologist*, 66(6), pp. 1-34
- Hymes, D. (1996). *Ethnography, Linguistics, Narrative Inequality: toward an understanding of voice*. London: Taylor and Francis
- Ifekwunigwe, J. (2003) 'Scattered Belongings: Reconstructing the 'African' in the English-African Diaspora' in Koser, K. (Ed.) *New African Diasporas*, London: Routledge. pp. 56-70
- Inner London Education Authority (1979) *Report on the 1978 Census of those ILEA pupils for whom English was not a first language*. London: ILEA
- International Organisation for Migration (2006a) *Angola Mapping Exercise*, London: International Organisation for Migration UK
- International Organisation for Migration (2006b) *Mozambique Mapping Exercise*, London: International Organisation for Migration UK
- Íssa, T. (2008) 'Multiculturalism and Inter-Group Dynamics: Language, Culture, and Identity of Turkish-Speaking Youth in the UK' in Lytra, V. & Jørgensen, J. (eds.) (2008) *Multilingualism and Identities Across Contexts: Cross-disciplinary perspectives on Turkish-speaking youth in Europe*, Copenhagen: University of Copenhagen, Faculty of the Humanities. pp. 151-177
- Januario, I. (2003) 'Don Quixote and the windmills of social class and ethnic origin: community attempts to improve the situation of Portuguese-Canadian students in Ontario schools' in Abreu, G., Cline, T., & Lambert, H. (2003). *The Education of Portuguese Children in Britain: Insights from Research and Practice in England and Overseas*. Luton: Department of Psychology, University of Luton. 159-178.
- Jørgensen, J.N. (2008) 'Polylingual Linguaging Around and Among Children and Adolescents', *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 5:3, pp. 161-176
- Jørgensen, J. N., Karrebæk, M. S., Madsen, L. M., & Møller, J. S. (2011). Polylinguaging in superdiversity. *Diversities*, 13(2), pp. 23-37.
- Joseph, J. (2004) 'Language and Politics' in Davies, A. & Elder, C. (eds.) *The handbook of Applied Linguistics*, Oxford: Blackwell. pp. 347-366
- Kamberelis, G. & Dimitriadis, G. (2005) *Qualitative Inquiry: Approaches to language and literacy research*, New York: Teachers College Press

Kassovitz (1995) *La Haine* [Film] France: Canal+.

Keating, M.C. (2005) 'The Person in the Doing: Negotiating the Experience of Self' in Barton, D. & Tusting, K. (eds.), *Beyond Communities of Practice: Language, Power, and Social Context*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. pp. 105-138

Keating, C., Solovova, O. & Barradas, O. (2014) 'Migrations, multilingualism and language policies in Portugal and the United Kingdom: a polycentric approach', in Moita-Lopes, L. P. (ed.) *Global Portuguese: Linguistic ideologies in late modernity* (Vol. 8). London: Routledge. pp. 144-162

Klimt, A. (2000): 'Enacting national selves: Authenticity, adventure, and disaffection in the Portuguese Diaspora', *Identities: Global Studies in Culture and Power* 6,40: pp. 513-550

Knowles, C. (2013) 'Nigerian London: re-mapping space and ethnicity in superdiverse cities', *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 36:4, pp. 651-669

Kroskrity, P. (2000) 'Regimenting Languages: Language Ideological Perspectives' in Kroskrity, P. (ed.) *Regimes of Language: Ideologies, Politics, and Identities*, Oxford: James Currey. 1-34

Lam, V. & Scott, G (2009) 'African and Caribbean adolescents in Britain: ethnic identity and Britishness', *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 32:7, pp. 1248-1270

Lambeth Education (2015) *Language diversity in Lambeth schools*, London: Lambeth Education, Research and Statistics Unit

Lareau, A. (1996) 'Common Problems in Field Work: A Personal Essay', in Lareau, A., Shultz, J., and Shultz, J. J. *Journeys through ethnography: Realistic accounts of fieldwork*. Oxford: Westview Press pp. 195-236

Lave, J. & Wenger, E. (1991) *Situated Learning: Legitimate peripheral participation*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Lemos Martins, M. (2004) 'Lusotropicalismo e Lusofonia. Equívocos e possibilidades de dois conceitos hiper-identitários'. Universidade do Minho, Centro de Estudos de Comunicação e Sociedade, 10<sup>th</sup> Congresso Brasileiro de Língua Portuguesa: Lusofonia. São Paulo, Brazil 28<sup>th</sup> April – 1<sup>st</sup> may 2004. Braga, Universidade do Minho.

Leung, C. (2001) 'English as an Additional Language: Distinct Language Focus or Diffused Curriculum Concerns?', *Language and Education*, 15: 1, pp. 33-55

Lewis, M. P. (ed.), (2009) *Ethnologue: Languages of the World, Sixteenth edition*. Dallas, Tex.: SIL International. Online version: <http://www.ethnologue.com/>.

Lewis, A., and Lindsay, G. (2000) 'Emerging issues' in Lewis, A. & Lindsay, G. (eds) *Researching Children's Perspectives*, Buckingham: Open University Press. 189-197

Li, W. & Zhu, H. (2013). 'Translanguaging identities and ideologies: Creating transnational space through flexible multilingual practices amongst Chinese university students in the UK'. *Applied linguistics*, amt022.

Linguistic Minorities Project (1985) *The Other Languages of England*, London: Routledge & Kegan Paul plc

Little, A. (2016) 'UK 'can no longer duck the issue of immigration', says social policy expert', *Sunday Express*. [online] 6 December. Available at: < <http://www.express.co.uk/news/uk/740172/Immigration-UK-issues-report-ethnic-minority>> [Accessed 12 February 2017].

*Local Government Act 1966*. (c.42), London: HMSO.

Lytra, V., & Baraç, T. (2009). 'Multilingual practices and identity negotiations among Turkish-speaking young people in a diasporic context' in Stenström, A. B., & Jørgensen, A. M. (Eds.). *Youngspeak in a multilingual perspective* (Vol. 184). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing. pp. 55-78,

Lytra, V. & Baraç, T. with Creese, A., Bhatt, A., Blackledge, A., Hamid, S., Wei, L., Martin, P., Wu, C. & Yağcıoğlu-Ali, D. (2008) 'Language Practices, Language Ideologies and Identity Construction in London Turkish Complementary Schools', in Lytra, V. & Jørgensen, J. (eds.) (2008) *Multilingualism and Identities Across Contexts: Cross-disciplinary perspectives on Turkish-speaking youth in Europe*, Copenhagen: University of Copenhagen, Faculty of the Humanities. pp. 15-43

Macedo, H. (2001) 'Portugal: The New Frontier' in Rodríguez de Laguna, A. ed. (2001), *Global Impact of the Portuguese Language*, London: Transaction Publishers. pp. 3-10

Macpherson, W. (1999) *The Stephen Lawrence Inquiry – report of an inquiry by Sir William Macpherson of Cluny, advised by Tom Cook, the Rt Rev John Sentamu, Richard Stone; presented to Parliament by the Secretary of State for the Home Department by Command of Her Majesty*, London: Stationery Office.

Mar-Molinero, V. (2010) 'Family and Transmission: Collective Memory in Identification Practices of Madeirans on Jersey' *Portuguese Studies* vol. 26 no. 1 (2010), pp. 94–110

Martins, V. (2010) 'CPLP and the Politics of Language', IPRIS Lusophone Countries Bulletin, 9, July 2010, pp. 11-12

Massini-Cagliari, G. (2004). 'Language policy in Brazil: Monolingualism and linguistic Prejudice', *Language Policy*, 3, pp. 3–23.

Mattos e Silva, R. V. (1988) 'Diversidade e Unidade: A Aventura Linguística do Português' *Revista ICALP*, vol. 11, Março de 1988, pp. 60-72

McDonald, F. (ed.) (1997/2012) *Eyewitness Travel: Portugal*, London: Dorling Kindersley

McKenley, J., Power, C., Ishani, L., and Demie, F. (2003). *Raising the achievement of black Caribbean pupils: Good practice in Lambeth schools*. London: Lambeth Education Research and Statistics Unit.

Meissner, F., & Vertovec, S. (2014). Comparing super-diversity. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, (ahead-of-print), pp. 541-555.

- Millward, D. (2000) 'Spectre of racism between Africans and Caribbeans' *The Telegraph*, [online] 2 December. Available at: <<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/uknews/1376574/Spectre-of-racism-between-Africans-and-Caribbeans.html>> [Accessed 21 February 2016].
- Modood, T. (1994) 'Political Blackness and British Asians' *Sociology* 28: pp. 859-876
- Moita-Lopes, L. P. (2014a) 'Linguistic Ideology: How Portuguese is being discursively constructed in Late Modernity', in Moita-Lopes, L. P. (ed.) *Global Portuguese: Linguistic ideologies in late modernity* (Vol. 8). London: Routledge. pp. 1-26
- Moita-Lopes, L. P. (2014b) 'Portuguese as a communicative resource in a globalized world: the how and why of new directions in theory-building', in Moita-Lopes, L. P. (ed.) *Global Portuguese: Linguistic ideologies in late modernity* (Vol. 8). London: Routledge. pp. 87-104
- Monbiot, G. (2013) 'Bono can't help Africans by stealing their voice' *The Guardian*, [online] 17 June. Available at: <<http://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2013/jun/17/bono-africans-stealing-voice-poor>> [Accessed 20 February 2016].
- Mullard, C. (1986). *Pluralism, Ethnicism and Ideology: implications for a transformative pedagogy*. Centre for Race and Ethnic Studies, University of Amsterdam.
- Müller de Oliveira, G. (2014) 'Language policy and globalization: the Portuguese language in the Twenty-First Century', in Moita-Lopes, L. P. (ed.) *Global Portuguese: Linguistic ideologies in late modernity* (Vol. 8). London: Routledge. pp. 27-46
- Nandi, A. & Platt, L. (2012) 'Developing ethnic identity questions for *Understanding Society*', *Longitudinal and Life Course Studies*, 3:1. pp. 80-100
- National Association for Language Development in the Curriculum [NALDIC] (2011) *Languages in schools*, [online] Available at: <<http://www.naldic.org.uk/research-and-information/eal-statistics/lang>> [Accessed 19 February 2017].
- National Union of Teachers [NUT] (2007) *Born to be Great: A Charter on Promoting the Achievement of Black Caribbean Boys*. London: NUT
- Nava, M. (2007). *Visceral Cosmopolitanism: Gender, Culture and the Normalisation of Difference*. Oxford: Berg.
- Neves Cardoso, C. M. (1998): The Colonialist View of the African-origin 'Other' in Portuguese Society and its Education System, *Race Ethnicity and Education*, 1:2, pp. 191-206
- Nogueira, O. (1985). *Tanto preto quanto branco: estudos de relações raciais* (Vol. 9). Ta Queiroz.
- Nogueira, M. J. & Porteous, D. (2003) 'The socio-cultural characteristics and needs of a Portuguese community in South London' in Abreu, G., Cline, T., & Lambert,

- H. (2003). *The Education of Portuguese Children in Britain: Insights from Research and Practice in England and Overseas*. Luton: Department of Psychology, University of Luton. pp. 51-74.
- Nogueira, M. J., Porteous, D., & Guerreiro, S. (2015). *The Portuguese-speaking community in Lambeth: a scoping study*. London: The London Community Foundation
- Nicholas, J. (1994) *Language Diversity Surveys as Agents of Change*, Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd
- Oakley, A. (1991) 'Interviewing women: a contradiction of terms', in H. Roberts (ed.) *Doing Feminist Research*, London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Office for National Statistics (2012) *Population by Country of Birth and Nationality Datasheets January 2011 to December 2011*. [online] ONS. Available at: <<http://www.ons.gov.uk/ons/rel/migration1/migration-statistics-quarterly-report/august-2012/population-by-country-of-birth-and-nationality-datasets.xls>> [Accessed 19 February 2017]
- Okamoto, D.G. (2003) 'Toward a theory of panethnicity: explaining Asian American collective action', *American Sociological Review*, 68(6), pp. 811–842.
- Ornelas, J. (2001) 'Construction of Identity in Portuguese Contemporary Narrative' in Rodríguez de Laguna, A. ed. (2001), *Global Impact of the Portuguese Language*, London: Transaction Publishers. pp. 145-165
- Otsuji, E., & Pennycook, A. (2010). Metrolingualism: Fixity, fluidity and language in flux. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 7(3), pp. 240-254.
- Panayi, P. (2010) *An Immigration History of Britain: Multicultural Racism since 1800*, Edinburgh: Pearson Education Limited
- Phillips, M. & Phillips, T. (1998), *Windrush: the irresistible rise of multi-racial Britain*, London: Harper Collins
- Piel, J. M. (1989) *Estudos de Linguística Histórica Galego-Portuguesa*, Lisboa, IN-CM,
- Pieterse, J. N. (2001). Hybridity, so what? The anti-hybridity backlash and the riddles of recognition. *Theory, Culture & Society*, 18(2-3), pp. 219-245.
- Pinto, J.P. (2014) 'From prefigured speaker identities to the disinvention of Portuguese', in Moita-Lopes, L. P. (ed.) *Global Portuguese: Linguistic ideologies in late modernity* (Vol. 8). London: Routledge. pp. 105-123
- Pinto, P. F. (2008) *Política de Língua na Democracia Portuguesa (1974-2004)*, Ph. D. Open University of Portugal. Available at: <<http://hdl.handle.net/10400.2/1141>> [Accessed 19 February 2017].
- Potter, J. & Wetherell, M. (1987) *Discourse and Social Psychology: Beyond Attitudes and Behaviour*. London: Sage Publications Ltd.
- Qualifications and Curriculum Authority (2000) *A language in common: Assessing English as an additional language*. London: QCA

- Quist, P., & Jørgensen, J. N. (2007). 14. Crossing–negotiating social boundaries. *Handbook of multilingualism and multilingual communication*, 5, p. 371
- Race Relations (Amendment) Act (2000) (c.2) London: HMSO
- Rampton, B. (1991) ‘Interracial Panjabi in a British adolescent peer group’, *Language in society*, 20(3), pp. 391-422.
- Rampton, B. (1995a) *Crossing: Language and Ethnicity Among Adolescents*, London: Longman
- Rampton, B. (1995b) ‘Language Crossing and the Problematisation of Ethnicity and Socialisation’. *Pragmatics* 5. pp. 485-513
- Rampton, B. (2007) ‘Neo-Hymesian linguistic ethnography in the United Kingdom’. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 11(5), pp. 584-607
- Rampton, B. (2009) ‘Interaction ritual and not just artful performance in crossing and stylization’, *Language in Society*, 38(02), pp. 149-176.
- Rampton, B. (2011a) ‘Style contrasts, migration and social class’. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 43(5), pp.1236-1250.
- Rampton, B. (2011b). From ‘multi-ethnic adolescent heteroglossia’ to ‘contemporary urban vernaculars’. *Language & Communication*, 31(4), pp. 276-294.
- Rampton, B. (2013). Drilling down to the grain in superdiversity. *Working Papers in Urban Language & Literacies*, Paper 98.
- Rampton, B. (2014) ‘Conviviality and phatic communication?’ *Working Papers in Urban Language & Literacies*, Paper 140.
- Rampton, B. (2015). Conviviality and phatic communion?. *Multilingual Margins*, 83.
- Rampton, B., Blommaert, J., Arnaut, K. & Spotti, M. (2015) ‘Superdiversity and sociolinguistics’. *Working Papers in Urban Language & Literacies*, Paper 152.
- Rampton, B., Harris, R. & Leung, C. (2007) ‘Education and languages other than English’ in Britain, D. (ed.), *Language in the British Isles*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. pp. 417-435
- Rampton, B., Tusting, K., Maybin, J., Barwell, R., Creese, A. & Lytra, V., (2004) ‘UK linguistic ethnography: A discussion paper’. Unpublished, [www.ling-ethnog.org.uk](http://www.ling-ethnog.org.uk).
- Ratcliffe, P. (1996) ‘Introduction: social geography and ethnicity: a theoretical, conceptual and substantive overview’, in P. Ratcliffe (ed.), *Ethnicity in the 1991 Census: Volume Three: Social Geography and Ethnicity in Britain: Geographical Spread, Spatial Concentration and Internal Migration*, London: HMSO, pp. 1-22

- Rattansi, A. & Phoenix, A. (2005) 'Rethinking Youth Identities: Modernist and Postmodernist Frameworks', *Identity: An International Journal of Theory and Research*, 5:2, pp. 97-123
- Rebello, H. (2015) 'Acerca da Prosódia nas Ilhas Madeirenses'. *Estudos em variação geoprosódica*, Aveiro: Universidade de Aveiro. pp. 53-78.
- Reeve -Lewis, B. (2013) 'Immigration checks will exclude ethnic minorities from renting', *The Guardian*. [online] 16 October. Available at: <<https://www.theguardian.com/housing-network/2013/oct/16/immigration-checks-landlords-ethnic-minorities>> [Accessed 12 February 2017].
- Reid, E. (1984) 'The newer minorities: spoken languages and varieties' in Trudgill, P. ed. (1984), *Language in the British Isles*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. pp. 408-24
- Reynolds, R. D. J. (2006) *Jabari: Authentic Jamaican Dictionary of the Jamaic Language; Featuring Jamaican Patwa and Rasta Iyaric Pronunciations and Definitions*. Waterbury, Connecticut: Around the Way Books.
- Ribeiro, L. (2007) 'Supporting Portuguese-speaking pupils in Lambeth primary schools' in *Community Languages Bulletin*, issue 20, London: CILT. p. 5
- Ribeiro, M. C. (2002) 'Empire, Colonial Wars and Post-Colonialism in the Portuguese Contemporary Imagination', *Portuguese Studies*, Vol. 18, pp. 132-214
- Rodrigues, A. (1996) 'As línguas gerais sul-americanas', *PAPIA: Revista Brasileira de Estudos Crioulos e Similares*, v.4, n.2, p.6-18, [online] Available at: <<http://abecs.net/ojs/index.php/papia/article/view/143/210>> [Accessed 19 November 2012].
- Rodríguez de Laguna, A. (2001) 'Introduction' in Rodríguez de Laguna, A. ed. (2001), *Global Impact of the Portuguese Language*, London: Transaction Publishers. pp. xiii-xxii
- Rosen, H. & Burgess, T. (1980) *Languages and Dialects of London School Children*, London: Ward Lock Educational
- Rubinstein-Avila, E. (2002) 'Problematizing the "Dual" in a Dual-Immersion Program: A Portrait', *Linguistics and Education* 13(1): pp. 65-87
- Santarita, P. & Martin-Jones, M. (1991) 'The Portuguese speech community' in Alladina, S. & Edwards, V. (eds.), *Multilingualism in the British Isles: The Older Mother Tongues and Europe*, London: Longman Group UK Ltd. pp. 228-240
- Schwartzman, S. (1999). Fora de foco: diversidade e identidades étnicas no Brasil. *Novos Estudos CEBRAP*, 55, pp. 83-96.
- Seabra, P. & Gorjão, P. (2011) 'Intertwined Paths: Portugal and Rising Angola', *South African Institute of International Affairs, South African Foreign Policy and African Drivers Programme, Occasional Paper No 89*
- Sewell, T. (1997). *Black Masculinities and Schooling. How Black Boys Survive Modern Schooling*. Stoke on Trent: Trentham Books Ltd.



- Sheringham, O. (2010) 'A Transnational Space? Transnational Practices, Place-Based Identity and the Making of 'Home' among Brazilians in Gort, Ireland' *Portuguese Studies* vol. 26 no. 1 (2010), pp. 60–78
- Sidaway, J. D. & Power, M. (2005) 'The Tears of Portugal': empire, identity, 'race', and destiny in Portuguese geopolitical narratives' *Environment and Planning: Society and Space* volume 23, pp. 527-554
- Silverstein, M. (2013). How language communities intersect: Is "superdiversity" an incremental or transformative condition. In *Plenary lecture, international conference on Language and Super-diversity: Explorations and Interrogations, University of Jyväskylä*.
- Skidmore, T. (2003) 'Racial Mixture and Affirmative Action: The Cases of Brazil and the United States', *The American Historical Review*, Vol. 108, No. 5 (December 2003), pp. 1391-1396
- Souza, A. (2006) "'Should I speak English or Portuguese?": Ethnic and Social Identity Construction in the Language Choices of Brazilian Mothers and their Mixed-Heritage Children at Home and in a Community Language School in the UK', Unpublished PhD thesis, Goldsmiths College University of London.
- Souza, A. (2008) 'How linguistic and cultural identities are effected by migration' in *Language Issues*, Vol 19, no 1, pp. 36-42
- Souza, A. (2010) 'Migrant Languages in a Multi-Ethnic Scenario: Brazilian Portuguese-Speakers in London' *Portuguese Studies* vol. 26 no. 1 (2010), pp. 79–93
- Spindler, G. & Spindler, L. (1982) 'Roger Harkes and Schönhausen: from the familiar to the strange and back', in Spindler, G. (ed.) *Doing the Ethnography of Schooling: Education Anthropology in Action*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston. pp. 20-47
- Spivak, G. C. (1987) 'Scattered speculations on the question of value', in *In Other Worlds: Essays in Cultural Politics*, New York: Methuen.
- Spivak, G. C. (1990) 'The new historicism: political commitment and the postmodern critic', in Harasym, S. (ed.) *The Post-Colonial Critic*, London: Routledge
- St Louis, R., Chandler, G., Clark, G., Dowl, A., Gleeson, B., Landon, R., Raub, K. & Smith, P. (1989/2010) *Lonely Planet: Brazil*, London: Lonely Planet Publications
- St Louis, R., Armstrong, K., Clark, G. & Skolnick, A. (1997/2011) *Lonely Planet: Portugal*, London: Lonely Planet Publications
- Stenning, A., Champion, T., Conway, C., Coombes, M., Dawley, S., Dixon, L., Raybould, S., & Richardson, R. (2006). *Assessing the local and regional impacts of international migration: Final report of a research project for the Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG), formerly the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister (ODPM)*. Newcastle Upon Tyne: Centre for Urban and Regional Studies.

- Stephen Spender Trust (2016) *Translation Nation* [online] Available at: [http://www.stephen-spender.org/translation\\_nation.html](http://www.stephen-spender.org/translation_nation.html) [Accessed 26 February 2017]
- Straubhaar, J. (2013) 'Desire for shared cultural experience'. *BRICS and their Evolving Role in Developing Media Markets*, p. 61
- Street, B. (1993) 'Culture is a Verb: Anthropological aspects of language and cultural process' in Graddol, D. (ed.) *Language and Culture*, Clevedon: Multilingual Matters/BAAL. pp. 23-43
- Stronach, I. & Maclure, M. (1997) *Educational Research Undone: The Postmodern Embrace*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Stroud, C. (2007) 'Bilingualism: colonialism and postcolonialism' in Heller, M. (ed.) *Bilingualism: A Social Approach*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan. pp. 25-49
- Taylor, M. (1981) *Caught Between: a Review of Research into the Education of Pupils of West Indian Origin*. London: NFER-Nelson
- Thorne, T. (2014). *Dictionary of contemporary slang*. London: Bloomsbury.
- Tomlinson, S. (1983) *Ethnic Minorities in British Schools: A Review of the Literature, 1960-82*. London: Heinemann
- Troyna, B. (1985). The great divide: policies and practices in multicultural education. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 6(2), pp. 209-224.
- Troyna, B. (1987). Beyond Multiculturalism: towards the enactment of anti-racist education in policy, provision and pedagogy [1]. *Oxford Review of Education*, 13(3), pp. 307-320.
- Turismo de Portugal (2008) *Culture*. [online] Available at: <http://www.visitportugal.com/NR/exeres/382AD86C-3912-4735-A9D6-EDD19F618E9A,frameless.htm> [Accessed 19 February 2017].
- United Nations Population Fund (2008) 'State of World Population 2008' *Reaching Common Ground: Culture, Gender and Human Rights*, New York: United Nations Population Fund
- Van der Aa, J. & Blommaert, J. (2015) 'Ethnographic monitoring and the study of complexity' *Working Papers in Urban Language & Literacies*, Paper 150
- Vertovec, S. (1999): *Conceiving and researching transnationalism*, *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 22:2, pp. 447-462
- Vertovec, S. (2007) 'Super-diversity and its implications', *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 30:6, pp. 1024-1054
- Vertovec, S. (2010). Towards post-multiculturalism? Changing communities, conditions and contexts of diversity. *International social science journal*, 61(199), pp. 83-95.

- Werbner, P. (2004). Theorising complex diasporas: purity and hybridity in the South Asian public sphere in Britain. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 30(5), pp. 895-911.
- Werbner, P. (2010). 'Complex Diasporas', in Knott, K., & McLoughlin, S. (Eds.). *Diasporas: Concepts, intersections, identities*. London: Zed Books.
- Wessendorf, S. (2013). Commonplace diversity and the 'ethos of mixing': perceptions of difference in a London neighbourhood. *Identities*, 20(4), pp. 407-422.
- Wherritt, I. (1989) 'Portuguese Language Shift: About Town in Goa, India', *Hispania*, Vol. 72, No. 2, pp. 385-391
- Wikitravel (2012a) *Angola*. [online] Available at: <<http://wikitravel.org/en/Angola>> [Accessed 19 February 2017].
- Wikitravel (2012b) *Brazil*. [online] Available at: <<http://wikitravel.org/en/Brazil>> [Accessed 19 February 2017].
- Woods, P. (1986) *Inside Schools: Ethnography in Educational Research*. London: Routledge.
- Yorke, G. (1999) 'Bible Translation and Language Use in Lusophone Africa: The Case of Mozambique', *Language Matters: Studies in the Languages of Africa*, 30:1, pp. 131-144
- Youdell, D. (2003). 'Identity traps or how black students fail: The interactions between biographical, sub-cultural, and learner identities'. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 24(1), pp. 3-20.
- Your Boy Mcleon (2014) *How To - West African Accents*. [video online] Available at: <<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=9gI8UtPvzeU>> [Accessed 18 February 2017].
- Zúquete, J. P. (2008) 'Beyond Reform: The Orthographic Accord and the Future of the Portuguese Language', *South European Society and Politics*, 13:4, pp. 495-506