Foreword: Linguistic Citizenship – Unlabelled Forerunners and Recent Trajectories

Kenneth Hyltenstam and Caroline Kerfoot

Introduced at the turn of the millennium, the term 'Linguistic Citizenship' (Stroud, 2001) now has a history of almost 20 years. The thinking behind the term, however, has a much longer record. There were many forerunners in Christopher Stroud's work, which, when viewed in retrospect, all reveal the kernel of concern with the role of language – and representations of language – in the production of marginalized, vulnerable and silenced voices that is at the centre of Linguistic Citizenship.

The thinking and research focus building up to the final coinage of the term emerged and were developed successively over an extended time in a seemingly heterogeneous medley of applied research areas. This can be seen in several of Christopher Stroud's diverse contributions to linguistics over the decades before 2000. They include themes, topics and agents as varied as those implicated by the following list of issues: a conceptual critique of the notion of semilingualism (Stroud, 1978); communicative practices in schizophrenia (Stroud, ms., nd.); communicative agency in bilingual dementia (Hyltenstam & Stroud, 1989); the intention and meaning of Taiap/Tok Pisin code-switching in Gapun, an isolated small village in Papua New Guinea (Stroud, 1992); patterns of literacy in Gapun (Kulick & Stroud, 1990); language shift and maintenance in the Swedish-Saami context (Hyltenstam & Stroud, 1991; Hyltenstam *et al*., 1999); the use of African languages in education in Mozambique (Stroud & Tuzine, 1998), a large-scale sociolinguistic review of oral Portuguese in Maputo, Mozambique (Gonçalves & Stroud, 1999, 2002; Stroud & Gonçalves, 1997a, 1997b, 2000); the ideology and political rhetoric about Portuguese in Mozambican language policy and planning (Stroud, 1999); English in Singapore (summarized later in Stroud & Wee, 2012). This seemingly heterogeneity of topics, spanning linguistic/communicative pathologies and Melanesian sociolinguistics to Nordic language politics, Singaporean

multilingualism and Southern African educational linguistics is linked by aspects that are inherent components in the idea of Linguistic Citizenship: they all address linguistic manifestations of vulnerability, and they are all concerned with various degrees of lack of agency, with unheard voices, with the dominated constituency in unbalanced power relationships. Although the contexts are spread around the world, they illustrate the North–South relationship, many of them long before this distinction had entered the academic discourse. The diverse observations made and analyses undertaken in these heterogeneous areas have in different ways contributed to dense theorization through the introduction of the notion of Linguistic Citizenship. Trying to be more concrete, we will briefly review how some of these themes, which, together with the choice and variety of data on which they are based, can be seen as forerunners of Linguistic Citizenship theory development.

The first example is one of Christopher Stroud's earliest publications, if not the first one. Stroud (1978) was one of the early critics of the notion of semilingualism, which had gained wide currency in Scandinavian academia and beyond only 10 years after its introduction to a wider audience in a book with the title *Tvåspråkighet eller halvspråkighet?* [*Bilingualism or semilingualism?*] (Hansegård, 1968). Hansegård defined semilingualism as the unfavourable linguistic (and psychological) consequences of an early deprivation of the native language, and he used the term double semilingualism for 'a semi-command of Swedish [the second language] and a semi-command of the mother tongue [the first language]' (Hansegård, 1968: 128). In a multilayered analysis of the concept from both cognitive and sociolinguistic perspectives, Stroud notes that the concept lacks reliable empirical evidence. However, the main point of the analysis deals with the widespread use of the term semilingual in society at large and the stigma it attaches to individuals labelled as semilinguals. Similar critiques were aired a few years later when the notion of semilingualism had gone global via its spread to Canada and the US (see e.g. Martin-Jones & Romaine, 1986; see also Salö & Karlander, this volume). As a typical concept of deficit with an unclear definition and inadequate empirical basis, it created harmful consequences in terms of low expectations of academic success, high expectations of psychological difficulties, and even criminality. Revealing such serious consequences of a linguistic label is, indeed, compatible with a Linguistic Citizenship perspective.

A second example is that of Taiap/Tok Pisin code-switching in Gapun, as noted above, a small village in Papua New Guinea (Stroud, 1992). Taiap is the traditionally spoken language of Gapun, at the time of analysis actively used by fewer than the approximately 100 inhabitants of the village; as of 1987, no child under the age of 10 actively spoke Taiap (Kulick, 1992: 7). It is classified as an isolate Papuan language, probably belonging to the Sepic-Ramu phylum. Tok Pisin is the most widely spoken language in Papua New Guinea and also the official language of the

country together with English and Hiri Motu. Stroud (1992) presents an analysis of a long talk given by a male villager to an audience in one of the 'men's houses', where the 'orator' throughout the talk intricately switches between the two languages. It can be understood that the speaker needs some help in organizing a burial ceremony, but this request is expressed extremely implicitly and indirectly, among other things, with many seeming contradictions. Parts of the talk are verbatim repetitions in each language of the same content. The context for this is the fact that in a Melanesian egalitarian society like the one under study, 'no relationship, not even that between adult and child, is understood by villagers to involve the legitimate power to order another person to do something against his or her will' (Stroud, 1992: 9). So why is it that the speaker uses all his linguistic repertoires in this instance? The study highlights a context where language is not primarily seen as a reflection of a person's individual thoughts or intentions, where meaning is constructed collectively, where some meanings are hidden, and where consensus is the overriding principle. It concludes that 'Western' perspectives where meaning is attached to individual code-switches cannot be applied to this context. The analysis further underscores the implausibility that sociolinguistic accounts of code-switching prevalent at the time which assumed that 'members of a bilingual speech community attach different identities, rights and obligations to each of their languages' (Stroud, 1992: 5) would give a reasonable insight into why Taiap/Tok Pisin code-switching occurs in this talk. The analysis is an example of the tenet held in a Linguistic Citizenship perspective that southern realities become invisible and deformed when analyzed with northern tools, an early example of identifying the effects of 'research through imperial eyes' (Smith, 1999: 42). It also contributes to challenging the adequacy of these very tools even for northern contexts.

The final example comes from a set of studies of communication disorders in bilinguals diagnosed with Alzheimer's dementia carried out in Stockholm in the 1980s. People suffering from dementia constitute a communicatively marginalized group generally, but aging migrants in this category, increasing in number along with the ever-growing migration flows, are especially defenseless because they are often dependent on interlocutors of their second language, a language that has been shown to be more vulnerable in dementia than a first language, even in cases where the second language has dominated their communicative interaction during most of their adult lives. For example, in Hyltenstam and Stroud (1989), which is a detailed case study, it was shown that GM, a German L1/Swedish L2 bilingual, had more topic-focused contributions, had fewer lexical search problems, used more relevant second-pair turns and more often complied with communicative task demands in conversations with a German-speaking interlocutor than in conversations with a Swedish-speaking interlocutor. Particularly interesting was the fact that GM never

slipped into the other language (Swedish) in interaction with his German interlocutor. With the Swedish interlocutor this happened frequently. This is an obvious case where the potential agency of this category of speakers is systematically stronger in conversations with speakers of their first language, a condition to which they are in many cases denied access. Revealing such patterns is, again, an example of demonstrating obvious contextual requirements necessary for empowering marginalized groups and individuals, clearly a forerunner to Linguistic Citizenship.

The first explicit mention of Linguistic Citizenship, uniting a complex set of ideas as it does, came out of work in the late 1990s that attempted to delve into the factors behind the differential successes of bilingual and mother-tongue programmes in countries of the South (Stroud, 2001, 2003). This work showed contradictory results: programmes that operated under seemingly comparable conditions 'resulted in very dissimilar outcomes in different contexts' (Stroud, 2018: 18). A closer look, however, revealed that the failure of many programmes in reaching their goals 'could be traced to the more or less complete absence of indigenous and local participation in areas of curriculum design, materials development etc.' (Stroud, 2002: 82) and that solutions developed with strong parental participation by Western elites, such as Canadian immersion or European Union bilingual school models, were not considered viable in 'developing' contexts. This strong support for grassroots points of view is embedded in Linguistic Citizenship and has been presented as paradigmatically opposed to the Linguistic Human Rights perspective. The differences between the two have been discussed in terms of agency, language vs. repertoires, recognized vs. non-recognized varieties, etc. (Stroud, 2001, 2009; Stroud & Heugh, 2004). The links between multilingualism, marginalization and vulnerability were further developed in the early 2000s, emphasizing that a lack of recognition for local linguistic resources has a direct bearing on political, economic and social participation, along with other dimensions of well-being such as health (Hyltenstam & Stroud, 2016 [2002]).

It was this encounter with the realities of the global and metaphorical South which came to have – and continues to have – a catalytic influence on the subsequent development of the notion of Linguistic Citizenship as a contribution to a theory of critical multilingualism and to a decolonial sociolinguistics. From its early formulation, with a significant contribution from Kathleen Heugh's work on South African language politics and practices (see Heugh, 2003), Linguistic Citizenship carried a critique of the legitimacy of 'majority speaking, official-language society's validation of language practices solely in terms of the formal, public sphere and a systemic construct of language' (Stroud & Heugh, 2004: 214). An illustrative example is an analysis of how Mozambican women street vendors used multilingual repertoires to negotiate a political position in the first general elections (Stroud, 2004). Increasingly, attention has focused on how encounters across difference are mediated linguistically to offer a space for

interrupting colonial relationships (e.g. Stroud & Williams, 2017). This work focuses on the manifold ways in which alternative voices can be inserted into processes and structures, especially those dominated by the 'zombie discourses' (Bock & Stroud, 2018) of a racialized past. Stroud and Guissemo (2017: 42) illustrate how the lingering effects of colonial social logics on postcolonial realities dictates that African languages in Mozambique 'dwell either in the past or in the future, but never in the present', an observation that applies to many other Southern sites. Linguistic Citizenship, however, highlights the importance of practices where speakers exercise control over the languages in their repertoires, however fleetingly, seizing the opportunity to forge decolonial subjectivities and articulate claims for justice from new spaces (Peck & Stroud, 2015; Stroud, 2016; Stroud & Jegels, 2014; Stroud & Mpendukana, 2009; Williams & Stroud, 2014). Where liberal perspectives on multilingualism allow other languages a space within existing frameworks of experience, Linguistic Citizenship seeks to rupture colonial regimes of language by building 'an inclusiveness of voice in ways that repair and rejuvenate relationships to self and others' (Stroud, 2018: 36), thus opening the possibility of a restorative mutuality.

Alongside this focus on non-institutionalized sites of activity, the potential of Linguistic Citizenship for the formal sphere of education in both Southern and Northern contexts has also been explored. Here multilingualism is seen as a transformative epistemology and methodology of diversity while the challenges involved in implementing such a vision are acutely perceived (Chimbutane & Stroud, 2012; Stroud & Heugh, 2011; Stroud & Kerfoot, 2013, 2021; Stroud & Wee, 2010). In this regard, Linguistic Citizenship emphasizes that linguistic diversity is generally entangled with the sociopolitics of inequality and therefore that remedies directed to language alone can seldom provide adequate solutions to supposed language problems (and *vice versa*).

Linguistic Citizenship is thus seen as a geopolitical Southern and decolonial concept (Stroud, 2018: 18). It is important to keep in mind, though, that south and north should not be seen as geographical locations *per se*, but as metaphors: 'a South […] also exists in the global North, in the form of excluded, silenced and marginalized populations' (Santos, 2012: 51).

The theorizing of Linguistic Citizenship is clearly anchored in the millennium shifts in sociolinguistics, social anthropology and political theory. As noted by Rampton *et al*. (2018, and this volume) in their review of the notion of Linguistic Citizenship, Stroud repeatedly refers to two political theorists, Nancy Fraser (see e.g. Fraser, 1995) for her notion of 'transformative remedies' of inequalities (as opposed to 'affirmative remedies') and Engin Isin (see e.g. Isin, 2017) for his notion 'acts of citizenship': 'citizenship is not a status, but an act … acts of citizenship are the practices whereby new actors, seeking recognition in the public space in order to determine a new course of events, shift the location of agency and voice' (Stroud, 2018: 21, italics in original).

Engaging with scholars as diverse as Agamben, Bloch, Fanon, Glissant, Levinas, Mbembe and Santos, to name but a few, Linguistic Citizenship offers to sociolinguistics a remarkable, pluriversal depth and rigour, solidifying its often-tenuous connections with philosophy, sociology and political theory. Its 'politics through/of language for the present' (Stroud, 2018: 10) simultaneously holds the seeds of transformative, linguistically mediated futures.

As outlined above, the theoretical implications of sociolinguistic analyses based on a Linguistic Citizenship perspective are far-reaching. Resonating with, and often prefiguring, recent developments in sociolinguistics such as raciolinguistics (Alim *et al*., 2016; Rosa & Flores, 2017), decoloniality, embodiment and temporality, Linguistic Citizenship provides a means of enlarging knowledge of agents, practices and processes which could lay the basis for what Papadoupolous (2011) calls 'alter-ontologies', critiquing and replacing destructive institutional structures, classifications, and the technologies that sustain them.

The fundamental focus of Linguistic Citizenship has come to be on the role of voice, linguistic repertoire, communicative practices, agency and societal transformation of previously invisibilized constituencies. In other words, it focuses on the involvement of local communities and often silenced individuals in matters affecting the inequalities they suffer and, generally, their life trajectories and living conditions. At whatever point power imbalances exist in societies, the perspective behind Linguistic Citizenship is that of the dominated, the unheard. However, given the complexity of multiple, intersecting power relationships in any society, Linguistic Citizenship can have liberating and emancipating value for everyone.

The framework can typically be applied to multilingual sites with unequal status for different languages (which is more or less universal) as in the case of having a say in the planning and implementation of bilingual programmes, but more generally, to all kinds of situations where negotiations and other linguistic struggles occur, aiming at the transformation and elimination of inequalities between groups along multiple, intersectional axes of difference.

This book has an important role to play in pursuing the key questions that underpin Stroud's scholarship: What theorization of language and politics best allows for an understanding of multilingualism as a transformative technology for social change? What sort of questions should we be asking of language if we wish to become truly ethical, democratic subjects?

References

Alim, H.S., Rickford, J.R. and Ball, A.F. (eds) (2016) *Raciolinguistics: How Language Shapes Our Ideas about Race*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Bock, Z. and Stroud, C. (2018) Zombie landscapes: Apartheid traces in the discourses of young South Africans. In A. Peck, Q. Williams and C. Stroud (eds) *Making Sense of People, Place and Linguistic Landscapes* (pp. 11–28). London: Bloomsbury Press.

Chimbutane, F. and Stroud, C. (eds) (2012) *Educação bilingue em Moçambique: Reflectindo criticamente sobre políticas e práticas*. Maputo: Texto Editores.

Fraser, N. (1995) From redistribution to recognition? Dilemmas of justice in a 'post-socialist' age. *New Left Review* 212, 68–93.

Gonçalves, P. and Stroud, C. (eds) (1999) *Panorama do Português oral de Maputo. Vol. III, Struturas gramaticais do Português: Problemas e exercicios. Cadernos de Pesquisa* 27. Maputo: Instituto National do Desenvolvimiento da Educação.

Gonçalves, P. and Stroud, C. (eds) (2002) *Panorama do Português oral de Maputo. Vol. V, Vocabulário básico do Português. Dicionário de regências. Cadernos de Pesquisa* 41. Maputo: Instituto National do Desenvolvimiento da Educação.

Hansegård, N.E. (1968) *Tvåspråkighet eller halvspråkighet?*[*Bilingualism or Semilingualism?*]. Stockholm: Aldus/Bonniers.

Heugh, K. (2003) A re-take on bilingual education in and for South Africa. In K. Fraurud and K. Hyltenstam (eds) *Multilingualism in Global and Local Perspectives. Selected Papers from the 8th Nordic Conference on Bilingualism, November 1–3, 2001, Stockholm-Rinkeby* (pp. 47–70). Stockholm: Centre for Research on Bilingualism and Rinkeby Institute of Multilingual Research.

Hyltenstam, K. and Stroud, C. (1989) Bilingualism in Alzheimer's dementia: Two case studies. In K. Hyltenstam and L.K. Obler (eds) *Bilingualism Across the Lifespan. Aspects of Acquisition, Maturity, and Loss* (pp. 202–226). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hyltenstam, K. and Stroud, C. (1991) *Språkbyte och språkbevarande. Om samiskan och andra minoritetsspråk* [*Language Shift and Language Maintenance. On Saami and other Minority Languages*]. Lund: Studentlitteratur.

Hyltenstam, K. and Stroud, C. (2016 [2002]) At the nexus of vulnerability: Multilingualism in development. Paper 200, *Working Papers in Urban Language & Literacies* (at www.academia.edu).

Hyltenstam, K., Stroud, C. and Svonni, M. (1999) Språkbyte, språkbevarande, revitalisering. Samiskans ställning i svenska Sápmi. [Language shift, language maintenance and revitalization. The status of Saami in Swedish Sápmi]. In K. Hyltenstam (ed.) *Sveriges sju inhemska språk – ett minoritetsspråksperspektiv* (pp. 41–97). Lund: Studentlitteratur.

Isin, E. (2017) Performative citizenship. In A. Shadhar, R. Bauboeck, I. Bloemraad and M. Vink (eds) *The Handbook of Citizenship* (pp. 500–523). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Kulick, D. (1992) *Language Shift and Cultural Reproduction. Socialization, Self, and Syncretism in a Papua New Guinean Village*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kulick, D. and Stroud, C. (1990) Christianity, cargo and ideas of self: Patterns of literacy in a Papua New Guinean village. *Man* 25, 286–304.

Martin-Jones, M. and Romaine, S. (1986) Semilingualism: A half-baked theory of communicative competence. *Applied Linguistics* 7 (1), 26–38.

Papadopoulos, D. (2011) Alter-ontologies: Towards a constituent politics in technoscience. *Social Studies of Science* 41 (2), 177–201.

Peck, A. and Stroud, C. (2015) Skinscapes. *Linguistic Landscape* 1 (1–2), 133–151.

Rampton, B., Cooke, M. and Holmes, S. (2018) Sociolinguistic Citizenship. *Journal of Social Science Education* 17 (4), 70–83.

Rosa, J. and Flores, N. (2017) Unsettling race and language: Toward a raciolinguistic perspective. *Language in Society* 46 (5), 621–647.

Santos, B. de S. (2012) Public sphere and epistemologies of the South. *Africa Development* 37 (1), 43–67.

Smith, L.T. (1999) *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples*. London: Zed Books.

Stroud, C. (1978) The concept of semilingualism. *Studies in General Linguistics Dedicated to Bertil Malmberg by Students and Colleagues on the Occasion of his 65th Birthday*

22nd April 1978. *Working Papers* 16 (pp. 153–172). Lund: Phonetic Laboratory, Department of General Linguistics, Lund University.
Stroud, C. (1992) The problem of intention and meaning in code-switching. *Text* 12, 127–155.
Stroud, C. (1999) Portuguese as ideology and politics in Mozambique: Semiotic (re)constructions of a postcolony. In J. Blommaert (ed.) *Language Ideological Debates* (pp. 343–380). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
Stroud, C. (2001) African mother-tongue programmes and the politics of language: Linguistic citizenship versus linguistic human rights. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 22 (4), 339–355.
Stroud, C. (2002) Framing Bourdieu socioculturally: Alternative forms of linguistic legitimacy in postcolonial Mozambique. *Multilingua* 21 (2–3), 247–273.
Stroud, C. (2003) Retheorising a politics of language for development and education. In K. Fraurud and K. Hyltenstam (eds) *Multilingualism in Global and Local Perspectives*. *Selected Papers from the 8th Nordic Conference on Bilingualism, November 1–3, 2001, Stockholm-Rinkeby* (pp. 17–29). Stockholm: Centre for Research on Bilingualism and Rinkeby Institute of Multilingual Research.
Stroud, C. (2004) The performativity of codeswitching. *International Journal of Bilingualism* 8 (2), 145–166.
Stroud, C. (2009) A postliberal critique of language rights: Toward a politics of language for a linguistics of contact. In J.E. Petrovic (ed.) *International Perspectives on Bilingual Education: Policy, Practice and Controversy* (pp. 191–218). Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.
Stroud, C. (2015) Linguistic citizenship as utopia. *Multilingual Margins* 2 (2), 20–37.
Stroud, C. (2016) Turbulent linguistic landscapes and the semiotics of citizenship. In R. Blackwood, E. Lanza and H. Woldemariam (eds) *Negotiating and Contesting Identities in Linguistic Landscapes* (pp. 3–18). London: Bloomsbury Academic.
Stroud, C. (2018) Linguistic Citizenship. In L. Lim, C. Stroud and L. Wee (eds) *The Multilingual Citizen: Towards a Politics of Language for Agency and Change* (pp. 17–39). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
Stroud, C. (ms., nd.) Language in schizophrenia.
Stroud, C. and Gonçalves, P. (eds) (1997a) *Panorama do Português oral de Maputo*. *Vol. I: Objectivos e métodos*. *Cadernos de Pesquisa* 22. Maputo: Instituto National do Desenvolvimiento da Educação.
Stroud, C. and Gonçalves, P. (eds) (1997b) *Panorama do Português oral de Maputo*. (Vol. II). *A constução du um banco de 'erros'*. *Cadernos de Pesquisa* 24. Maputo: Instituto National do Desenvolvimiento da Educação.
Stroud, C. and Gonçalves, P. (eds) (2000) *Panorama do Português oral de Maputo*. *Vol. I". Vocabulário básico do Português (espaço, tempo e quantidade): Contextos e prática pedagógica*. *Cadernos de Pesquisa* 36. Maputo: Instituto National do Desenvolvimiento da Educação.
Stroud, C. and Guissemo, M. (2017) Linguistic messianism: Multilingualism in Mozambique. In A.E. Ebongue, and E. Hurst (eds) *Sociolinguistics in African Contexts* (pp. 35–51). Cham: Springer International.
Stroud, C. and Heugh, C. (2004) Linguistic human rights and linguistic citizenship. In D. Patrick and J. Freedland (eds) *Language Rights and Language Survival: A Sociolinguistic Exploration* (pp. 191–218). Manchester: St Jerome.
Stroud, C. and Heugh, K. (2011) Language in education. In R. Mesthrie (ed.) *The Cambridge Handbook of Sociolinguistics* (pp. 413–439). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Stroud, C. and Jegels, D. (2014) Semiotic landscapes and mobile narrations of place: Performing the local. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 228, 179–199.

Stroud, C. and Kerfoot, C. (2013) Towards rethinking multilingualism and language policy for academic literacies. *Linguistics and Education* 24 (4), 396–405.

Stroud, C. and Kerfoot, C. (2021) Decolonizing higher education: Multilingualism, linguistic citizenship and epistemic justice. In Z. Bock and C. Stroud (eds) *Languages and Literacies in Higher Education: Reclaiming Voices from the South* (pp. 21–51). London: Bloomsbury.

Stroud, C. and Mpendukana, S. (2009) Towards a material ethnography of linguistic landscape: Multilingualism, mobility and space in a South African township. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 13 (3), 363–386.

Stroud, C. and Tuzine, A. (eds) (1998) *Uso de linguas africanas no ensino. Problemas e perspectivas. Cadernos de Pesquisa* 26. Maputo: Instituto National do Desenvolvimiento da Educação.

Stroud, C. and Wee, L. (2010) Language policy and planning in Singaporean late modernity. In L. Lim, A. Pakir and L. Wee (eds) *English in Singapore: Modernity and Management* (pp. 181–204). Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press.

Stroud, C. and Wee, L. (2012) *Style, Identity and Literacy: English in Singapore*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Stroud, C. and Williams, Q. (2017) Multilingualism as utopia: Meaning making in the periphery. *AILA Review* 30 (1), 167–188.

Williams, Q. E. and Stroud, C. (2014) Battling the race: Stylizing language and coproducing whiteness and colouredness in a freestyle rap performance. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 24 (3), 277–293.