

4 Linguistic Citizenship and the Questions of Transformation and Marginality

Ben Rampton, Melanie Cooke and Sam Holmes

This chapter sets the notion of Linguistic Citizenship (LC) developed by Stroud and associates in dialogue with (a) ethnographic sociolinguistics of the kind shaped by Dell Hymes, and with (b) experiences of language and education over the last 50 to 60 years in England.¹ We see LC as a major contribution to research and practical intervention, but the first dialogue interrogates LC's emphasis on transformation, and the second qualifies its association with struggle at the margins.

LC is 'an attempt at a comprehensive *political stance* on language' (Stroud, 2008: 45), arguing that a subtle understanding of how language positions people in society can and should enhance democratic participation. This is similar to the view that motivated Hymes's work on language in society in the United States (e.g. 1996 [1975]: 63–106), and the strength of the LC argument partly derives from the way its central ideas are echoed elsewhere in the fields that Hymes influenced – in the deconstruction of named languages and the focus on communicative practice found in linguistic anthropology and linguistic ethnography as well as LC. But these links also point to productive complications. 'Voice' and the effective expression of one's views and perceptions are central to LC, but getting heard and influencing relations of power often requires linguistic and discursive negotiation and compromise, and if the influence is going to be more than fleeting, some kind of institutionalization or conventionalization will also be necessary. Both processes make it harder to speak of political and social transformation than the discussions of LC sometimes recognize.

Across a range of publications, Stroud and others conceive of LC as a concept from the global south, but how far and in what ways is the idea of LC relevant or achievable outside the African contexts they describe, and what modifications might be required in a place such as England? The

sociolinguistic terrain flagged by the notion of superdiversity (Arnaut *et al.*, 2015) has actually generated a significant number of relatively small-scale projects promoting LC, and we describe two that rely on fundraising from charities and other sources of short-term finance. But this does not mean that the promotion of LC can always only ever happen outside the state: from the 1960s to the 1980s, state schooling in England was strongly influenced by educationalists who accepted linguistic diversity, promoted a broadly sociolinguistic understanding of communication and sought to develop creatively independent voices among their students. This was ultimately closed down by the Conservative government in the 1990s, but this case shows that LC is not necessarily just an alternative in the margins. It can also be a mainstream objective, promoted, contested and defended in the corridors of power.

‘Linguistic Citizenship’ Rather than ‘Linguistic Human Rights’

Stroud’s notion of LC first emerged in his 2001 paper, which focused on the success and failure of educational programmes in Africa using local rather than ex-colonial metropolitan languages as media of instruction. It argued that although the idea of Linguistic Human Rights was widely invoked, it was inadequate as a framework for understanding and promoting mother-tongue programmes that actually worked. Stroud (2001: 349) characterized Language Human Rights as an approach to language education that involves:

- (a) the selective provision for a specific group, usually designed to overcome historic disadvantage;
- (b) the identification, description and introduction of the group’s distinctive language as an entitlement in institutional activity – in schools, in law courts, in aspects of state bureaucracy;
- (c) an expectation that the courts and other bodies overseeing the nation-state will grant and monitor all this.

The constitutional recognition given to 11 official languages after apartheid has meant that the Linguistic Human Rights perspective has been very influential in South Africa, where Stroud is based, but he pointed to a number of serious limitations (see also Makoni, 2003; Stroud & Heugh, 2004):

- (a) the Linguistic Human Rights approach marginalizes people who use non-standard versions of the group’s language, generating new sociolinguistic inequalities;
- (b) it promotes an arbitrary and essentialist view of language and ethnicity – it creates artificial boundaries between ways of speaking that are actually continuous, and it overlooks mixing and hybridity; and
- (c) it appeals to a rather top-down and managerial politics; it presupposes membership of a single state; and it neglects population mobility.

It isn't well adapted to the fact that 'individuals now find themselves participating in a variety of sites in competition for resources distributed along multiple levels of scale, such as the nation, the supranation, the local and the regional' (Stroud, 2010: 200).

To overcome these problems, Stroud proposed the notion of LC which differed from Linguistic Human Rights in:

- (1) putting democratic participation first, emphasizing cultural and political 'voice' and agency rather than just language on its own;
- (2) seeing all sorts of linguistic practices – including practices that were mixed, low-status or transgressive – as potentially relevant to social and economic well-being, accepting that it is very hard to predict any of this if you are just watching from the centre; and
- (3) stressing the importance of grassroots activity on the ground, often on the margins of state control, outside formal institutions.

Going beyond the Linguistic Human Rights' arguments, Stroud's main contention is that an enhanced understanding of sociolinguistic processes should actually be central to emancipatory politics. LC 'aims to make visible the sociolinguistic complexity of language issues' (Stroud & Heugh, 2004: 192) and to promote 'the idea of language as a political and economic "site of struggle"', alongside 'respect for diversity and difference' and 'the deconstruction of essentialist understandings of language and identity' (Stroud, 2001: 353). This perspective, which should be 'inserted into political discourses and made into a legitimate form, target and instrument of political action' (2001: 343), has the potential to help marginalized people change their material and economic conditions for the better.

We will address several attempts to achieve this when we turn to language education in the UK. But before doing so, we should review the sociolinguistic and political ideas that LC draws on, try to clarify the combination of normative political position-taking and academic theory-and-description that LC entails, and point to some complications.

Sociolinguistic Underpinnings in Linguistic Citizenship

According to Dell Hymes, one of its founding figures, ethnographic sociolinguistics is a primarily analytical rather than a political or normative undertaking, focusing first on 'what is' rather than 'what should be'. But the careful comparative empirical study of communicative repertoires and practices ultimately serves the higher ethical aspiration of achieving *Liberté, Égalité, Fraternité* because it 'prepares [sociolinguists] to speak concretely to actual inequalities' (Hymes, 1977: 204–206, 1969; Santos, 2012: 46).

This interplay of the academic and the ethical/political can be seen in operation in Stroud's criticism of the way in which language and ethnicity

are conceptualized in the Linguistic Human Rights' perspective (= [A], [B], (a) and (b) in the previous section). There is now substantial sociolinguistic research which challenges the idea that distinct languages exist as natural objects and that a proper language is bounded, pure and composed of structured sounds, grammar and vocabulary designed for referring to things (e.g. Heugh, 2004: 197; Joseph & Taylor, 1990; Makoni & Pennycook, 2007; Stroud, 1999; Stroud & Heugh, 2004: 197; Woolard *et al.*, 1998). The idea of named languages is obviously still very powerful in education, in immigration policy, in high and popular culture etc. and it is often also the object of passionate personal attachment. But contemporary sociolinguists argue that it is more productive *analytically* to focus on the very variable ways in which individual linguistic features with identifiable social and cultural associations get clustered together whenever people communicate (e.g. Blommaert, 2005; Hudson, 1980; Le Page, 1988). If we take any strip of communication and focus on the links and histories of each of the linguistic ingredients, we can soon see a host of forms and styles that are actually connected to social life in a plurality of groups – groups that vary from the very local to the transnational (Stroud, 2001: 350). From this, a differentiated account of the organization of communicative practice emerges, centring on identities, relationships, activities and genres that are enacted in a variety of ways. Both official and common-sense accounts often miss this, but it makes the ideological homogenization achieved in national language naming rather obvious.

This is one way in which developments in sociolinguistic theory 'prepare [sociolinguists] to speak concretely to actual inequalities' more effectively. Politically, both Linguistic Human Rights and LC oppose the exclusion of people who do not have officially approved linguistic resources in their repertoires. But while Linguistic Human Rights focuses on the recognition of named or nameable languages associated with specific groups judged to have been marginalized, LC works with developments in sociolinguistics that allow a more open and inclusive position, attending to the diversity of linguistic practices that people use/need to get themselves heard in arenas that affect their well-being.

But this 'actor-oriented' focus on 'practice' raises a question about the potential effectiveness of LC as a political idea. Are not the processes that it addresses rather small-scale (Petrovic & Kuntz, 2013: 142), relinquishing the wide-angle view and the potential to affect relatively large numbers of people identified in the debates about Linguistic Human Rights? Not necessarily. Both in sociolinguistic and social theory, practices are seen as basic building blocks in the production of society, and turning the argument around, it is now often said that studies of *state-level* policy run into problems if they neglect practice, because they miss all the unpredictable complexity that the formulation and implementation of policy actually entails (Ball *et al.*, 2012; Jessop, 2007): 'policy never just "is", but rather "does" ... We do not restrict our analysis to ... official policy

declarations and texts... but place these in context as part of a larger sociocultural system... inferred from people's language practices, ideologies and beliefs' (McCarty, 2011: 2).

At the same time, however, if we are to understand how units 'both larger and smaller than the traditional nation-state' (Stroud, 2001: 350) enter the account, we need to move beyond practice to the networks in which it is embedded. In fact, this is implied in the notion of voice itself.

In the first instance, we might define 'voice' as an individual's communicative power and effectiveness within the here-and-now of specific events. But beyond this, there is the crucial issue of whether and how their contribution is remembered and/or recorded and subsequently reproduced in other arenas, travelling through networks and circuits that may vary in their scale – in their spatial scope, temporal durability and social reach (Blommaert, 2005, 2008; Kell, 2015; Maybin, 2017). This is studied in research on 'text trajectories' which focuses (a) on the here-and-now activity in which some (but not other) aspects of what is said get turned into textual 'projectiles' that can carry forward into other settings ('entextualization'); and then (b) the ways in which they are interpreted when they arrive there ('recontextualization'). This kind of account can cover both 'top-down' and 'bottom-up' trajectories, involving a variety of people, practices, media and types of text, working in cooperative and/or conflictual relationships within and across specific events, and it can of course be turned to political processes. So, for example, we could focus on directives formulated in government offices that are turned into curriculum documents, transmitted to schools, and then interpreted by teachers interacting with children in class, or alternatively, we could look at parents complaining at a school meeting, the local press reporting the matter, and local politicians then taking it up or dismissing it (see e.g. Kell, 2015; Mehan, 1996). These are obviously simplified sketches, but the essential point is that a 'trans-contextual and multi-scalar' framework of this kind allows us to investigate the resonance of particular communicative practices (or 'voices'). This then has two further implications.

First, this view of voice and text trajectories means that sociolinguists actually have to be flexible in their response to named languages and the essentialization that they involve, accepting that there may be occasions when the discourse of Linguistic Human Rights is strategically warranted. Certainly, when faced with data on linguistic practice situated in the here-and-now, sociolinguists first listen for the diversity of the communicative resources in play. But selection and reduction are unavoidable parts of the entextualization process, and if someone's viewpoint is to be heard elsewhere in unfamiliar situations, it needs to be represented in a repeatable form that, regardless of its eloquence, inevitably simplifies the first-hand experience that motivated it (see e.g. Haarstad & Fløysand, 2007). Named languages may form part of persuasive rhetorics that travel, and even though sociolinguists may worry about the negative (side-)effects and

watch out for opportunities to reassert the ideological constructedness of named languages (Stroud & Heugh, 2004: 212), an analytic interest in the trajectory of voices has to accept the possibility that in certain circumstances, the invocation of named languages helps to advance political causes that sociolinguists deem progressive. So, although Stroud's account of LC includes mixed, low-status and transgressive language practices, we certainly should not assume that notionally purer, higher status and more standard ones are thereby necessarily excluded (Blommaert, 2004: 59–60; Stroud & Heugh, 2004: 191).

Second, it is necessary to move beyond the 'freedom to have one's voice heard' to what Hymes (1996 [1975]: 64) calls the 'freedom to develop a voice worth hearing'. People in the particular networks through which a voice seeks to resonate inevitably have their own ideas of what's important, and if its message is to be taken seriously, it needs to understand and connect with these concerns. As the word 'develop' implies, it usually takes time, effort, imagination and the support of others to learn how to say things that are relevant to people who you want to persuade but don't yet know, and this brings education – formal and/or informal – into the reckoning. Stroud's (2001) discussion of LC centres more on the taking of control over language education programmes than on what these programmes actually teach (though see e.g. Bock & Mheta, 2014; Kerfoot, 2018; Stroud & Heugh, 2004: 201). But if the practices that promote democratic participation and persuasive voices from the grassroots are to sustain themselves, it is vital to consider the organization of institutionalized arenas for learning and socialization that are at least partly sheltered from the front-line struggle.

So the central ideas that Stroud and colleagues' LC builds on – the deconstruction of named languages and the focus on linguistic repertoires and practice – find a great deal of support in ethnographic sociolinguistics, where Hymes also outlined broadly comparable objectives at the interface of research and politics. At the same time, these links qualify LC's radical force: if claims and voices want people elsewhere to listen to them, they have to make themselves relevant, and the entextualization required to do so often results in messages that simplify and partly compromise the original intention. It can also take time to develop a 'voice worth hearing', and this raises the question of institutional support. There are similar effects when ethnographic sociolinguistics is drawn into interaction with discussions of citizenship in political theory.

Sociolinguistics and Citizenship in Political Theory

Two political theorists feature especially prominently in the accounts of Stroud and colleagues. Right from the start, Stroud (2001, 2018), draws on Nancy Fraser's (1995) distinction between '*affirmative* remedies for injustice [which are] aimed at correcting inequitable outcomes of social arrangements without disturbing the underlying framework that

generates them', and '*transformative* remedies [which are] aimed at correcting inequitable outcomes precisely by restructuring the underlying generative framework' (1995: 82).² While Linguistic Human Rights takes the affirmative path, LC makes the case for transformative politics, since as we have seen, it challenges traditional ideas about the distinctiveness and homogeneity of language groups and named languages, 'interrogat[ing] the historical, sociopolitical, and economic determinants of how languages are constructed' (Stroud, 2018: 20).

This commitment to transformation can also be seen in more recent references to Isin's work on citizenship (Isin, 2017; Isin & Nielsen, 2008; Stroud, 2018; Williams & Stroud, 2015). Like Fraser, Isin speaks of a politics that transgresses established frameworks (e.g. Isin, 2008: 18), but Isin also looks at how struggles over citizenship have been complicated and intensified by global mobility, arguing for an account of citizenship that reckons with the political agency of people like asylum-seekers and undocumented immigrants who occupy very precarious positions in the states where they reside (2008: 15–16; Isin, 2017: 504–505). To achieve this, Isin and Nielsen (2008: 2) speak of 'acts of citizenship', in which people actively constitute themselves as citizens by making claims to particular rights and duties, even though they are not formally seen as citizens by the law, and so they fall outside the realm of those eligible to claim such entitlements. The focus, therefore, is 'not only on the exercise of rights and duties as they exist [for ratified citizens] but also on claiming rights and duties yet to come as a result of social struggles' (Isin, 2017: 506). Claiming rights is a performative act and for analysis, this means 'asking questions not simply about what a right is but also about what it is we do when we make rights claims' (Isin, 2017: 506).

This concern with 'what we do when we make rights claims' means that philosophical, legal and system-focused accounts are insufficient – they need to be supplemented with empirical investigation of particular cases (e.g. Neveu, 2015; Oliveri, 2014). In fact, these investigations promise to qualify and complicate the idea of 'transformation' itself. In a distinction that resembles Fraser's 'affirmative' vs. 'transformative' politics, Isin starts out differentiating 'active' citizens who 'follow scripts' (\approx affirmative) and 'activist' citizens who 'engage in writing' them (\approx transformative) (Isin, 2008: 38). But later when he contemplates the key issues that empirical work on performative citizenship should tackle, he wonders whether acts of citizenship actually *break* conventions or just change them *incrementally*. The word 'rupture', Isin (2017) says, sometimes refers to 'revolution, regime change, or revolt' (2017: 519), but it can also refer to a 'quotidian and ordinary' act which simply 'draws people out of themselves to take notice of the taken for granted nature of a given state of affairs and turn critical attentiveness toward it' (2017: 519).

The analytic difficulties involved in determining whether change is major or minor, radical or merely adaptive, have in fact been widely noted

(e.g. Williams, 1977: 123),³ and linguistic ethnography also presents claims about rupture and transformation with a series of quite acute questions. As sociolinguists know well, every communicative act entails a huge range of partly autonomous and partly interwoven structures (themselves ‘generative frameworks’), operating at the linguistic, interactional and institutional levels.⁴ Saying for any given intervention which of these generative frameworks is and isn’t being ruptured, for and by whom, and with what subsequent effects, is hard, and of course it is likely to become even harder with the introduction of analytic schemes from sociology, politics, economics and so forth. Analysis has an *invaluable* part to play *alerting* us to the intricacies of change, but in the end, the assessment of whether an action is transformative, affirmative, reproductive or indeed repressive is likely to involve a holistic, all-round judgement that is inevitably also informed by understandings and commitments that go well beyond the scientific expertise of the observer. This kind of shift from the technical to the ethical and subjective is wholly compatible with Hymes’s view of an ethnographic sociolinguistics aligned with political values like *Liberté, Égalité, Fraternité* (e.g. Hymes, 1977: 194). At the same time, however, a strictly *analytic* lens from sociolinguistics puts the brake on romantic over-readings in which the observer attributes radical creativity to actions that participants see as rather mundane and inconsequential (Blommaert & Rampton, 2011: 9; Rampton, 2014). So it asks: exactly what aspects of the ‘underlying generative framework’ are challenged in an activity described as transformative, and what stays the same? The ideas expressed? The genre in which they are articulated? The interactional relationships etc? And how does it really ramify in subsequent events?

With this elaboration of Linguistic Citizenship’s ties to ethnographic sociolinguistics in place, together with a clarification of the inescapable uncertainties that emerge in the encounter with politics and political theory, we can now move to the second part of the chapter. Stroud characterizes ‘the concept of Linguistic Citizenship [as] a Southern and decolonial concept’, arising from the contradictions surrounding educational programmes in the geopolitical south (2018: 18). So how far and in what ways can it be transferred to a rich country like Britain in the North, where a relatively high degree of political continuity means that a notion like ‘transformation’ lacks the currency in public discourse that it has in a country like South Africa (see Burawoy & von Holdt, 2012)?

Projects Promoting Sociolinguistic Citizenship in England

In the UK in recent years, there have been two state-level discourses that have linked language to citizenship, but these are very hard to reconcile with LC in Stroud’s sense (Rampton *et al.*, 2018a: Section 4). One refers to the learning of European standard languages (Moore, 2011), and the other emphasizes the need for immigrants to learn English for social

cohesion and national security (Khan, 2017). On the ground, however, language repertoires and practices in England often involve the kinds of variety and mixing that Stroud and colleagues describe (e.g. Rampton, 2015a, 2016), and discussions of superdiversity in the UK also recognize that contemporary sociocultural heterogeneity challenges the demographic categories that public policy has traditionally relied on (Fanshawe & Sriskandarajah, 2010). This terrain has generated a range of relatively small-scale education and arts projects that can be aligned with Stroud's LC⁵ (although to avoid confusion with the two official conceptions in the UK context, it is probably worth referring here to 'Sociolinguistic Citizenship'). In what follows, we sketch two projects in which we have been involved, but before doing so, it is first briefly worth considering the notion of transformation in education, referring to debates about 'translanguaging', an umbrella term for hybrid language mixing that has a good deal in common with LC (Pennycook, 2016).

'Translanguaging' has gained a lot of currency in recent years, and it is sometimes said that its recognition in education can be transformative. According to García and Li (2014: 66), translanguaging in education is associated with 'creativity, criticality and transformations': creativity is 'the ability to choose between following and flouting the rules and norms of behaviour' (2014: 66); criticality 'is the ability... appropriately, systematically and insightfully to inform considered views of cultural, social, political and linguistic phenomena [and] to question and problematize received wisdom' (2014: 67); and their combination in the kinds of practice that García and Li describe makes translanguaging 'transformative for the child, for the teacher and for education itself' (García & Li, 2014: 68). The question of whether practices targeting change are transformative or not is very important, but it is also very hard because of the unpredictability of outcomes generated by particular pedagogies. As Jaspers (2017) notes, 'all classrooms must be approached as complex interactive settings where, rather than simply accepting what is offered, pupils always negotiate what is put on the table (curricula, teaching styles, teachers) and develop different strategies depending on their short- and long-term ambitions, the classroom climate and local socio-economic conditions' (2017: 11; see also Charalambous *et al.*, 2016). Jaspers also draws attention to the wide range of sociologists who 'question the idea that interventions at school can transform society in any significant way' (2017: 7, 11). So we will take a relatively cautious line in the ensuing account, linking the projects we describe to LC through the political *intentions* driving them (democratic participation, voice, linguistic inclusivity, sociolinguistic understanding), focusing more on questions of scale and sustainability than transformative impact.

The first project was a course in ESOL (English for Speakers of Other Languages) entitled *Our Languages*. It took place within a small charitable organization called English for Action (EFA) that was set up in 2006, motivated by the vision of 'UK migrants hav[ing] the language, skills and

networks they need to bring about an equal and fair society' (EfA, 2016: 7). According to its 2015–16 Annual Report (EfA, 2016), EfA is 'absolutely committed to community organising; that is listening to people's concerns in our classes and communities, connecting people, training people to listen and take action, taking action to effect change and building powerful groups to be able to hold powerful people and organizations to account. Our approach is above all, to develop the capacity of our students to effect change. Campaigns, such as to secure better housing or living wages, emerge from classroom work and our community organising' (EfA, 2016: 5). During 2015–16, 391 people accessed the 19 free of charge ESOL courses that EfA ran in seven London Boroughs, and 'over 100 students took action on a range of social justice issues' (EfA, 2016: 11). The courses were taught by a staff team of ten, with volunteers attending 85% of the classes, and this activity was supported with an income of £178,000, mostly raised from about a dozen charitable foundations.

Our Languages ran in 2017 as one strand in a three-year linguistic ethnography on 'Adult Language Socialization in the Sri Lankan Tamil diaspora in London' funded by the Leverhulme Trust (2015–2018) to the tune of £227,500. The course was designed to explore how far the linguistic experience of the Sri Lankan Tamils studied in the ethnography resonated with other migrant groups, and it involved participatory education (aligned with Freire [1970], critical pedagogy and democratic education). This takes an over-arching theme and then allows the exact shape of the course to emerge from session to session.⁶ Working in two classes (36 students from 18 countries), the courses began by playing the recording of someone from Sri Lanka talking about how he'd practiced his English working in an off-license, and by the end of the eight weeks, the students had covered: non-standard language varieties; bi/multilingual language practices; language identities; intergenerational language transmission; multilingual communicative repertoires; language ideologies; language discrimination and the social processes of learning English in the UK. In this way, the course addressed what Stroud and Heugh (2004: 209–210) see as a substantial problem for Linguistic Citizenship: the 'problem ... is that much current theorisation of language and politics is often unavailable to those communities who are theorised ... [L]inguistic knowledge needs to be built in dialogue with communities'.

At the end of course, there were gains in language learning, in pragmatic and 'multilingual narrative' competence and in vocabulary, and one of the students reported 'jokingly but proudly – that her family had commented that she was coming home from class "sounding like a dictionary", [using] research related terms such as "theme", "data" and "participant"' (Cooke *et al.*, 2018: 25). One of the groups also made representations to the All Party Parliamentary Group (APPG) on Social Integration, which was conducting an inquiry into the integration of immigrants. They invited its chair (who happened to be the local MP) to talk to them and

told him that the APPG's interim report (2017a) overlooked the government's 60% cuts to ESOL funding since 2007 and also lent itself to negative stereotyping. He appeared to listen: when the final report came out, it was entitled *Integration not Demonisation*, discussed the cuts (All Party Parliamentary Group on Social Integration (2017b: 69–70; hereafter APPG), and acknowledged EfA and 'the testimony of... community group members' (2017b: 9, 83). Whether this political action was transformative, affirmative or trivial could produce a range of answers, depending on whether the focus was on state policy for ESOL, on the APPG's committee deliberations, or on the development of particular individuals making representations. On occasion, students themselves expressed racist ideas; the session on intergenerational language transmission generated quite a lot of frustration and guilt when students talked about their children's lack of heritage language competence; and there was also quite strong support for an 'English Only' policy in ESOL lessons, even though students had been encouraged to draw on their multilingual repertoires. Even so, the course's alignment with the ideas of LC outlined by Stroud etc. is clear.

English for Action aims to encourage the growth of participatory ESOL by sharing best practice (and has developed multilingual ESOL teaching materials [www.ourlanguages.co.uk]). The sharing of pedagogies committed to the fluidity of language and identity, sociolinguistic understanding, linguistic inclusivity and voice was also central to the second project, *Multilingual Creativity* (www.kcl.ac.uk/Cultural/-/Projects/Multilingual-Creativity.aspx). This project ran from January 2015 to November 2016, and the question guiding it was: 'How can plurilingualism among young people be harnessed for creativity?' It recognized that there were a lot of unconnected projects in universities, schools and arts and cultural organizations which engaged with young people's hybrid multilingualism, and it set out to build links between them, seeking to develop something of a 'sector' for this kind of work.

There were three elements in the programme: research on current practice, the development of a website (www.multilingualcreativity.org.uk), and a series of events which focused on language communities, multilingual projects, performing and visual arts, print and multimedia texts, networking. These involved 52 cultural organizations (from education, museums, libraries, publishing and the arts sector), 17 artists, 12 academics and 32 members of the public. The research part surveyed existing projects and identified five pedagogic principles in something of a manifesto, illustrating them with examples of film making in Arabic supplementary schools, German teaching with hand-puppets for primary children, three-day workshops in creative translation, and a national language challenge (Holmes, 2015). The five principles were: plurilingualism over monolingual usage (the use of different 'languages' within the same utterance or activity); exuberant smatterings over fluency ('bits of language' as opposed to 'fluency' as a legitimate goal in language learning);

reflexive sociolinguistic exploration over linguistic ‘common sense’ (focusing on participants’ own language practices); collaborative endeavour over individualization (drawing on the pooling of repertoires within a group); and investment over ‘immersion’ (fostering a genuine desire to participate, rather than insisting on exclusive use of the ‘target’ language). The politics was less explicit than in *Our Languages* (though see Holmes, 2015: 10). But even though the issue of actual *outcomes* is more complex, the involvement of arts organizations pointed to a contrast with schools that speaks back to questions about change, with pedagogy looking more transformative in the arts and more affirmative in education:

A [school] teacher’s approach can be very focused on building. It often starts with planning out the edifice of knowledge and skills that a child needs according to the prescriptions of the curriculum, then takes stock of what foundations they already have, before using all this to design the scaffolding required to support the next bricks.... The approach of arts practitioners... often starts with an element of destruction. Those foundations a child has can be a prison of limited and limiting conceptualisations which stymie creative potential. Once this is exposed children are empowered to become architects as well as brick-layers. (Holmes, 2015: 3)

Like *Our Languages* and most of the organizations it surveyed, *Multilingual Creativity* depended on relatively short-term, project-specific funding from charitable foundations and local communities and institutions (five or six grants, amounting to about £67,000). All these projects depend(ed) on the initiative of a few dedicated individuals and their perseverance and success in raising income from a plurality of funding sources, and this raises the crucial issue of sustainability, both for the projects and for the linguistic repertoires and capacities that the projects seek to develop. As noted by one of the organizations quoted by Holmes, ‘creativity is not simply a matter of letting go. Serious creative achievement relies on knowledge, control of materials and command of ideas’ (2015: 14). Is one intensive three-day workshop in the course of a 12-year school career, or a couple of hours a week for five weeks, really enough to develop sophisticated plurilingual writing and ‘a voice worth hearing’? It would be optimistic to say ‘yes’, and this in turn raises the question: is civil society really the only place for educational programmes committed to the development of powerful but unorthodox voices and the sophisticated acceptance of mixed and non-standard language? Or could LC be incorporated within state provision? There are actually precedents, as we shall see in a historical glance back at language education in English schools in the 1960s–80s.

Sociolinguistic Citizenship in English State Education from the 1960s to the 1980s

Calls for language education to focus on standard English, grammar and correctness have a long pedigree in the UK (Rosen, 1981), but the period

from the 1960s to the late 1980s was dominated by 'progressive' pedagogies. During this period, local authorities, teaching unions and subject associations had much more influence than central government, and they were supported major Committees of Inquiry (DES, 1967, 1975), which stated for example that the 'aim is not to alienate the child from a form of language with which he [*sic*] has grown up ... It is to enlarge his repertoire so that he can use language effectively in other speech situations and use standard forms when they are needed' (DES, 1975: paras 10.6, 20.5).

Admittedly, there were different lines of thinking within broadly progressive language education during this period (Cox, 1990: 21; Rampton *et al.*, 1988: 10; Stubbs, 1986: 78), and not all would fit the model of LC outlined by Stroud. But there was an awareness of contemporaneous developments in ethnographic sociolinguistics (Burgess, 2002; Rosen & Burgess, 1980: 140), and a great deal of attention was given to voice and to pupils' own language use, which for many, brought the politics of gender, class and ethnicity into lessons (Gibbons, 2017: 30). In 1979, the ILEA English Centre published *Our Lives: Young People's Autobiographies* saying that 'community publishing groups have begun to show that local working-class autobiographies can contribute to the making of history every bit as forcefully as the autobiographies of the rich and powerful' (Ashton *et al.*, 1979: v). Rosen (1981: 17) noted this and spoke of 'sympathetic vibrations between ventures in popular theatre and drama in schools, between new black literature and the writing of dialect stories and poetry in schools, between a revitalized interest in the oral tradition and the classroom extension of this tradition'. Initiatives of this kind were supported by the National Writing Project (1985–89) and the National Oracy Project (1987–93), two very large-scale curriculum development initiatives 'that saw central funding being used to enable teachers, working with local authority advisers, their subject associations and higher education colleagues, to explore and investigate their own practice and develop new approaches rooted in the evaluation of their own experiences in collaboration with peers. Genuinely bottom up, these projects mirrored the ways in which associations like LATE and NATE had been working for 40 years' (Gibbons, 2017: 53).

A third curriculum development project of this kind, which focused on language itself, was called the Language in the National Curriculum project (LINC). This was supported with £21 million from central government (cf. £165 million at current values), and it ran from 1989 to 1992, involving 25 coordinators and more than 10,000 teachers in over 400 training courses (Carter, 1992: 16; Gibbons, 2017: 73). The project drew on applied linguistics as well as the experience of teachers, but 'recognise[d] that some aspects of language resist systematisation', and that 'language and its conventions of use are permanently and unavoidably unstable and in flux. Much of the richness, pleasure and creativity of language use inheres in such play with these conventions' (Carter, 1990: 17). LINC's six

main principles included the idea that '[b]eing more explicitly informed about the sources of attitudes to language, about its uses and misuses, about how language is used to manipulate and incapacitate, can *empower* pupils to see through language to the ways in which messages are mediated and ideologies encoded' (Carter, 1990: 4, original emphasis), and it drew explicitly on Critical Discourse Analysis. It also recognized that 'many bilingual children operate naturally... switching between languages in speech or writing in response to context and audience' and encouraged teachers in multilingual classrooms to 'create the conditions which enable children to gain access to the whole curriculum by encouraging them to use, as appropriate, their strongest or preferring language' (Morrison & Sandhu, 1992; Savva, 1990: 260, 263). All these ideas were turned into professional development materials for teachers – 12 flexible units supported by BBC TV and radio, each designed to take up one to 1.5 days of course time, organized into sections on development in children's talk, reading and writing, together with a block devoted to language and society (Carter, 1990: 2).

These values did not go unopposed. During the 1980s, the cultural politics around English teaching had intensified, with critics advocating meritocratic individualism, the needs of industry and/or going 'back to basics' (spelling, grammar and punctuation) (Cameron & Bourne, 1988; Rampton *et al.*, 2007). This struggle came to a spectacular climax in 1991 when the government refused to allow proper publication of the LINC training materials, objecting, among other things, to a chapter on multilingualism (Abrams, 1991), and asking, in the words of the minister of state: 'Why ... so much prominence [is] given to exceptions rather than the norm – to dialects rather than standard English, for example ... Of course, language is a living force, but our central concern must be the business of teaching children how to use their language correctly' (Eggar, 1991). In fact, more generally over the 1990s, the Conservative government closed down on the idea of using school to develop creative critical voices. It introduced a centrally planned national curriculum and a system of national tests for 7, 11 and 14 year olds, and shifted power away from Local Education Authorities. These changes also saw the demise of large-scale, teacher-driven language curriculum development initiatives like LINC and the National Writing and Oracy Projects, and in a recent review of English teaching from the 1950s to the present, Gibbons (2017: 3) concludes that 'the legacy of nearly thirty years of top-down reform has been profound de-professionalization – leaving English teachers with the underlying sense that the critical decisions about what to teach and how to teach are no longer theirs to make. So hegemonic seems the discourse around standards, accountability, performance and attainment that it can appear that this is just the way things are'.

It is important, of course, not to romanticize language education in England from the 1960s to the 1980s. Jaspers' (2017) call for caution

about transformation in education is needed here too, and after all, this historical sketch only describes the thinking of educationalists – it is far harder to know what young people themselves actually made of it all. Indeed, there were educationalists on the political left who argued that far from empowering students, pedagogies committed to voice masked the stratification and social filtering that schooling entailed, and that they failed to provide students with access to the genres that held greatest power in society (Kress, 1982; Reid, 1987; Rampton *et al.*, 1988). But we can still say: (a) that these ideas about developing creatively independent voices ‘worth hearing’ wouldn’t have lasted as long as they did if they had not worked with at least some of the students; and (b) that the students who were affected positively in this way must have been far greater in number, over much longer in their educational careers, than anything that the non-profit, ‘third sector’ projects described in the previous section can hope to achieve.

Stroud (2008: 45) himself recognizes the ‘shifting significance of language in citizenship across time and space, and across different political and economic structures’, and the story of language education in England shows that political and economic structures can, at any given time, be either more or less conducive to realizing the ideals of LC. But Stroud’s starting assumption is that traditional, state-based institutions are antipathetic to non-standard language mixing, and he focuses on grassroots activity at some distance from the centres of power. Perhaps because of this, in a recent paper looking at how the idea developed, he stresses LC’s ‘utopian’ qualities: ‘[t]he contestations played out in “acts of citizenship” frequently *prefigure* a better world ... tantamount to anticipating or imagining a world in which harmful categories and systems of othering are deconstructed ... These foreshadowings may often be experienced as aesthetic or euphoric resonances of subjectively experienced events or states: Linguistic Citizenship carries a utopian surplus in this sense’ (Stroud, 2018: 23; see also Hymes, 1972: 204–6; von Holdt, 2012: 172).

Compare this, however, with the view of Michael Stubbs (1986) in *Educational Linguistics* in England in 1986, who also envisaged ‘[a] reconstructionist [language] curriculum [which] sees education as a way of understanding and improving society’, which would give students ‘the ability to analyse, criticize, and possibly reconstruct social norms and practices’, and which was ‘essentially democratic in that all children have the right of access to such means of cultural analysis’ (1986: 78). This vision fits with LC, but Stubbs insisted that ‘[n]o utopian assumptions are necessarily made: it need not be assumed that there is one ideal kind of society, or that perfection will be attained’ (1986: 78). This pragmatism was well judged – just two years later, he was appointed to a government Working Group tasked with designing a national curriculum for English, and this committee soon produced a document that combined well with LINC and was well received by teachers (DFE, 1989; Cox, 1992: 264).

Admittedly, their text did not survive the transformations of the 1990s and it was soon overtaken by ‘a series of events which should not have occurred in a democratic society. From 1991 to 1995, a small group of Conservatives interfered with the National Curriculum in order to impose an extreme right-wing version of the knowledge and skills necessary for the education of our children’ (Cox, 1995: 185). Even so, in this context, it was tactics in the corridors of power that mattered, more than utopian aspiration at the margins. More than just working with utopian aspirations, Cox, Stubbs and their associates were fighting pragmatically for *specific proposals, building on existing* language education practices at least in part, targeting a clearly identified citizenry (5 to 16 year olds in England).

So the struggle for LC doesn’t have to be confined to relatively short-term projects, and it is possible to work on a scale which reaches far beyond local initiatives involving critical pedagogy or creative production that symbolically challenges the linguistic status quo. But this is likely to require the penetration of (whatever is left of) the state, with all the practical compromises that this entails. The kinds of abstraction and strategic simplification described in the discussion of entextualization, hearability and the effective circulation of ideas in the second Section of this chapter inevitably form part of this, and the challenge is to ensure that the core commitments of LC remain intact – commitments to democratic participation, to voice, to the heterogeneity of the linguistic resources that these entail, and to the political value of sociolinguistic understanding.

Conclusion

According to Stroud (2018: 18), LC is a southern and de-colonial concept. But it chimes well with the programme for ethnographic sociolinguistics outlined by Hymes in the United States, which he himself hoped would be politically productive, overcoming ‘scientific colonialism’ (1969: 49, 55). It is also congruent with a line of thinking in language education that was very influential in English state schooling for more than two decades. Central government shut this down in the 1990s, but there are still small-scale projects promoting LC principles, even though they tend to rely on relatively short-term project-specific funding raised from non-state sources. In fact, with sustained pressure to increase the non-academic impact of research, collaborations like the ones described, involving university-based sociolinguists and teachers, arts organizers and community activists, are likely to continue (Rampton, 2015b).

Sociolinguists cannot predict or ‘scientifically’ assess the effects produced by practical initiatives promoting LC, and obviously, the more there are and the longer they last, the harder this gets (even though the expansion would itself be welcome). Nevertheless, over the last few years,

a set of overarching terms seem to have crystallized in sociolinguistics that start to answer Fanshawe and Sriskandarajah's (2011: 5) call for 'a new way of talking about diversity in the UK'. *Superdiversity* characterizes the linguistic terrain, *translanguaging* points the kinds of communicative practice we find there, and *linguistic ethnography* identifies the stance and methods needed to understand them. To these, *Linguistic Citizenship* – or in the UK, 'Sociolinguistic Citizenship' – adds the need to strengthen democratic participation with political and educational efforts tuned to the significance of language. Of course, each of these concepts can and should be interrogated, unpacked, refined, applied and compared with different frameworks and situations (Burawoy & von Holdt, 2012). We have tried to do this in this chapter, and this interrogation is also grist to the academic/non-academic collaboration. But despite their flexible generality, these four broad concepts coalesce in a loosely coherent perspective on language and social change that denaturalizes the traditional equation of language, culture and nationality, and instead promotes a clearer understanding and a more constructive engagement with both the patterning and the unpredictability of contemporary sociolinguistic experience.

Notes

- (1) The arguments and illustrations in this chapter are developed in much greater detail in Rampton *et al.* (2018a).
- (2) Fraser and Stroud illustrate this in different political responses to discrimination against gay people. Affirmative action in the 1970s and 80s gave legitimacy to claims for equal treatment by giving positive recognition to gay identity, while transformative politics would follow queer theory and question 'the very basis of the distinction between heterosexual and homosexual, acknowledging instead the variable and amorphous sexuality of each individual ... destabilising sexual identities in the process' (Fraser, 1995: 85; Stroud, 2001: 344).
- (3) '[N]ew meanings and values, new practices and relationships and kinds of relationship are continually being created... but it is exceptionally difficult to distinguish between those which are really elements of some new phase of the dominant culture ... and those which are substantially alternative or oppositional to it' (Williams, 1977: 123)
- (4) Pronunciation, grammar, lexis, proposition, text organization etc ⇔ turn sequence and construction, participation and production format ⇔ media, genre, role, etc.
- (5) In fact, educational projects that, like Linguistic Citizenship, promote the voice of relatively marginalized people through the recognition of mixed/non-standard language practices and sociolinguistic awareness have a substantial pedigree in critical pedagogy and beyond (e.g. Freire, 1970; Heath, 1983). There has been, for example, a good deal of work with pedagogies involving hip hop in the US (Alim, 2009), Hong Kong (Lin, 2009), Finland (Pietikäinen & Dufva, 2014) and Denmark (e.g. Madsen & Karreb, 2015; www.rapolitics.org), to name just a few of the locations.
- (6) Sub-themes are drawn out and elaborated on through the use of a range of tools, activities and texts – see the accounts of two previous short courses in *Whose Integration?* (Bryers *et al.*, 2013) and *The Power of Discussion* (Bryers *et al.*, 2014; Cooke *et al.*, 2014).

References

- Abrams, F. (1991) Accents and dialects still unmentionable subjects. *Times Educational Supplement*, 14 June.
- Alim, S. (2009) Creating 'an empire within an empire': Critical hip hop language pedagogies and the role of sociolinguistics. In S. Alim, A. Ibrahim and A. Pennycook (eds) *Global Linguistic Flows: Hip Hop Cultures, Youth Identities and the Politics of Language* (pp. 213–230). London: Routledge.
- APPG (All Party Parliamentary Group on Social Integration) (2017a) *Interim Report*. London.
- APPG (All Party Parliamentary Group on Social Integration) (2017b) *Integration not Demonisation*. London.
- Arnaut, K., Blommaert, J., Rampton, B. and Spotti, M. (eds) (2015) *Language and Superdiversity*. London: Routledge.
- Ashton, P., Simons, M., Denaro, D. and Raleigh, M. (1979) *Our Lives: Young People's Autobiographies*. London: ILEA English Centre.
- Ball, S.J., Maguire, M. and Braun, A. (2012) *How Schools Do Policy: Policy Enactments in Secondary Schools*. London: Routledge.
- Blommaert, J. (2004) Rights in places: Comments on linguistic rights and wrongs. In D. Patrick and J. Freeland (eds) *Language Rights and Language Survival* (pp. 55–65). Manchester: St Jerome.
- Blommaert, J. (2005) *Discourse: A Critical Introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Blommaert, J. (2008) *Grassroots Literacy*. London: Routledge.
- Blommaert, J. and Rampton, B. (2011) Language and superdiversity. Paper 70, *Working Papers in Urban Language and Literacies*. See www.academia.edu.
- Bock, Z. and Mheta, G. (eds) (2014) *Language, Society and Communication*. Pretoria: Van Schaik.
- Bryers, D., Winstanley, B. and Cooke, M. (2013) Whose Integration? Paper 106, *Working Papers in Urban Language and Literacies*. See www.academia.edu.
- Bryers, D., Winstanley, B. and Cooke, M. (2014) The power of discussion. In D. Mallows (ed.) *Language Issues in Migration and Integration: Perspectives from Teachers and Learners* (pp. 35–54). London: British Council.
- Burawoy, M. and von Holdt, K. (2012) *Conversations with Bourdieu: The Johannesburg Moment*. Johannesburg: Wits University Press.
- Burgess, T. (2002) Writing, English Teachers and the new professionalism. In T. Burgess, C. Fox and J. Goody (eds) *When the Hurly-Burly's Done: What's Worth Fighting for in English Education?* Sheffield: NATE.
- Cameron, D. and Bourne, J. (1988) No common ground Kingman, grammar and the nation. *Language and Education* 2/3, 81–160.
- Carter, R. (1990) Introduction. In R. Carter (ed.) *Knowledge about Language* (pp 1–20). London: Hodder and Stoughton.
- Carter, R. (1992) LINC The final chapter? *BAAL Newsletter* 42, 16–20.
- Charalambous, P., Charalambous, C. and Zembylas, M. (2016) Troubling translanguaging: Language ideologies, superdiversity and interethnic conflict. In J. Jaspers and L. Madsen (eds) *Sociolinguistics in a Linguagised World*. Special issue of *Applied Linguistic Review* 7 (3). DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1515/applirev-2016-0014>. (A version of this is also available as Paper 190, *Working Papers in Urban Language and Literacies*. See www.academia.edu.)
- Cooke, M., Bryers, D. and Winstanley, B. (2018) 'Our Languages': Sociolinguistics in multilingual participatory ESOL. Paper 234, *Working Papers in Urban Language and Literacies*. See www.academia.edu.
- Cox, B. (1990) *Cox on Cox: An English Curriculum for the 1990s*. London: Hodder and Stoughton.
- Cox, B. (1992) *The Great Betrayal*. London: Chapmans.

- Cox, B. (1995) *Cox on the Battle for the English Curriculum*. London: Hodder and Stoughton.
- DES (Department of Education and Science) (1967) *Children and their Primary Schools*. (Plowden Report) London: HMSO.
- DES (Department for Education and Science) (1975) *A Language for Life*. (Bullock Report) London: HMSO.
- DES (Department of Education and Science) (1989) *English for Ages 5 to 16 (Cox Report)* London HMSO.
- Eggar, T. (1991) Correct use of English is essential. *Times Educational Supplement*, 28 June.
- English for Action (EFA) (2016) *Annual Report 2015–16*. See http://apps.charitycommission.gov.uk/Accounts/Ends68/0001133268_AC_20160731_E_C.pdf (accessed 7 December 2019).
- Fanshawe, S. and Sriskandarajah, D. (2010) ‘*You Can’t Put Me in a Box*’: *Super-diversity and the End of Identity Politics in Britain*. London: IPPR.
- Fraser, N. (1995) From redistribution to recognition? Dilemmas of justice in a ‘post-socialist’ age. *New Left Review* 212, 68–93.
- Fraser, N. (2003) From discipline to flexibilisation? Rereading Foucault in the shadow of globalisation. *Constellations* 10 (2), 160–171.
- Freire, P. (1970) *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- García, O. and Li, W. (2014) *Translanguaging*. Basingstoke: Palgrave.
- Gibbons, S. (2017) *English and its Teachers: A History of Policy, Pedagogy and Practice*. London: Routledge.
- Haarstad, H. and Fløysand, A. (2007) Globalisation and the power of rescaled narratives: A case of opposition to mining in Tambogrande, Peru. *Political Geography* 26, 289–308.
- Heath, S.B. (1983) *Ways with Words*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Holmes, S. (2015) Promoting multilingual creativity: Key principles from successful project. Paper 182, *Working Papers in Urban Language and Literacies*. See www.academia.edu.
- Hudson, R. (1980) *Sociolinguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hymes, D. (1969) The use of anthropology: Critical, political, personal. In D. Hymes (ed.) *Reinventing Anthropology* (pp. 3–82). Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.
- Hymes, D. [1975] (1996) Report from an underdeveloped country: Toward linguistic competence in the United States. In D. Hymes *Ethnography; Linguistics, Narrative Inequality: Toward an Understanding of Voice* (pp. 63–106). London: Taylor and Francis.
- Hymes, D. (1977) *Foundations in Sociolinguistics: An Ethnographic Approach*. London: Tavistock.
- Isin, E. (2008) Theorising acts of citizenship. In E. Isin and G. Nielsen (ed.) *Acts of Citizenship* (pp. 15–43). London: Zed Books.
- Isin, E. (2017) Performative citizenship. In A. Shadhar, R. Bauboeck, I. Bloemraad and M. Vink (eds) *The Oxford Handbook of Citizenship*. (pp. 500–523). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Isin, E. and Nielsen, G. (ed.) (2008) *Acts of Citizenship*. London: Zed Books.
- Jaspers, J. (2017). The transformative limits of translanguaging. Paper 226, *Working Papers in Urban Language and Literacies*. See www.academia.edu.
- Jessop, B. (2007) From micro-powers to governmentality: Foucault’s work on statehood, state formation, statecraft and state power. *Political Geography* 26 (1), 34–40.
- Joseph, J. and Taylor, T. (eds) (1990) *Ideologies of Language*. London: Routledge.
- Kell, C. (2015) Ariadne’s thread: Literacy, scale and meaning making across space and time. In C. Stroud and M. Prinsloo (eds) *Language, Literacy and Diversity: Moving Words* (pp. 72–91). London: Routledge. (Also available as Paper 118, *Working Papers in Urban Language and Literacies* [2013]. See www.academia.edu.)
- Kerfoot, C. (2018) Making and shaping participatory spaces: Resemiotisation and citizenship agency in South Africa. In L. Lim, C. Stroud and L. Wee (eds) *The Multilingual*

- Citizen: Towards a Politics of Language for Agency and Change* (pp. 263–288). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Khan, K. (2017) Citizenship, securitisation and suspicion in UK ESOL policy. In K. Arnaut, M.S. Karrebaek, M. Spotti and J. Blommaert (eds) *Engaging Superdiversity: Recombining Spaces, Times and Language Practices* (pp. 303–320). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Kress, G. (1982) *Learning to Write*. London: RKP.
- Le Page, R. (1981) *Caribbean Connections in the Classroom*. London: Mary Glasgow Language Trust.
- Le Page, R. (1988) Some premises concerning the standardisation of languages, with special reference to Caribbean Creole English. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 71, 25–36.
- Lin, A. (2009) ‘Respect for da chopstick hip hop’: The politics, poetics and pedagogy of Cantonese verbal art in Hong Kong. In S. Alim, A. Ibrahim and A. Pennycook (eds) *Global Linguistic Flows: Hip Hop Cultures, Youth Identities and the Politics of Language* (pp. 159–178). London: Routledge.
- Language in the National Curriculum Materials for Professional Development* (LINC) (1992) Nottingham: Department of English Studies, University of Nottingham.
- Madsen, L. and Karrebæk, S. (2015) Hip hop, education and polycentricity. In J. Snell, S. Shaw and F. Copland (eds) *Linguistic Ethnography: Interdisciplinary Explorations* Palgrave Advances Series (pp. 246–265). Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Makoni, S. (2003) From misinvention to disinvention of language: Multilingualism and the South African constitution. In S. Makoni, G. Smitherman, A. Ball and A. Spears (eds) *Black Linguistics: Language, Society and Politics in Africa and the Americas* (pp. 132–152). London: Routledge.
- Makoni, S. and Pennycook, A. (2007) (eds) *Disinventing and Reconstituting Languages*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Maybin, J. (2017) Textual trajectories: Theoretical roots and institutional consequences. *Text and Talk* 37 (4), 415–435.
- McCarty, T. (2011) Introducing ethnography and language policy. In T. McCarty (ed.) *Ethnography and Language Policy* (pp. 1–28). London: Routledge.
- Mehan, H. (1996) The construction of an LD student: A case study in the politics of representation. In M. Silverstein and G. Urban (eds) *Natural Histories of Discourse* (pp. 253–176). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Moore, R. (2011) Standardisation, diversity and enlightenment in the contemporary crisis of EU language policy. Paper 74. *Working Papers in Urban Language and Literacies*, 74. See www.academia.edu.
- Morrison, M. and Sandhu, P. (1992) Towards a multilingual pedagogy. In K. Norman (ed.) *Thinking Voices: The Work of the National Oracy Project* (pp. 100–107). London: Hodder and Stoughton.
- Neveu, C. (2015) Of ordinariness and citizenship processes. *Citizenship Studies* 19 (2), 141–154.
- Oliveri, F. (2014) Acts of citizenship against neo-liberalism: The new cycle of migrant struggles in Italy. In N.K. Kim (ed.) *Multicultural Challenges and Sustainable Democracy in Europe and East Asia* (pp. 221–242). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Pennycook, A. (2016) Mobile times, mobile terms: The trans-super-poly-metro movement. In N. Coupland (ed.) *Sociolinguistics: Theoretical Debates* (pp. 201–216). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Petrovic, J. and Kuntz, A. (2013) Strategies of reframing language policy in the liberal state: A recursive model. *Journal of Language and Politics* 12 (3), 126–146.
- Pietikäinen, S. and Dufva, H. (2014) Heteroglossia in action: Sámi children, textbooks and rap. In A. Blackledge and A. Creese (eds) *Heteroglossia as Practice and Pedagogy* (pp. 59–74). Dordrecht: Springer.

- Rampton, B. (2014) An everyday poetics of class and ethnicity in stylisation and crossing. In M. Fludernik and D. Jacob (eds) *Linguistics and Literary Studies: Interfaces, Encounters, Transfers* (pp. 261–268). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Rampton, B. (2015a) Superdiversity and social class: An interactional perspective. In C. Stroud and M. Prinsloo (eds) *Language, Literacy and Diversity: Moving Words* (pp. 149–165). London: Routledge.
- Rampton, B. (2015b) The next ten years for applied linguistics? Paper 165, *Working Papers in Urban Language and Literacies*. See www.academia.edu.
- Rampton, B. (2016) Drilling down to the grain in superdiversity. In K. Arnaut, J. Blommaert, B. Rampton and M. Spotti (eds) *Language and Superdiversity* (pp. 91–109). London: Routledge.
- Rampton, B., Bourne, J. and Cameron, D. (1988) The Kingman Inquiry A briefing document. *Politics and Linguistics Newsletter* 5, 3–21.
- Rampton, B., Cook, M. and Holmes, S. (2018a) Promoting Linguistic Citizenship: Issues, problems and possibilities. Paper 233, *Working Papers in Urban Language and Literacies*. See www.academia.edu.
- Rampton, B., Harris, R. and Leung, C. (2007) Education and languages other than English in the British Isles. In D. Britain (ed.) *Language in the British Isles* (2nd revised edn) (pp. 417–35). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rampton, B., Leung, C. and Cooke, M. (2020) Education, England and users of languages other than English. Paper 275, *Working Papers in Urban Language and Literacies*. See www.academia.edu.
- Reid, I. (ed.) (1987) *The place of genre in learning: Current debates*. Geelong: Centre for Studies in Literary Education, Deakin University
- Rosen, H. (1981) *Neither Bleak House nor Liberty Hall: English in the Curriculum*. London: University of London Institute of Education.
- Rosen, H. and Burgess, T. (1980) *The Languages and Dialects of London Schoolchildren*. London: Ward Lock.
- Santos, B. de S. (2012) Public sphere and epistemologies of the South. *Africa Development* 37 (1), 43–67.
- Savva, H. (1990) The rights of bilingual children. In R. Carter (ed.) *Knowledge about Language* (pp. 248–68). London: Hodder and Stoughton.
- 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. (2008) Bilingualism: Colonialism and post-colonialism. In M. Heller (ed.) *Bilingualism: A Social Approach* (pp. 25–49). Basingstoke: Palgrave.
- Stroud, C. (2010) Towards a post-liberal theory of citizenship. In J. Petrovic (ed.) *International Perspectives on Bilingual Education: Policy, Practice and Controversy* (pp. 191–218). New York: Information Age Publishing.
- 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. and Heugh, K. (2004) Linguistic human rights and linguistic citizenship. In D. Patrick and J. Freeland (eds) *Language Rights and Language Survival* (pp. 191–218). Manchester: St Jerome.
- Stubbs, M. (1986) *Educational Linguistics*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- von Holdt, K. (2012) The symbolic world of politics. In M. Burawoy and K. von Holdt (eds) *Conversations with Bourdieu: The Johannesburg Moment* (pp. 169–174). Johannesburg: Wits University Press.

Williams, R. (1977) *Marxism and Literature*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Williams, Q. and Stroud, C. (2015) Linguistic citizenship: Language and politics in post-national modernities. *Journal of Language and Politics* 14 (3), 406–430.

Woolard, K., Schieffelin, B. and Kroskrity, P. (1998) *Language Ideologies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.