Language and citizenship

Broadening the agenda

Tommaso M. Milani
University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg

The main argument advanced in this article that frames this special issue is that citizenship is not just a highly polysemic word employed by the media and other political institutions; it is also a set of norms and (linguistic) behaviours that individuals are socialised into, as well as a series of practices that social actors perform through an array of semiotic means including multilingualism, multivoicedness, the body, and affect. In light of this, it is proposed that the linguistic/discursive study of citizenship should be expanded beyond a rather narrow emphasis on political proposals about language testing to include the diverse, more or less mundane, ways in which citizenship is enacted via an array of *multivocal, material,* and *affective* semiotic resources.

Keywords: acts; affect; citizenship; habitus; multivocality; status

1. Introduction

Over the last ten years or so, public debates about language and citizenship have cropped up in many European and non-European countries, typically resulting in the implementation of stricter "testing regimes" (Extra & Spotti 2009). Underpinning such structures and practices of social control are not simply preoccupations with migrants' proficiency in what count as the 'national'/'official' languages of the country they moved into, but also concerns with the preservation of that country's 'cultural canon', whatever this may be (see in particular Extra & Spotti 2009; Blackledge 2008).

It is difficult, if not impossible, to understand the emergence of this *obsession* with linguistic and cultural requirements for the naturalisation of migrants without taking a *multi-scalar* approach that considers developments in a national arena in relation to trans-national movements and supra-national, EU policies (see also Blommaert 2007 for a discussion of the notion of scale). Such a multi-scalar interconnectedness is explored by Horner (*this issue*) who offers a convincing analysis

of the relationships between discussions on multilingualism and citizenship in Luxembourg and EU enlargement (see also Wodak 2011 as well as Krzyzanowski & Wodak 2011 for a cogent analysis of the connections between the so-called Lisbon strategy and EU multilingualism policies). Needless to say, issues of language and citizenship are never isolated but are deeply imbricated with other societal discussions about refugees, social cohesion, and state security, as well as neoliberal preoccupations with economic expansion (see e.g. Blackledge 2005; Milani 2008; 2009; Pulinx and van Avermaet, *this issue,* Horner, *this issue,* Wee, *this issue*).

Overall, debates about language and citizenship are arguably the most patent manifestations of deeper "frictions" (Tsing 2005) between the enhanced transnational movements of people and economic and symbolic goods (including languages), on the one hand, and the endurance of the monolingual and monocultural nation-state as the ideal model of political organisation, on the other (see also Isin 2008, 16).

Such debates have been analysed at length in a growing literature within the field of language politics (Blackledge 2005; see also the contributions to Extra et al. 2009; Hogan-Brun et al. 2009; Shohamy and McNamara 2009), supplementing academic work on citizenship in a variety of other disciplines such as anthropology, politics, and sociology (see amongst others the articles in the journal *Citizenship Studies* and the numerous publications produced by the research team at EUDO Observatory on Citizenship).

The ground-breaking aspect of these publications lies in their unravelling of the interplay between the actors, the arguments, and the ideologies at work in the process of shaping language policies related to citizenship. At the risk of falling into undue oversimplifications, however, there are three main shortcomings in this scholarship that should be highlighted. Firstly, it has concentrated almost exclusively on state discourses and thus overlooked the grassroots reactions to, and attitudes toward, language policies for citizenship (see however Cooke & Simpson 2008). Secondly, it has been mainly concerned with issues of (language) testing, side-lining the many other semiotic arenas in which citizenship takes shape (see however Reynolds & Chun 2013; Ramanathan 2013 for important exceptions). Thirdly, it has failed to fully unpack the complexity of citizenship itself (see however Blackledge 2008 and Horner 2009). To take but one example, Extra et al. (2009) state in the introduction to their compelling volume on language testing regimes that

> [i]n the context of the reference that we make to nation-states in this Volume, we also have to draw another distinction, that between nationality and citizenship. […] Nationals belong to a nation-state but they may not have all the rights linked to citizenship (e.g. voting rights). In this sense, citizenship is a more inclusive concept than nationality.   (Extra et al. 2009, 5)

Although a definition of citizenship is offered in the extract above, the full implications and different shapes which the concept may take do not seem to be fully explored. In contrast, the contributors to this special issue believe that there is more to citizenship than what the state and its institutions have to say. So we treat citizenship as a complex and *dynamic* phenomenon that includes, but is *not* reducible to, rights and duties (see also Devlin & Pothier 2006 and Ramanathan 2013 for a similar point). Therefore, we propose that the linguistic/discursive study of citizenship should be expanded beyond the rather narrow emphasis on political proposals about language testing to include the diverse, more or less mundane, ways in which various social actors enact citizenship with the help of an array of *multivocal, material,* and *affective* semiotic resources (see in particular Williams and Stroud as well as Milani, *this issue*).

Against this backdrop, the main aims of this special issue are to:

1. Continue investigating institutional discourses about the relationship between nationality and citizenship, but relate them to more ethnographically grounded interactions;
2. Tease out the multiple and often conflicting meanings of citizenship;
3. Explore the different linguistic/semiotic guises that citizenship might take on in different contexts.

In doing so, the contributors do not subscribe to a single theoretical framework, but rather draw upon a plethora of analytical lenses through which to make sense of the often chaotic data under inquiry. Put differently, these investigations are based on the epistemological premise of "conceptual pragmatism" (Mouzelis 1995; see also Wodak 2001b), according to which social theory "has as its major task to clarify conceptual tools and to construct new ones by criteria of utility rather than truth" (Wodak 2001a, 9; see in particular Milani, *this issue* for the queer concept of *cityzenship*). This being said, all the authors engage in critical discourse analysis by pursuing nuanced deconstructions of a variety of texts, from policy documents to print media outputs, from stand-up comedy scripts to ethnographic notes and photographs. The articles also provide empirical evidence supporting and engaging with Isin's (2008) theorisation of citizenship, which I will now present.

2. Citizenship: Status, habitus, acts

Political theorist Engin Isin (2008) argues that existing critical scholarship on citizenship can be divided into three major strands which correspond to three different ways of conceptualising citizenship as *status, habitus,* or *acts*. In what follows,

I highlight how each contribution to this special issue fits in, and contributes to, Isin's (2008) distinction. Admittedly, not all of the articles here explicitly refer to this theory. Yet, Isin's interpretation of citizenship can be taken as the theoretical scaffolding that undergirds this special issue as a whole.

2.1   Status, linguistic capital, and the reproduction of social inequality

As *status,* citizenship can be understood as a form of membership, usually in the (nation-)state. It is within this conceptualisation that citizenship and nationality become closely and problematically intertwined. Here, *citizenship* can be defined as a social contract about rights and duties between an individual and one or several states – what Bauböck (2012) calls "citizenship constellation", that is, "a structure in which individuals are simultaneously linked to several such political entities in such a way that their legal rights and duties are determined not only by one political authority, but by several" (2012, 3). Rights include but are not restricted to "the right to protection of the law, freedom of speech, personal security, political participation" (Wingstedt 1998, 88). Among the duties is "demonstrating loyalty to the state when called upon, e.g. participation in military enterprises" (Wingstedt 1998, 88). In contrast, *nationality* means belonging to a particular national community, which is enshrined *inter alia* in the wielding of a passport.

To explain the relationships between citizenship as *status* and nationality, I can take myself as an example – I am an Italian national residing in South Africa. My passport is the lawful proof of belonging to a particular nation-state, Italy. In terms of citizenship, I have the right to vote and be elected in Italian as well as EU elections. Furthermore, the Italian constitution prescribes that "the defence of the Motherland is a sacred duty" (Costituzione della Repubblica Italiana, Art. 52). By virtue of a valid South African permanent residence permit, I have the right to perform an academic profession at a South African institution of tertiary education. I have the duty to pay taxes to the South African Revenue Services, but I am not entitled to vote in South African elections. In eight years' time, however, I will be eligible for South African "citizenship by naturalisation". And, because of bilateral agreements between Italy and South Africa on dual citizenship, I will not need to renounce my Italian nationality.

From this personal narrative, it is possible to get a sense of the semantic entanglements of citizenship and nationality supporting the view that, in many contexts, "citizenship law is synonymous with nationality law" and "[the] terms citizenship and nationality are virtually interchangeable" (Vincent 2002, 83). The complex semantics of citizenship is explored further by Pulinx and van Avermaet in the article that opens this special issue, which critically investigates the Flemish context. In Belgium, the regional government of Flanders cannot determine Belgian

naturalisation requirements. As the authors demonstrate through a detailed textual analysis of policy documents, the meaning of citizenship in the Flemish context has little to do with the process of naturalisation or with formal rights and duties. Rather, it has taken on a moral connotation of integration, something that, however, applies only to some individuals (=migrants) but not others (see also Blommaert & Verschueren 1998). By the same token, through an investigation of multilingual media texts in Luxembourg, Horner shows that

> Despite calls for cooperation between (long-term) Luxembourg nationals and non-nationals, the discourse of integration squarely places the onus on non-nationals. (Horner, *this issue*)

Read together, the first two articles in this special issue reveal the discursive moves that tie citizenship together with integration; they also demonstrate how citizenship is employed as a linguistic and cultural gate-keeping technique through which membership and participation in the nation-state are more or less overtly policed. Though both rights and duties are spoken about in Flemish policy documents and Luxembourgish media texts, they do not contribute equally to the meaning of citizenship. Instead, the meaning of the word seem skewed towards a focus on the duties of migrants to comply with a predetermined set of linguistic and socio-cultural requirements (see also Blommaert & Verschueren 1998).

Bourdieu's (1991) notion of *market,* together with the concepts of *linguistic, cultural,* and *symbolic* capital, can be particularly apt to understanding the processes of linguistic and cultural (de)valuing at work in the Flemish and Luxembourgish contexts. In Bourdieu's terms, languages are like currencies with different values in a particular market (see also the contributions to Blackledge & Pavlenko 2002; Pavlenko & Blackledge 2005). So, in the cases of Flanders and Luxembourg, the languages spoken by certain minority groups – Arabic, Turkish, and Portuguese – are worth less than the 'national'/'official' language(s). Crucially, these specific minority groups are required to increase their *linguistic capital* by learning a 'national'/'official' language; they are also expected to acquire a particular *cultural capital* that will make them 'less different' from the national majority. It could be argued that increasing *linguistic* and *cultural* capital for minority groups is a well-meant attempt on the part of a nation-state to endow these groups with symbolic capital, that is, *prestige.* However, whenever minorities' social inclusion and enfranchisement is promised on the basis of pre-given norms set by the majority, the possibility of reshaping these norms is foreclosed. Furthermore, social and linguistic inequality (Piller 2012) is (re)produced because the 'official'/'national' languages and cultures are *misrecognised* as the standard to which everyone should aim and conform, whereas some migrants' languages and cultures are devalued as irrelevant to what counts as the 'national'.

In (re)producing inequality, the linguistic and cultural assimilationism under-pinning *integration* rhetoric gives rise to what Ramanathan (2013a) calls (dis)citi-zenship, a concept borrowed from critical disability studies indicating "a form of citizenship minus, a disabling citizenship" (Devlin & Pothier 2006; see also the contributions to the special issue of the *Journal of Language, Identity and Edu-cation* (Ramanathan 2013b)). Reread through this notion, then, the policies in Flanders and Luxembourg *inactivate* the potential inherent in linguistic and cul-tural diversity, and "create contexts of (dis)citizenship" (Ramanathan 2013, 9) in that "the offer has been made, the conditions have been set and applicants have the duty to alter their linguistic abilities and practices to demonstrate 'sufficient integration' as stipulated by the law" (Horner, *this issue*; see also Wodak 2013 for a cogent analysis of (dis)citizenship in the German context). Put bluntly, you'll only be a citizen if you can prove that you can behave according to 'our' norms.

2.2   Habitus, heteroglossia, and the ambivalent life of authoritative discourse

Whilst analyses of policy documents and media outputs are relevant in that they lay bare elite discourses that might over time become hegemonic and be taken for granted (see also van Dijk 1993; Blackledge 2005; Milani 2007), an exclusive focus on citizenship as *status* fails to grasp the *dynamics* through which individuals per-ceive and enact citizenship in their daily lives (see in particular Cooke & Simpson 2008). As Isin has noted, it is important to understand "how status becomes con-tested by investigating practices through which claims are articulated and sub-jectivities are formed" (2008, 17). This understanding of citizenship as a form of *embodied practice* is informed by (1) Bourdieu's theorisation of *habitus* as "systems of durable, transposable dispositions … which generate and organize practices and representations" (1980, 53), and (2) Foucault's (1991) notes on governmental-ity, that is, "conduct of conduct" (see also Milani 2009; Kauppinen 2013). Viewed from such a perspective, citizenship is not so much the sum of rights one is enti-tled to and duties one is burdened by, nor a quality one is endowed with (i.e. natu-ralisation), but is rather a *mode of conduct* that is acquired through a multiplicity of "routines, rituals, customs, norms and habits of the everyday" (Isin 2008, 17).

The notion of *habitus* has been employed by some scholars of nationalism in order to conceptualise the processes of *national identity* formation, particularly at the level of the individual (see e.g. Wodak et al. 2009; Unger 2013; Unger et al. 2014). For example, Wodak et al. define national identity as

> a complex of common or similar *beliefs or opinions* internalised in the course of socialisation […] and of common or similar *emotional attitudes* […] as well as common or similar *behavioural dispositions*, including inclusive, solidarity-oriented and exclusive, distinguishing dispositions and also in many cases linguistic dispositions.   (2009, 28 emphasis in original)

Obviously, the state lies behind such process of ideological, emotional, and behavioural inculcation "[t]hrough classificational systems (specially according to sex and age) inscribed in law, through bureaucratic procedures, educational structures and social rituals" (Bourdieu 1994, 7).

It is precisely the social ritual of naturalisation that is explored by Khan and Blackledge (this issue) with the help of an extended ethnography of one migrant's journey towards becoming a British citizen. What emerge in this article are the complex intersections of citizenship and national identity *habituses*. On the one hand, the naturalisation process, crowned by the final ceremony, can be taken as one of the most patent "bureaucratic procedures" through which "the state molds mental structures and imposes common principles of vision and division" (Bourdieu 1994, 7), seeking to turn applicants into *British citizens*. On the other hand, however, this process is never smoothly and fully accomplished. To be officially recognised as a citizen of the UK is neither co-extensive with an identification with Britishness nor is it indicative of a longing to belong (see also Fortier 2013 for an incisive analysis of the *affective* dimension of citizenship).

This push and pull is generated by a clash between *centripetal* – homogenising – forces of the state and *centrifugal* – particularising – drives of the individual migrant (Bakhtin 1981). Textually, this tension manifests itself in the highly *heteroglossic* and *dialogical* nature of the narratives presented in the article. Developed by the semiotician and literary critic Mikhail Bakhtin, *heteroglossia* and *dialogism* are related to each other. Dialogism "refers to the ceaselessly shifting power relations between words, their sensitivity to each other, and the relativizing force of their historically motivated clashes and temporary resolutions" (Vice 1997, 5). Heteroglossia is "*another's speech* in *another's language*, serving to express authorial intentions but in a refracted way […] It serves two speakers at the same time and expresses simultaneously two different intentions" (Bakhtin 1981, 324). Put simply, dialogism is the principle underpinning heteroglossia.

Bakhtin's concepts are mobilised by Khan and Blackledge in order to deconstruct the processes through which applicants for British citizenship are socialised into a particular citizenship *habitus*. Prospective citizens seem to acquire a monoglot, authoritative discourse which "demands unconditional allegiance" (Bakhtin 1981, 343) to the nation-state. During the actual naturalisation ceremony, however, they "do not necessarily offer such unconditional allegiance, as they may be moving their lips without uttering the authoritative text" (Khan and Blackledge, *this issue*). The act of mouthing the words silently is not politically irrelevant; it one of those "banal" (Billig 1995), but nonetheless crucial, moments of "mimicry" (Bhabha 1994) which turn the apparent acquisition and reproduction of habitus into resistance; it is an act of defiance of the rules established by the state. Such

resistance can, according to Isin (2008), be described with the help of the notion of *acts of citizenship*.

2.3 Acts of linguistic and bodily citizenship

A focus on habitus is important because it brings to the fore the dynamic aspect of citizenship as a set of norms and behaviours that are acquired over time through a particular process of socialisation. That being said, too strong of an emphasis on habitus, and on the concomitant reproduction of the *status quo,* might make us blind to those moments in which individuals actually "break with habitus. Without such creative breaks it is impossible to imagine social transformation or to understand how subjects become citizens as claimants of justice, rights and responsibilities" (Isin 2008, 18). Echoing to some degree Butler's (1997) argument that Bourdieu's theory fails to take into serious account any possibility of agency, opposition or resistance "from the margins of power" (Butler 1997, 156), Isin's understanding of *acts of citizenship* draws our attention to performances of radical dissent which often happen "when one may be led to least expect it – in the nooks and crannies of everyday life, outside of institutionalized contexts that one ordinarily associates with politics" (Besnier 2009, 11; see also Butler 1990). And these are acts that might even operate at the boundaries of what is considered legal (see in particular Milani's discussion about the protest against Johannesburg Pride in 2012, *this issue*).

It should be highlighted that the notion of *acts of citizenship* is similar to the sociolinguistic concept of "linguistic citizenship" (Stroud 2001, 2003, 2009; see also Milani & Shaikjee 2013). Stroud explains that linguistic citizenship refers to "the situation where speakers themselves exercise control over their language, deciding *what* languages are, and what they may *mean*, and where language issues […] are discursively tied to a range of social issues – policy issues and questions of equity" (Stroud 2001, 353, italics in original).

In brief, linguistic citizenship aims to capture those performances that go against the grain by drawing upon oppositional discourses in order to disrupt established hegemonic views about language, destabilising the status quo from the margins (see also Horner's argument about moments of rupture in the Luxembourgish press that challenge the notion of integration and the centrality of the Luxembourgish language in daily life).

As Williams and Stroud (*this issue*) propose, however, linguistic citizenship – and acts of citizenship, for that matter – should not be restricted to describing public events of political mobilisation, but can also be usefully employed in order to understand the many ephemeral and apparently mundane occurrences of agency *on grounds of language* that unfold in daily interactions – both private and public

(see also Milani & Shaikjee 2013). They do so by examining a multilingual skit performed by a famous South African Jewish stand-up comedian – Nik Rabinowitz – at a well-known braaied meat establishment in the Western Cape township of Gugulethu. Through a careful analysis of the Bakhtinian heteroglossia of the performance (see also section above), the article shows how each voice, each accent, each language mobilised by the comedian does not simply generate humour and tickle the audience, but also acts as a powerful political critique of South Africa. Racial and other cultural stereotypes are indeed brought into being through particular linguistic choices. However, they are partly invoked in order to be overthrown and contested, thus producing a social critique that disrupts hegemonic views.

A similarly ambiguous situation which oscillates between reproducing and contesting the social order through *acts of citizenship* is picked up by Milani in his analysis of a 'die-in' demonstration in which the South African activist group *One in Nine* used their bodies to momentarily stop the annual Pride parade in Johannesburg in 2012. On the basis of a critical discourse analysis of media texts and material collected during the parade, Milani shows how the 'die-in' demonstration is an important act of citizenship that questions the commercialisation of the pride parade and its concomitant downplaying of key social issues in South Africa, such as the so-called corrective rapes and murders of black lesbians. However, by virtue of inhabiting a seemingly lifeless position on the street tarmac, the women of *One in Nine* also *conform* to a visually intelligible position in the South African context; they embody – literally – the epitome of powerlessness. Milani argues that this is a strategy that might seem paradoxical for a group that strives towards a society "where women are the *agents* of their own lives". With hindsight, however, this seemingly powerless embodiment of death proved to be a powerfully *turbulent* "act of citizenship". Stroud (in press) proposes that turbulence offers us an important metaphor through which we can re-conceptualise the role played by (dis) order in politics in that it captures

> a political impulse that attunes to uncertainty and chance (Anker 2009). Retallack's (2003) suggestion that we attend to the swerve of events entails a politics that does not assume turbulence as a moment of breakdown – a fundamentally bad thing – but rather an event of creative potentiality. Moments of turbulence in quite literal mobilities produce sudden visibilities in systems that would otherwise remain mostly invisible and taken-for-granted. (Cresswell & Martin 2012, 526)

Not only did the *One in Nine* make visible the racial and racist splits within lesbian and gay constituencies in South Africa; it also set in motion the development of new political assemblages around sexuality issues: the NGO that had been organising Joburg Pride ceased operation only a few months after the 'die-in', and a new formation emerged with the aim of organising a more politicised march in support

of non-normative sexualities. Hence, one could conclude that the *One in Nine* die-in was "a stitch that sutures but leaves the wound that it mends […] a discursive intervention to address narrative erasure and insert a troubling presence in dominant racializing [and class-based] structures" (Fleetwood 2011, 9).

2.4   Instead of reaching consensus

Not all authors in this special issue are in agreement with regard to the theoretical distinction between *status, habitus*, and *acts.* In the concluding article, Lionel Wee takes Singapore as a case in point, exploring the ways in which the government changed the official rhetoric about citizenship. Through a thorough analysis of the Prime Ministers' speeches over forty years, Wee demonstrates that it is not only citizens, but also governments that have a *habitus* – that is, "systems of durable, transposable dispositions […] which generate and organize practices and representations" (Bourdieu 1980, 53). Importantly, these systems are manifold and may change over time. In the case of Singapore, the government has clearly moved away from promoting a view of its citizenry as "passive", "territory-based" inhabitants of a "city-state" towards the endorsement of an "active" and "globally mobile" citizenship. On a theoretical level, the article offers an important critique of Isin's theoretical distinction between *acts* and *habitus,* which, according to Wee, only serves to lead us to an impasse. Put simply, if "habitus" in the Bourdieuan sense is a disposition to act, and "acts", according to Isin, are moments of rupture with the habitus, this "would imply that these acts emerge *ex nihilo* only after any pre-existing dispositions have been dispensed with" (Wee, *this issue*).

Theoretical (dis)agreements notwithstanding, the articles in this special issue illustrate that citizenship is not just a highly polysemic word employed by the media and other political institutions (Pulinx and van Avermaet, Horner, Wee), but is also a set of norms and (linguistic) behaviours that individuals are socialised into (Khan and Blackledge), as well as a series of practices that individuals perform (Williams and Stroud, Milani) through an array of semiotic means including *multilingualism*, *multivoicedness,* the *body*, and *affect*. It is to this *multi-semioticity* that I now turn because it represents, in my view, one of the most pressing theoretical and methodological challenges to be addressed by critical discourse studies about citizenship.

3.   Where to from here?

It has not been possible in this introduction to fully address the many theoretical and methodological issues arising from discourse-based investigations of

citizenship. However, it is worth noting that nearly all of the articles in this special issue seem to be underpinned by a *logocentric* approach that privileges the 'verbal' and the 'written' modes. This might not be particularly surprising given that the study of language and citizenship began as an offshoot of the broad field of language politics before developing into its own arena of academic inquiry. Moreover, a purely 'linguistic' focus can be explained by the very nature of the texts chosen by most of the contributors, that is, policy documents, newspaper articles, ethnographic notes, and transcripts of a stand-up performance.

That being said, it is useful to remind ourselves that Fairclough argued more than a decade ago that "written texts in contemporary society are increasingly becoming more visual […], not only in the sense that newspapers, for instance, combine words with photographs […], but also because considerations of layout and visual impact are increasingly salient in the design of a written page" (1995, 17; see also Machin 2007, 16). Taking an even stronger position, Kress and van Leeuwen proposed that "[l]anguage always has to be realized through, and comes in the company of, other semiotic modes" (1998, 186), concluding that "any form of text analysis which ignores this will not be able to account for all the meanings expressed in texts" (1998, 186). More recently, Kress has proposed that

> [m]any signs we encounter are in three-dimensional form […] We engage with [them] […] not only through the modes of image, writing, [and] colour, but also in actual or imagined 'inner' mimesis through touch and feel, scent and smell, in action – imagined or real […] all engage more of our body in their materiality than sparser notions of 'representation' might usually suggest.   (Kress 2010, 77)

In the same way that other strands of sociolinguistics and linguistic anthropology have moved towards an acknowledgment of the *visual* and the *material* over the last few years (see in particular Stroud & Mpendukana 2009), I would propose that, if we also want to account for the semiotic multifacetedness of citizenship, we too cannot afford to overlook the growing body of research on *multimodality* and *materiality* (see also Milani & Johnson 2010 for a similar proposal for the field of language ideologies; and Milani 2014 for the study of language and masculinities).

Moreover, Fortier's recent work on "naturalization and the politics of desire" illustrates how important it is to bring the notion of *affect* into the analytical toolkit of citizenship studies because "citizenship constitutes *a site of emotional investment* not only on the part of applicants and 'new' citizens but also on the part of the state" (2013, 697, emphasis added; see also Shohamy 2001; Messer et al. 2012, Blackledge, *this issue*). Focusing rather less on naturalisation than on what he provocatively names "sexual cityzenship", Milani (*this issue*) similarly argues for a focus on the *politics of affect* in order to fully appreciate acts of claim-staking of

urban environments in relation to sexuality. The political impact of the *One in Nine* protest is not reducible merely to its turbulent character that unsettles the "ordered motion" (Cresswell & Martin 2012, 521) of the Pride parade. But it is through the mobilisation of a particular emotion – shame – that the *One in Nine* could crack and perturb the very idea of a South African lesbian and gay 'community', unveiling the hollowness of its apparent unity. Ultimately, the social production of shame shook the very ground on which the Pride parade was built; it questioned a liberal post-apartheid sexual identity politics that recognises equality for everyone, but has actually not benefited everyone in the same way.

To conclude, discourse-based research on citizenship cannot be confined to the purely linguistic (see also van Zoonen et al. 2010). Without a serious engagement with the *visual,* the *corporeal*, and the *affective,* it is difficult to effectively unpack the dynamics of citizenship in contemporary late-modern conditions. In my view, it is in the mapping of the *social life of affect* (Ahmed 2004), and how it manifests semiotically, that there is the promise of better understanding – and maybe changing – social structures and practices. Such a move, however, is not without implications for a discipline like Critical Discourse Studies that is largely underpinned by a Habermasian idea of a rational subject/speaker (see Habermas 1984). Perhaps it is in the direction of the *affective* that we should be heading.

References

Ahmed, Sara. 2004. "Affective Economies." *Social Text* 22 (2): 117–139.
    DOI: 10.1215/01642472-22-2_79-117
Bakhtin, Mikhail. 1981. *The Dialogic Imagination. Four Essays*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
    DOI: 10.1075/z.184.15bak
Bauböck, Rainer. 2012. "Constellations and Transitions: Combining Macro and Micro Perspectives on Migration and Citizenship." In *Migrations: Interdisciplinary Perspectives,* ed. by Michi Messer, Renée Schröder, and Ruth Wodak, 3–14. Vienna: Springer.
    DOI: 10.1007/978-3-7091-0950-2_1
Besnier, Niko. 2009. *Gossip and the Everyday Production of Politics*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press. DOI: 10.1111/j.1548–1352.2011.01175.x
Bhabha, Homi. 1994. *The Location of Culture*. London: Routledge.
    DOI: 10.1177/147447409600300117
Billig, Michael. 1995. *Banal Nationalism*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
    DOI: 10.1017/s0034670500020635
Blackledge, Adrian. 2005. *Discourse and Power in a Multilingual World.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins. DOI: 10.1093/applin/aml008
Blackledge, Adrian. 2008. "Liberalism, Discrimination and the Law: Language Testing for Citizenship in Britain." In *Neo-Colonial Mentalities in Contemporary Europe? Language and Discourse in the Construction of Identities*, ed. by Guido Rings, and Anne Ife, 50–66. New Castle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Blackledge, Adrian, and Aneta Pavlenko (eds). Special issue of *Multilingua* 21 (2–3).

Blommaert, Jan. 2007. "Sociolinguistic Scales." *Intercultural Pragmatics* 4 (1): 1–19. DOI: 10.1515/ip.2007.001

Blommaert, Jan, and Jef Verschueren. 1998. *Debating Diversity: Analysing the Discourse of Tolerance*. London: Routledge. DOI: 10.1075/z.184.75blo

Bourdieu, Pierre. 1980. *The Logic of Practice*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Bourdieu, Pierre. 1991. *Language and Symbolic Power*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Bourdieu, Pierre. 1994. "Rethinking the State: Genesis and Structure of the Bureaucratic Field." *Sociological Theory* 12 (1): 1–18. DOI: 10.2307/202032

Butler, Judith. 1990. *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*. New York: Routledge. DOI: 10.5040/9781472545688.ch-002

Butler, Judith. 1997. *Excitable Speech: The Politics of the Performative*. New York: Routledge. DOI: 10.2307/2647658

Cooke, Melanie, and James Simpson. 2008. *ESOL: A Critical Guide*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Cresswell, Tim, and Craig Martin. 2012. "On Turbulence: Entanglements of Disorder and Order on a Devon Beach." *Tijdschrift voor economische en sociale geografie* 103 (5): 516–529. DOI: 10.1111/j.1467–9663.2012.00734.x

Devlin, Richard, and Dianne Pothier. 2006. "Introduction: Toward a Critical Theory of Dis-Citizenship." In *Critical Disability Theory: Essays in Philosophy, Politics, Policy, and Law*, ed. by Richard Devlin, and Dianne Pothier, 1–22. Vancouver: UBC Press. DOI: 10.1017/s0829320100009182

Extra, Guus, Massimiliano Spotti, and Piet van Avermaet (eds). 2009. *Language Testing, Migration and Citizenship: Cross-national Perspectives on Integration Regimes*. London: Continuum. DOI: 10.1111/j.1467–9841.2012.00545_6.x

Extra, Guus, and Massimiliano Spotti. 2009. "Testing Regimes for Newcomers to the Netherlands." In *Language Testing, Migration and Citizenship: Cross-national Perspectives on Integration Regimes*, ed. by Guus Extra, Massimiliano Spotti, and Piet van Avermaet, 125–147. London: Continuum. DOI: 10.1075/dapsac.33.08ext

Fairclough, Norman. 1995. *Media Discourse*. London: Arnold.

Fortier, Anne-Marie. 2013. "What's the Big Deal? Naturalization and the Politics of Desire." *Citizenship Studies* 17 (6–7): 697–711. DOI: 10.1080/13621025.2013.780761

Foucault, Michel. 1991. "Governmentality." In *The Foucault Effect: Studies in Governmentality with Two Lectures by and an Interview with Michel Foucault*, ed. by Graham Burchell, Colin Gordon, and Peter Miller, 87–104. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press. DOI: 10.1017/s0829320100002507

Habermas, Jürgen. 1984. *The Theory of Communicative Action. Vol. 1: Reason and the Rationalization of Society*. Boston: Beacon Press. DOI: 10.2307/2130954

Hogan-Brun, Gabriella, Clare Mar-Molinero, and Patrick Stevenson (eds). 2009. *Discourses on Language and Integration: Critical Perspectives on Language Testing Regimes in Europe*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. DOI: 10.1007/s10993-010-9164-5

Horner, Kristine. 2009. "Language, Citizenship and Europeanization: Unpacking the Discourse of Integration." In *Discourses on Language and Integration: Critical Perspectives on Language Testing Regimes in Europe*, ed. by Gabriella Hogan-Brun, Clare Mar-Molinero, and Patrick Stevenson, 109–128. Amsterdam: Johns Benjamins. DOI: 10.1075/dapsac.33.10hor

Isin, Engin F. 2008. "Theorizing Acts of Citizenship." In *Acts of Citizenship,* ed. by Engin F. Isin, and Greg M. Nielsen, 15–43. London: Zed Books. DOI: 10.1017/s0025727300000697

Kauppinen, Kati. 2013. "'Full Power despite Stress': A Discourse Analytical Examination of the Interconnectedness of Postfeminism and Neoliberalism in the Domain of Work in an International Women's Magazine." *Discourse & Communication* 7 (2): 133–151. DOI: 10.1177/1750481313476596

Kress, Gunther. 2010. *Multimodality: A Social Semiotic Approach to Contemporary Communication*. London: Routledge. DOI: 10.1177/0963947010377683

Kress, Gunther, and Theo van Leeuwen. 1998. "Front Pages: (The Critical) Analysis of Newspaper Layout." In *Approaches to Media Discourse*, ed. by Allan Bell, and Peter Garrett, 186–219. Oxford: Blackwell.

Krzyżanowski, Michał, and Ruth Wodak. 2011. "Political Strategies and Language Policies: The European Union Lisbon Strategy and Its Implications for the EU's Language and Multilingualism Policy." *Language Policy* 10 (2): 115–136. DOI: 10.1007/s10993-011-9196-5

Kymlicka, Will. 2011. "Multicultural Citizenship within Multinational States." *Ethnicities* 11 (3): 281–302. DOI: 10.1177/1468796811407813

Machin, David. 2007. *Introduction to Multimodal Analysis*. London: Hodder Arnold.

Messer, Michi, Renée , and Ruth Wodak (eds). 2012. *Migrations: Interdisciplinary Perspectives*. Vienna: Springer. DOI: 10.1007/978-3-7091-0950-2_1

Milani, Tommaso M. 2007. "A Language Ideology in Print: The Case of Sweden." In *Language in the Media: Representations, Identities, Ideologied*, ed. by Sally Johnson, and Astrid Ensslin, 111–129. London: Continuum.

Milani, Tommaso M. 2008. "Language Testing and Citizenship: A Language Ideological Debate in Sweden." *Language in Society* 37 (1): 27–59. DOI: 10.1017/S0047404508080020

Milani, Tommaso M. 2009. "At the Intersection between Power and Knowledge: An Analysis of a Swedish Policy Document on Language Testing for Citizenship." *Journal of Language and Politics* 8 (2): 287–304. DOI: 10.1075/jlp.8.2.06mil

Milani, Tommaso M. 2014. "Queering Masculinities." In *The Handbook of Language, Gender and Sexuality.* 2nd edition, ed. by Susan Ehrlich, Miriam Meyerhoff, and Janet Holmes, 260–278. Malden: Wiley Blackwell. DOI: 10.1075/jls.4.1.06lea

Milani, Tommaso M., and Sally Johnson. 2010. "Critical Intersections: Language Ideologies and Media Discourse." In *Language Ideologies and Media Discourse: Texts, Practices, Politics*, ed. by Sally Johnson, and Tommaso M. Milani, 3–14. London: Continuum. DOI: 10.1177/0957926512450064c

Milani, Tommaso M., and Mooniq Shaikjee. 2013. "A New South African Man? Beer, Masculinity and Social Change." In *Gender and Language in Sub-Saharan Africa: Tradition, Struggle, and Change*, ed. by Lilian L. Atanga, Sibonile E. Ellece, Lia Litosseliti, and Jane Sunderland, 131–148. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. DOI: 10.1075/impact.33.10mil

Mouzelis, Nikos. 1995. *Sociological Theory: What Went Wrong? Diagnoses and Remedies*. London: Routledge.

Pavlenko, Aneta, and Adrian Blackledge (eds). *Negotiation of Identities in Multilingual Contexts*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters. DOI: 10.1017/s0047404506230343

Piller, Ingrid. 2012. "Multilingualism and Social Exclusion." In *Handbook of Multilingualism,* ed. by Marilyn Martin-Jones, Adrian Blackledge, and Angela Creese. 281–296. London: Routledge.

Ramanathan, Vaideshi (ed). 2013a. *Language Policies and (Dis)Citizenship*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Ramanathan, Vaideshi (ed). 2013b. Special Forum: Language Policies and (Dis)Citizenship: Who Belongs? Who Is a Guest? Who Is Deported? *Journal of Language, Identity and Education* 12 (3): 162–196.

Reynolds, Jennifer F. and Elaine Chun (eds). 2013. *Figuring Youth Citizenship: Communicative Practices Mediating the Cultural Politics of Citizenship and Age*. Special issue of *Language & Communication* 33 (4): 473–572. DOI: 10.1016/j.langcom.2013.07.002

Shohamy, Elana. 2001. *The Power of Tests: A Critical Perspective on the Uses of Language Tests*. London: Longman. DOI: 10.1017/s0272263102244058

Shohamy, Elana, and Tim McNamara (eds). 2009. "Language Assessment for Immigration, Citizenship and Asylum." Special issue of *Language Assessment Quarterly* 6 (1): 1–111. DOI: 10.1080/15434300802606440

Stroud, Christopher. 2001. "African Mother Tongue Programs and the Politics of Language: Linguistic Citizenship versus Linguistic Human Rights." *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 22 (4): 339–355. DOI: 10.1080/01434630108666440

Stroud, Christopher. 2003. "Postmodernist Perspectives on Local Languages: African Mother Tongue Education in Times of Globalisation." *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* 6 (1): 17–36. DOI: 10.1080/13670050308667770

Stroud, Christopher. 2009. "Towards a Postliberal Theory of Citizenship." In *International Perspectives on Bilingual Education: Policy, Practice and Controversy*, ed. by John E. Petrovic, 191–218. New York: Information Age Publishing.

Stroud, Christopher. in press. "Turbulent Semiotic Landscapes and the Semiotic of Citizenship." In *Negotiating and Contesting Identities in Linguistic Landscapes*, ed. by Robert Blackwood, Elizabeth Lanza, and Hirut Woldemariam. London: Bloomsbury.

Stroud, Christopher, and Sibonile Mpendukana. 2009. "Towards a Material Ethnography of Linguistic Landscape: Multilingualism, Mobility and Space in a South African Township." *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 13 (3): 363–386. DOI: 10.1111/j.1467–9841.2009.00410.x

Tsing, Anna L. 2005. *Friction: An Ethnography of Global Connection*. Princeton: Princeton University Press. DOI: 10.1017/s0010417505220297

Unger, Johann. 2013. *The Discursive Construction of the Scots Language: Education, Politics and Everyday Life*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. DOI: 10.1075/dapsac.51

Unger, Johann, Michał Krzyżanowski, and Ruth Wodak (eds). 2014. *Multilingual Encounters in Europe's Institutional Spaces*. London: Bloomsbury.

Van Dijk, Teun. 1993. *Elite Discourse and Racism*. Thousand Oaks: Sage. DOI: 10.4135/9781483326184

Van Zoonen, Liesbet, Farida Vis, and Sabina Mihelj. 2010. "Performing Citizenship on Youtube: Activism, Satire and Online Debate around the Anti-Islam Video *Fitna*." *Critical Discourse Studies* 7 (4): 249–262. DOI: 10.1080/17405904.2010.511831

Vice, Sue. 1997. *Introducing Bakhtin*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Vince, Andrew. 2002. *Nationalism and Particularity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wingstedt, Maria. 1998. *Language Ideologies and Minority Language Policies in Sweden: Historical and Contemporary Perspectives*. Ph.D. dissertation. Stockholm: Centre for Research on Bilingualism. DOI: 10.1075/lplp.23.3.09hai

Wodak, Ruth. 2001a. "What CDA is about – A Summary of its History, Important Concepts and its Developments." In *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*, ed. by Ruth Wodak, and Michael Meyer, 1–13. London: Sage. DOI: 10.4135/9780857028020.n1

Wodak, Ruth. 2001b. "The Discourse-Historical Approach." In *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*, ed. by Ruth Wodak, and Michael Meyer, 63–94. London: Sage.
  DOI: 10.4135/9780857028020.n4

Wodak, Ruth. 2011. *The Discourse of Politics in Action: Politics as Usual.* Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan. DOI: 10.1007/s10993-009-9143-x

Wodak, Ruth. 2013. "Dis-Citizenship and Migration: A Critical Discourse-Analytical Perspective." *Journal of Language, Identity and Education* 12 (3): 173–178.
  DOI: 10.1080/15348458.2013.797258

Wodak, Ruth, de Cillia, Rudolf, Reisigl, Martin, and Karin Liebhart. 2009. *The Discursive Construction of National Identity*. 2nd edition. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
  DOI: 10.1007/s10993-010-9161-8

Author's address

Tommaso M. Milani
Linguistics/SLLM
University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg
Private Bag 3
WITS 2050
South Africa

Tommaso.Milani@wits.ac.za

About the author

Tommaso M. Milani is Associate Professor of Linguistics at the University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, South Africa. He is Co-Editor of the journals *African Studies* (Taylor and Francis) and *Gender and Language* (Equinox); he is also Editor of the book series *Advances in Sociolinguistics* (Bloomsbury). His work has appeared in many international journals, including *Gender & Language, Discourse & Society, Journal of Sociolinguistics,* and *Language in Society.* He has recently edited the book *Language and Masculinities: Performances, Intersections, Dislocations* (Routledge).