

Which multilingualism do you speak? Translanguaging as an integral part of individuals' lives in the Casamance, Senegal

Miriam Weidl

Abstract: Senegal is a West African country that is highly diverse and multilingual on a societal and individual level. Multilingualism is used in most interactions of peoples' everyday lives in a translanguaging fashion. Yet, beside some small efforts, the only official language in the institutional sector and education remains French. However, educational systems and language policies do not reflect the reality of the people they are created for since monolingualism often only plays a minor role in their lives. Based on empirical data collected in the Casamance, this article focuses in particular on these issues through displaying multilingualism as an adapting system that moves within the social environments while integrating different languages, intermixed in a way that is appropriate for its speakers in respective situations. On the basis of case examples, concepts are presented for the reinforcement of multilingualism with potential to strengthen local languages and cultures from the inside out.

Keywords: Casamance, Senegal, West Africa, multilingualism, education, translanguaging, language policy, linguistic realities.

Note on the author: Miriam Weidl is a (socio)linguist with a background in African studies and anthropology and is currently working as a postdoctoral researcher at the University of Helsinki. Her research is based in West Africa, especially focusing on southern Senegal. Her interest is aimed at multilingualism, the use of multiple languages in different situations of life, the diversity of individuals' linguistic repertoires and the alternation of language during conversations, which is highly connected to people's social realities, experiences aims and moods. She finished her PhD at SOAS, University of London, as part of the Crossroads Team (soascrossroads.org) and is a founding member of the LILIEMA project (www.liliema.com), which constitutes the basis of her postdoctoral research. She is currently investigating translanguaging practices and the connectedness of multilingual language use and social settings through in-depth ethnographic research and focuses on a better description and understanding of linguistic realities.

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4891-1909>

miriam.weidl@gmail.com

1 Introduction: the monolingualisms in multilingualism

Large parts of the world are ruled either monolingually, pursuing the nation-state model to create hypothetical homogeneity and unity, or multilingually, in a few languages. In this scenario, multilingualism is broadly understood as the utilisation of more than one clearly defined monolingual system, a phenomenon that often does not do justice to the complexity of multilingualism.

Supporting official societal multilingualism concerning mainly the institutional sector yields benefits for individuals in culturally and linguistically diverse areas but also bears high potential for exclusion. This is, for example, the case of the Nordic countries (Björklund *et al.* 2013), which, compared to many places in the Global South, host a rather low number of languages spoken by the majority of inhabitants. The system fails weaker cultural and linguistic groups, who suffer disadvantages. In the Western world, language and national identity are intertwined concepts that perform well for many (Davis & Dubinsky 2018; Simpson 2008), yet prescribed identity markers often do not hold for all groups of speakers.

In the Global South, most people's lived realities are characterised by high cultural diversity and complexity, which go hand in hand with applied societal and individual multilingualism (Evans 2018; Ndhlovu & Makalela 2021). Yet, official institutional systems, all over West Africa (and many other parts of the world), are preoccupied by monolingualisms. Here, we face a conundrum; on the one hand, policy and education makers try to enable education through a reduction of diversity with language as a medium but not the aim, while, on the other hand, many researchers of multilingualism try to emphasise the importance of exactly this diversity for equality, (self-)development and even conflict-management. The essential basis for cooperation, however, is lacking.

In Senegal, the official language is French only, even though only an extremely small minority of inhabitants (partly) identifies as French and neither use the French language in their private spheres nor identify with French culture (Ngom 2003). Within multilingual Senegalese societies, fluid linguistic practices carry little to no resemblance to linguistic applications within the official systems. It is impossible to ignore this fact, as limited approaches to linguistic inclusion and promotion of major Senegalese languages (like Wolof, Pulaar, Sereer and Joola) in different official sectors are made. Although appreciated by many speakers who clearly identify with the chosen languages, for others, implementations are likely to be received as just another conflicting language policy that creates division and potentially weakens smaller ethno-linguistic groupings. Thereby, part of the main problem seems to be a misunderstanding of multilingualism: the use of a multitude of monolingualisms, inadequately entitled as 'multilingualism' without further explanation in education or politics,¹ neglects the speakers' realities while disregarding widespread

translanguaging practices (Blommaert *et al.* 2015; Canagarajah 2012; Canagarajah & Wurr 2011).

More attention needs to be drawn to the multiplicity of existing multilingualisms, which cannot and should not simply be replaced by monolingual practices in every sphere. Nevertheless, the formal inclusion of several languages (or multilingualism) in institutional and educational sectors poses a huge difficulty, and efforts made by governmental agencies might always struggle to meet everybody's needs. Yet, a step towards an involved discussion in order to establish an inclusive approach, creating awareness of wider macro- and micro-societal issues, is a general rethinking of the concept of multilingualism itself.

This paper contributes to a more in-depth understanding of multilingualism by displaying it as an adapting system that moves within the social realities of its speakers and integrates different languages, definitions, lects and styles that are intermixed in a way that is appropriate for the respective situation. In the following section, I therefore briefly discuss conceptualisations and terminologies surrounding multilingualism; then, in section 3, I focus on the macrolinguistic and sociolinguistic environment in Senegal and the Casamance. In section 4, I present the diversity of language use through translanguaging examples of multilingual repertoire users in two very different contexts. I demonstrate that daily realities are rather far removed from a centralised, often urban-based elite and the official institutional system. One example shows a private conversation in a household; the other presents data collected in a more formal LILIEMA² course setting. Section 5 is dedicated to reflecting on the highly multilingual individuals who live in strict monolingual official systems as well as the needed adaptation of research, showing the relevance of various perspectives on situations and data. The final section concludes with an outlook on possible improvements that could arise for multilingual people, especially being part of small-scale language ecologies through a better understanding of multilingualism as well as a greater collaboration of research, educational institutions and politics.

¹ Within the Senegalese Government, for instance, 'national languages' (that is, local Senegalese languages with a rather undetermined national status) and their use are accepted as working languages alongside French, as long as they are understood by all attendees. This framework supports the use of widespread Senegalese languages (Wolof, Sereer, Pulaar etc.), which in higher political levels often get translated to French by interpreters (Diallo 2010)—a system led by the presupposition that 'multilingualism' is the result of subjoining more than one standardised language with clear language borders.

² LILIEMA is a project that aims to empower multilingual speakers to use, read and write the languages in their repertoires in a way that is appropriate for them and is of use for their personal needs. For more information, see section 4.2 or www.liliema.com.

2 Conceptualisations and terminologies surrounding multilingualism

This chapter deals with a brief conceptualisation of multilingualism as a backdrop to the empirical analysis presented below. Various schools of thought widely agree on the fact that multilingualism can be found everywhere on the globe; recent years have seen a great expansion of research into multilingualism, in not only volume, but also methodology (Blackledge & Creese 2010a; Evans 2018; Otsuji & Pennycook 2010; Stavans & Hoffmann 2015 a.o.). Nevertheless, multilingual speakers and their environments can vary widely, and multiple approaches are needed for various contexts, aiming to enrich each other in order to create a broader understanding of multilingualism (Aronin & Hufeisen 2009; Edwards 2012; Kemp 2009). Although most of the research concentrates on Western(ised) societies and the Global North, recent investigations focus more and more on multilingual, decentralised and (rural) small-scale ecologies, providing detailed insights into lived realities of multilingual repertoire users of the Global South, as it is the case for the present article (see e.g. Di Carlo *et al.* 2019; Evans 2018; Léglise 2017; Lüpke *et al.* 2020; Singer & Harris 2016b).

Notwithstanding more open-minded approaches, including more scholars from the Global South as well as various views on data and settings (see also Goodchild 2018; Weidl 2018), we are obliged to use the knowledge and terminologies originating from the Global North. However, many publications are part of the long tradition of Western scientists and missionaries researching according to their specific aims and needs while analysing from their sole points of view and must be understood as such and reconsidered in their individual context (Ndhlovu & Makalela 2021; Phipps 2019). Data veracity often presents as a matter of opinion; for instance, the description of monolingual societies and clearly delimited languages can be the result of the research projects having predefined, leading objectives. In this respect, the clear definition of ‘a language’ is a sociocultural and often also political abstraction and in many instances poorly reflects real life applications (Jørgensen *et al.* 2011: 26), which are central to this article.

Whereas special attention is often drawn to small or bigger scale institutional mono/multilingualism, much more complex societal multilingualism as well as translanguaging practices have probably always existed. Linguaging or translanguaging are concepts that accept all mixtures in language use as natural and real (Canagarajah 2012; Wei 2018). Rather than a counting of standardised languages, translanguaging recognises that actual language is far more complex and comprises many factors, going far beyond ‘a named language’. Real-life language use is analysed in its context, without restrictions of standardisation (Blommaert & Backus 2012; Jørgensen *et al.* 2011; Toivanen & Saarikivi 2016). Translanguaging is subsequently also used as an approach and analytic tool in sociolinguistic research and incorporates not only language use but also social and societal context, situation-specific social interactions,

passive comprehension, any kind of body language and writing (Blackledge & Creese 2010b; Canagarajah 2011; Wei 2018).

In this context, multiculturalism, diversity and superdiversity also play a significant role. Whereas multiculturalism describes a situation in which an individual is partly a member of more than one cultural orientation (Vertovec 2007; Zarete *et al.* 2011), ‘superdiversity’ is understood as a concept going beyond diversity, without an obligation for a numerical measurement of language, culture or society (Blommaert & Backus 2012). Originating in a tremendous increase of diversity through faster globalisation and migration in the West, I would like to argue here that ‘superdiversity’ is also often a norm in the Global South, yet is additionally encouraged by globalisation and migration (Blommaert *et al.* 2015; Jørgensen *et al.* 2011; Toivanen & Saarikivi 2016). Similar to the Global North, labourers in particular originate from different places all over the world³ and also settle in rural areas to conduct their business and live with their families. With superdiversity, a more in-depth approach is supported. This goes beyond a diversity of concealed concepts and instead integrates more complex, context-dependent concepts within individual interpretations of situations that are needed for the analysis of the empirical data presented below.

3 Senegal and the Casamance: sociolinguistic insights and macrolinguistic overview

3.1 Contemporary linguistic environment: repertoires and education

Senegal is one of many West African countries in which societal and individual multilingualism, including a huge number of languages, varieties and lects, determines private life but plays a relatively small role in official and educational institutions. The majority of the inhabitants of Senegal are highly multilingual; many speak more than four languages in often fluid and context-dependent practices. Here it must be emphasised that most of the languages are acquired orally though fluid languaging practices in which languages are often blended together. People’s linguistic repertoires

³ In the area of interest, specialised labourers and traders selling beauty products and herbal remedies originate from all over Africa; Asian countries (India, Sri-Lanka, Bangladesh etc.) seem to be especially interested in the cashew crop, whereas Europeans and Americans are for example trading partners for peanuts in the Casamance. The road construction company fixing the biggest roads in the area are Spanish, however, employing Italians and Portuguese as well, all of whom leave family and regular workers behind. Additionally, many people (predominantly originating from other French-speaking countries) have families in the Casamance and are as present as regular researchers, NGOs and church members originating from all over the world, making the Casamance highly diverse—a diversity that increases even more in urban centres.

and their scopes of application are versatile and depend on individual (family) backgrounds, places lived, mobility, interests and experiences (Goodchild 2018; Lüpke & Storch 2013; Weidl 2018).

In Senegal, the linguistic situation can be described as versatile. Just under half of the population of the country at least partly identify with Wolof, which is also the most used language of wider communication in Senegal. Wolof is spoken by more than an estimated 90 per cent of the population, all over the country, and plays a considerable role in everyday lives for many people (Johnson 2005). The power of the language is irrefutable and outperforms French, with the result that some people in some areas fear ‘Wolofisation’, a theory of a forceful spread of Wolof, gradually devouring smaller, less powerful languages and even being co-responsible for language death (Keese 2016; McLaughlin 1995; O’Brien 1998).⁴ Other languages, like Pulaar, Sereer, Mandinka, Joola or Soninke, are identity markers for a large number of people and play a role as regional languages of wider communication in different areas either next to Wolof or even replacing it in certain sectors. Furthermore, many small identity and patrimonial languages are spread all over the country, representing a huge diversity while creating and adding to the creation of (super)diverse personalities (Goodchild & Weidl 2019; Lüpke 2016, 2018; Weidl 2018).

The ex-colonial language French is the only official language of the institutional sector in Senegal, making the language a condition to accessing certain official services like education, politics, parts of the job market and often also economic success. A relatively small number of Senegal’s inhabitants actually use French as a language in their daily conversations, which is reflected in statistical data about French proficiency:⁵ depending on the source, a variety of French is regularly used only by approximately 15–20 per cent of the population, with a wider distribution amongst men than women (Bichler 2003). McLaughlin (2008) mentions that only 10 per cent of the population uses standard French in their daily conversations, and as an identity language, unmixed standard French is almost exclusively used by Senegalese families with French origin or roots in France (Ngom 2003).⁶

Public schools, with the exception of a few bilingual pilot-schools, use French only as a medium of instruction from year one. For the students attending these schools

⁴ Wolofisation is often perceived as a threat to languages and cultures all over the country; however, former research by Weidl (2018) in the southern parts of Senegal and Haust (1995) in The Gambia proved that neither Wolof nor globalisation and modernisation are threatening smaller but locally stable identity languages. Quite the opposite happens, and languages in people’s linguistic repertoires seem to increase.

⁵ The author observed that a much larger number of speakers in Senegal are able to communicate their needs in French (orally); they are not included in these statistics since their linguistic application is too far from the norm and/or they are not comfortable in French literacy practices.

⁶ Similar observations were already mentioned by Dumont (1982), have not changed much since not long after Senegal’s independence in 1960 and won’t undergo radical changes soon.

who have had very different previous exposure to French, a certain proficiency or self-study is a precondition. Many students who previously did not have much contact with standard French are initially unable to follow the content of the courses and might only acquire French through listening, if they can remain in the system long enough (Fall 2013; Lüpke *et al.* 2021). Yet, due to the instrumentalisation of French and the creation of a statistically consistent French-using elite, standard French is largely associated with prestige, quality education, development and high social class (Ngom 2003). Nonetheless, theoretical efforts are made to integrate national languages into the official educational system throughout the country; a recommendation resulting from the *Assises de l'éducation du Senegal* (2014) (Senegalese education conference) is to create a language policy that includes local languages in the educational system all over the country, but particularly advises to be clear and coherent in the application of languages. However, as will become apparent throughout this chapter, these monolingual-based systems do not reflect people's linguistic realities, irrespective of the fact that homogenous language areas are culturally scarce and appropriate teaching materials are insufficient.

Moreover, Arabic plays a central role in Senegal as the language of the most widespread religion, Islam, to which over 90 per cent of the Senegalese population officially belongs. The language is taught in connection to studying the Quran in Quranic schools; however, the private education sector also offers education in Arabic, opening avenues to religious leadership and the Arabic world (Lüpke & Bao-Diop 2014; Ngom 2017).

Senegalese media are dominated by French, but Wolof and other languages with (regionally) high numbers of speakers play an essential role on the radio and some TV programs. Smaller languages, however, are dependent on local, private initiatives promoting the distribution of information in certain languages (Weidl 2018). Amongst the overall population, active literacy use in private spheres is relatively low but contains versatile potential applications. Individuals write in either Latin or Arabic script in French or Arabic respectively, or use the script to write in local (often not codified) languages, applying flexible and multifaceted local grassroots literacy practices (Blommaert 2011; Vigouroux 2011; Weidl *et al.* forthcoming). Interestingly, UNESCO (2019) observed that 51.9 per cent of the Senegalese population over 15 years of age are literate in French, a number which does not, however, correspond to proficiencies in standard French and needs to be further scrutinised. Even though clear sources for the data are not provided, the number matches with 51 per cent of students who complete the primary school cycle (UNESCO 2016) and therefore might have influenced the assumption that every student who attended French school for a certain number of years is also able to read and write in French. The reality is rather different, and many students face great problems during their education, where they transfer to the next school-level without understanding the content or passing the exams, or

drop out early, whereupon they seem not to use literacy in French much, if at all. Nevertheless, they might still be active literates according to their needs, using other, often ignored literacy practices that are devalued by many. Nowadays, due to globalisation and development, there is a growth of manifold grassroots literacy use which is recognised (Blommaert 2008), especially in online media and social networks of the mainly younger Senegalese population (Deumert & Lexander 2013; Lexander 2010).

Despite high multilingualism, Senegal is officially ruled by monolingualism, with very few approaches to integrate multilingualism—which is, however, understood as a multitude of monolingualisms. Notwithstanding, the above insight into the linguistic environment has presented a highly diverse and complex character, creating multilingual inhabitants who have to linguistically adapt to different situations and contexts throughout their days and lives.

3.2 The Casamance: some characteristics fuelling multilingualisms

Zooming in on smaller geographical areas, generalisations become inoperative as the multidimensional nature further increases. A closer consideration of subgroups within the bigger language classifications of the above-named languages and the incorporation of cultural diversities that play a considerable role in peoples' lives, as well as the individuality and personal ethnography of every single repertoire user, is indispensable. The closer we look at repertoire users and their societies, the more sophisticated insights about multilingualism become possible. This section will focus on linguistic and cultural diversities within the Casamance region of Senegal, with a focus on the possible makeup of individual linguistic repertoires, striving not for generalisations but rather to present an inclusiveness of varieties.

The Casamance is an area marked by an eventful history which is, in its multidimensional nature, reflected in the multilingual lives of its inhabitants. The area is located in the south of Senegal, partially bounded by The Gambia, a country located inside Senegal, and bordering Guinea Bissau to the south. Even though across the borders local cultural and linguistic dissemination are merging, colonial borders and political rule have resulted in an even greater mix of languages. Up to today, The Gambia's only official language is English, much in the same way as Portuguese is in Guinea Bissau (De Jong 2007; Juillard 1991). A wide range of exchange and trade by the inhabitants is apparent, and residents in the border regions can cross the border freely, stimulating intensive (linguistic and cultural) contact.

Even though people with roots in the Casamance often express solidarity (especially when geographically not being placed in the Casamance), being a 'Casamancaise' cannot be an indicator of common denominator for linguistic and cultural homogeneity. The urban areas are highly multilingual, but intense multilingualism is

similarly common in rural areas; former investigations have shown that the numbers of languages increased drastically in connection to people's mobility and experiences (Goodchild & Weidl 2019; Lüpke 2016).

Different languages of wider communication aid activities in the area, with a significant impact of Joola Fogny (but regionally limited to also other Joola languages) in the southern parts of the Casamance river and Mandinka in the north of the river. Additionally, Wolof speakers are present everywhere in the Casamance; however, attitudes towards the language and its use differ from person to person and village to village, as for example research by Goodchild (2018) and Weidl (2018) has shown. Furthermore, a Portuguese-based Creole⁷ also spoken in Guinea Bissau is part of many peoples' linguistic repertoires and was, as mentioned by Juillard (2001), used as the main language of wider communication especially in the regional capital of Ziguinchor; however, an increasing proliferation of Wolof (and probably also other local languages) has gained dominance today. Described by Dreyfus and Juillard (2004), mainly people coming from the north of the country were employed in institutional sectors and opened up possibilities to orally use Wolof. This situation aided the proliferation of Wolof in sectors that would otherwise have been exclusively French (see also De Jong 2007; M. Evans 2003).

Many of the villages in the Casamance use patrimonial languages as identity markers, which can be traced back to the language associated with the male founder of the village.⁸ Different languages within these villages are often amalgamated as one (including many varieties) by linguists and politics, as the example of Joola languages (see e.g. Barry 1987; Goodchild 2018; Tomàs 2005; Watson 2018) or Bainouk languages (Biagui 2006; Cobbinah 2010; Lüpke 2016), even though none of them are used in the official system and many differ widely from one another. For their speakers, a disparity is perfectly clear and subtler understanding is vital. Patrimonial or heritage languages (and bound cultural affiliation) play an important role in people's lives, and it is, for example, no rarity that individuals who migrated elsewhere (e.g. to work) send their children to the village of their ancestral origin for linguistic residencies (Calvet & Dreyfus 1990), a time in which they can acquire the language and become familiar with local cultural traits and responsibilities. Such languages mostly count relatively stable but small speaker-numbers, and these numbers remain stable since people are adapting to a changing world through adjusting their multilingualisms (Goodchild & Weidl 2019). They are further strengthened and maintained by local cultural activities, ceremonies and (ancestral) beliefs,⁹ which are performed based on the patrimonial language and aid the preservation of small-scale languages.

⁷ Henceforth indicated as 'Kreol'.

⁸ Identities are mainly based on patrilineal descent but are individually customisable (Weidl 2018: 303).

⁹ Local beliefs are very frequently performed in combination with Islam or Catholicism, as only these are officially recognised in the country and the religious systems seem to mutually accept each other, even though ideologies differ.

Neither villages that are characterised by one patrimonial language nor their inhabitants are monolingual, and diversity is increased by people's individual backgrounds, exogamous marriage patterns, and a certain need for everyone to be able to be familiar with at least one language of wider communication (Di Carlo 2017; Lüpke 2016). Large languages of wider communication like Wolof, Kreol, Joola Fogny or even French seem not to pose a risk for the people, but are, if necessary, acquired in addition. The number of identities, cultures and languages is substantial and much more fine-grained and complex than widely assumed. Linguistic attitudes and ideologies, always going hand in hand with cultural (self-)identification, are wide-ranging; like everywhere else, people are biased, which can influence individual development of multilingual linguistic repertoires (Busch 2015; Irvine & Gal 2000; Swigart 2000). Preconceptions leading towards an affirmation or denial of certain languages and cultures often originate from local historical events, rivalries or more individual, personal reasons. However, what is most important is that these sensitive linguistic and social structures are context-dependently applied in real life situations. Speakers fluidly adapt their multilingualisms in fluid (trans)linguaging practices influenced by their interlocutors, social settings, aims in conversation, experiences, attitudes and ideologies, and even missing conceptions of terms in certain languages, emotions and mood, as will become clear in the follow sections.

4 Insights into manifold linguistic realities and settings

This section is dedicated to presenting communicative events from multilingual repertoire users in the Casamance, based on empirical data collected in the Casamance, Senegal, since 2014 during the Crossroads project (www.soascrossroads.org) and the LILIEMA project (www.liliema.com). These together provide an insight into the manifoldness of multilingualisms as an integral part of people's daily lived experiences (see also Goodchild & Weidl 2019; Lüpke *et al.* 2021; Weidl 2018). Therefore, I present data from participants' language use in two very different settings that are quite opposed: a family discussion in the village of Djibonker and a teaching–learning environment in the village of Darsalam. Hereafter insight is presented into the sociolinguistic environment surrounding speakers as well as the individual linguistic repertoires, context, ethnographic background and interlocutors' common grounds. Data is discussed from different perspectives, combining the views of repertoire users, research assistants and the researcher in analysis (Goodchild 2018; Weidl 2018; Weidl & Goodchild in preparation).

4.1 Actual language use in a familiar setting

Below, a multi-layered analysis is presented of a short verbal exchange of close family members of a household located in Djibonker, a village in the southeast of the

Casamance, Senegal. Bainouk Gubëeher, a language spoken by about 1000–1500 people residing in the village and more living elsewhere (Cobbinah 2010; 2013), is attributed as the patrimonial language to the village. Bainouk Gubëeher is not fully mutually intelligible with any other Bainouk language,¹⁰ even though their speakers always find multilingual ways to communicate with each other. The village and its inhabitants are highly multilingual, and during investigations for several years, not one speaker reported being monolingual (Goodchild & Weidl 2019; Weidl 2018). Multilingualism existing as a norm is necessary for day-to-day tasks and is further supported by migration, exogamous marriage patterns, the village's geographical position and mobility, as well as the proximity to a national road connecting significant trading points (Weidl 2018).

In the household where the verbal exchange took place, four adults and ten children are regular residents: LOGf3,¹¹ her husband JPSm4 and their five children; KS2f4 and her husband LMm4, with their four children; as well as one fostered boy, who is related to the men of the family and was sent to the village from Dakar around 8 years old to become familiar with his ascribed patrimonial identity. The two men are half-brothers who were born and lived for large parts of their lives in the village. LOGf3 and KS2f4 moved to the village after their respective marriages and have linguistically and culturally different backgrounds to their husbands. The household can be described as superdiverse, and people adapt their interpretation of their identity and linguistic repertoire dependent on context and interlocutor.

On the day of the recording, all the adults, their children, and IPSm4 and myself (MWf3) were present (both being regular and well-known guests), yet not everybody joined the conversation below. In Figure 1 all the adult¹² speakers' self-reported languages within their multilingual linguistic repertoires are listed to give a brief overview of diversity. Unfortunately, due to lack of space, the speakers cannot be presented in

LOGf3	Bainouk Gubëeher, Balante, Joola (undefined), Joola Fogy, Kreol, Njago, Wolof
JPSm4	Bainouk Gubëeher, Bayot, French, Joola Banjal / Joola Enampore, Joola Buluf, Joola Fogy, Joola Kaasa, Joola Brin, Njago, Wolof
KS2f4	Arabic, Bainouk Gubëeher, Bainouk Guñaamolo, Bayot, Joola Buluf, Joola Fogy, Joola Kaasa, Joola Kujireray, Sarakhule, Sose, Wolof
IPSm4	Arame, Kreol, Wolof, Joola Fogy, French, Sose, Joola (undefined), Bayott

Figure 1. Reported linguistic repertoires.

¹⁰ Reported by Bainouk Gubëeher speakers, as well as speakers of Bainouk Gujaher and Bainouk Guñaamolo.

¹¹ The subscript after the participant code designates their sex, as well as their age group at the time of the recording: 'f3' therefore means 'female, in her 30s' and 'm6' would mean 'male, in his 60s'.

¹² Speakers under 18 were only interviewed if they expressed interest in participating by themselves.

detail; however, their linguistic repertoires can be traced back to individual experiences and life-histories (see also Weidl 2018).

On this ordinary Saturday, the family sits together in the most commonly used space in the front of their house, discussing and doing chores together. The setting of the conversation in Example 1 is pictured in Figure 2; some of the speakers are visible for the camera,¹³ the position of IPSm4 is indicated through an arrow and the children were mobile during the conversation. The arrows in the transcription of Examples 1 and 2 signal who the person is addressing with their speech.



Figure 2. Household conversation.

In the conversation, the adults are reprimanding the children, who do not behave in the way they should. The two mothers lead the conversation; however JPSm4 and IPSm4 interfere, using the term ‘orange’ [L06, L07, L08] to indicate that their behaviour is inappropriate (whereby ‘red’ would have been an escalation). The excerpt was transcribed and translated to French by a Senegalese research assistant (RA) and to English by the author. A translation and retranslation from French to English was necessary for the purpose of this article; however, all examples have been discussed with various participants of the example as well as the RA to guarantee an ‘authentic’ translation to English, as far as this was possible. The RA was further asked to add his interpretations of the languages used, which is displayed to the right. Already showing a huge number of languages, they even increase with more perspectives on the data. Here, the RA is in the position of a local but external observer who is familiar with the people and shares many languages within their multilingual repertoires.

From a researcher’s perspective, even more languages could be found in the example above, and certain definitions could also differ; for example, the lexeme ‘ebol’ [bowl]

¹³ Audio and video recordings were always used as a default if the circumstances permitted it.

Example 1.

01	LOG _{f3}	→kids	<i>ukaan dēdū</i> “put them there”	Bainouk Gubēeher
02	KS2 _{f4}	→ LOG _{f3}	<i>emukenoruti</i> “this is not sorted out yet”	Joola
03		→LAM _{m0}	<i>iseni ebol yay uye</i> “I gave you which bowl, the one over there”	Joola
04		→kids	<i>úwülen úwülen mun usenoom ebolai ebol yěkóon</i> “put it down, put it down and you give me that bowl, there is only one bowl”	Joola
05	JPSm4	→all	<i>orange orange legi</i> “orange orange at the moment”	Wolof, French
06		→	<i>orange</i> “orange”	French
07		→	<i>dey deplane ñiñi</i> “is brings people of their plans”	Wolof, French
08	IPSm4	→ JPSm4	<i>Orange moom moi lolú</i> “Oranges that is what they do”	Wolof, French
09	KS2 _{f4}	→kids	<i>ulax úděěk unooh</i> “Take and sit down”	Bainouk Gubēeher
10		→	<i>gunohuro [incomprehensible]</i> “if you do not [incomprehensible]”	Bainouk Gubēeher
11		→	<i>mu ne ko bilahi</i> “He told him bilahi”	Wolof
12		→ JCMm1	<i>jean-sena uwulol wai</i> “Jean-cena give him some”	Joola

[DJI040217MW_c ut07¹⁴]s

and ‘ebolay’ [that bowl] is used in L03 and L04, which was marked as Joola by the RA. However, ‘bol’ is a lexeme originating from French, which is used with a Joola noun class prefix ‘e-’ and determining suffix ‘-ai’. KS2f4 reports not speaking French as she

¹⁴ This example is also analysed in Weidl (2018: 243) but with a different focus, and it is therefore reanalysed within a different context here.

only visited school very infrequently; however ‘bool’ or ‘bol’ is also a lexeme frequently used in Wolof (Diouf 2003: 73) and could have come into the repertoire of KS2f4 in different ways. L07 was tagged as Wolof and French by the RA; the lexeme ‘deplane’, spelled ‘deplaner’ in the translation to French, is interesting. While agreeing that the verb looks a lot like French, it is only used in Senegal and not in standard French, and whereas the RA translated it as ‘bringing people of their plans’, other speakers explained that the word could also mean ‘to embarrass someone’. In L11, KS2f4 uses the word ‘bilahi’, which was marked as Wolof and was not translated by the RA; however, from a researcher’s perspective, this originates from Arabic, meaning something like ‘by god’. KS2f4 is a regular user of Arabic terms; however, she rarely analyses as Arabic herself. The use of these terms can be traced back to her childhood education as a Muslim by her father, even though she identifies as Catholic nowadays.

In an analytic conversation after watching recordings of a very multilingual family discussion including the one presented above, LJSf1, the oldest daughter (17 at the time of the interview) of LOGf3 and JPSm4, described the language situation as following:

This is how we speak, that is what feels natural. We can all understand each other, there is no need to restrict ourselves to one language. Some things, I cannot say them in one language, but does it matter? When I see my friends in Ziguinchor I also speak in many languages, but maybe in others. It works. [DJI170317MW]

Confirming the statement above, the combination of different kinds of data and analysis gives further insights into multilinguals’ linguistic realities. KS2f4, for instance, reports that she is only confident to use Bainounk Gubëeher (which she reports to have low proficiency in) in her home with LOGf3 and the children (but not the men), if she knows the right terms. She often uses a Joola language to address her husband, whereas she uses Wolof to address JPSm4, who is himself not an advocate for using a Joola as a language in their home. The RA did not feel confident defining which Joola languages are used but mentions that it seems to be close to Joola Fogy.¹⁵ The only speaker who uses Joola actively in this conversation, however, reports that she speaks Joola Buluf (or ‘her own Joola’) and refutes her own use of Joola Fogy in the household, which represents the manifold possibilities for interpreting a situation.

The speakers themselves reflect their linguistic behaviour as they also explain it in in-depth sociolinguistic interviews. The application of language is highly context dependent but also influenced by interlocutors, as can be observed. Furthermore, the use of a certain language can be used to determine who is addressed, or to in/exclude certain people from conversations, and background knowledge on the people present is

¹⁵ In both projects, we simultaneously worked with several RAs who often mutually supported each other for translations and the naming of languages.

¹⁶ LILIEMA is a project supporting language-independent literacies for inclusive education in multilingual areas. See Lüpke *et al.* (2021), Weidl *et al.* (forthcoming) and www.liliema.com for more information.

used. Even though language choice in multilingual, fluid language use seems to supervene; it follows certain rules that can only be understood by the speakers themselves and can only be noticed from an in-depth sociolinguistic and ethnographic approach.

4.2 Translanguaging practices in an official setting

The second example shows a conversation in a teaching–learning environment during LILIEMA¹⁶ multilingual literacy courses. These courses are taught by trained Senegalese instructors who offer them in various villages in the Casamance, and neither the teachers nor the attendees are restricted by a predefinition of language(s) that can be used. During the courses, the aim is to motivate individuals with various backgrounds to use literacy (more) actively and in a way that is adapted to their needs, accepting multilingualism and heterogeneity in spoken and written language, without enforcing language standards. This is not only an inclusive way to support a sustainable development of literacy use but also further empowers highly multilingual individuals in small-scale language ecologies and opens up new opportunities (see also [Lüpke et al. 2021](#); [Weidl et al. forthcoming](#)).

The example below is a classroom conversation in Darsalam, an adjoining village to Djibonker to the west. Darsalam is linguistically and culturally highly complex and an interesting place which cannot be identified with one patrimonial language; during the French colonial period, villages were officially structured, and settlements geographically separated from each other instead of considering cultural orientating and a part of Djibonker ended up being officially in the village of Darsalam. Other parts of the village are described as being Bayot or Joola Fogny dominated, with speakers being multilingual in many of the languages present.

The attendees of the course all know each other and live in the same village, yet do not share the same households and would not all describe their cultural identities to be similar. The two teachers present are JD5f4, who is from and lives in Djibonker but has spent a long time in Senegal’s capital, Dakar, and ACBm3, who was born and lived most of his life in Brin, a village bordering Djibonker to the east, with Joola Kujireray as a patrimonial language. In [Figure 3](#) the teachers’ reported linguistic repertoires as well as the languages reported by the LILIEMA attendees in Darsalam are

JD5f4	Bainouk Gubëeher, French, Joola Fogny, Joola Kujireray, Wolof
ACBm3	Bainouk Gubëeher, Bayot, English, French, Joola Eegiima, Joola Kujireray, Joola Fogny, Joola Kaasa, Mandinka, Wolof
LILIEMA course attendees	Arabic, Bainouk Gubëeher, Bayot, English, Joola Fogny, Joola Kaasa, Joola Kreol, Kujireray, Mandinka, Pulaar, Wolof

Figure 3. Reported linguistic repertoires.

presented. Not all the attendees of the LILIEMA course participated in research to the same depth and individuals are therefore not introduced separately.

Figure 4 and Figure 6 show the teaching–learning context and Figure 5 the blackboard labelled with different human body parts in various languages.



Figure 4. ACB_{m3} (left) teaching.
[200205DAR_MW_ P1040311]



Figure 5. Blackboard.
[200205DAR_MW_P1040540]



Figure 6. Some course attendees (sitting) and LILIEMA teacher JD5f4 (standing).
[200205DAR_MW_scs04]

Example 2 presents an excerpt of a conversation the attendees and course teachers had during an exercise with the aim of naming as many human body parts as possible in any language.

In **Example 2**, the five course participants and the two teachers discuss the task to jointly write down certain terms on the blackboard and in their notebooks, in a conversation that can be easily followed. The conversation feels habitual, and the participants move between languages fluidly, the only way that they describe to be very natural and expedient for them. The RA marked five different languages in this short excerpt and the participants seem to comprehend all of them, or at least understand the meanings in their context. In analytical sessions of the recordings with course participants, the languages categorised by the transcriber were (partly) identified in another way, adding different perspectives on the data. Such group discussions are especially helpful to get an idea of the broader sociocultural settings as well as experiences, attitudes and ideologies of all people involved, including the researchers.

Since the opportunity is provided and encouraged within the LILIEMA course, we further observed that this manifold and fluid use of languaging is also applied

Example 2.

01	P01 _m →all	<i>Oli an ukan ja ma 'kameñ' an ateki ma, oli yo jonemi kameñ</i>	Bayot, Joola Fogny
		“We, if a person does that ‘kameñ’ (makes a movement with his hand), if a person hits you like that, this is what we call ‘kameñ’”	
02	P02 _m →P01	<i>Ambroise, kuñia</i>	Bayot
		“Ambroise, cheek!”	
03	P03 _f →all	<i>ee kakonaku kameñaku koke ko nuɲaremu man utek</i>	Joola Fogny
		“Yes, this is the same (in Joola Fogny) this is the one (word) you use if you hit someone”	
04	P02 _m →all	<i>Orijo</i>	Bayot
		“forehead”	
05	P03 _f →all	<i>Waa kurege kuñia?</i>	Joola Fogny, Bayot
		“How do we say cheek?”	
06	P02 _m →all	<i>Kuñia, les joux les joux, oriɲo c'est le front</i>	Bayot, French
		“Cheek, the cheeks, the cheeks, forehead is the forehead”	
07	JD5 _{f4} →P02 _m	Aah bijun	Bainounk Gubëeher

01	P01 _m →all	<i>Oli an ukan ja ma 'kameñ' an ateki ma, oli yo jonemi kameñ</i>	Bayot , Joola Fogny
		“Aah forehead”	
08	ACB _{m3} →all	Waa usagoe?	Joola Fogny
		“What else is missing?”	
09	→P03	Vivianne, yangi bind fofu ?	Wolof
		“Vivianne, are you writing there?”	
10	P04 _m → ACB _{m3}	<i>Non, bindul</i>	French , Wolof
		“No, she does not write”	
11	P03 _f → ACB	<i>Bindaguma de</i>	Wolof
		“I have not written it yet”	
12	ACB _{m3} → P03 _f	<i>Do bind?</i>	Wolof
		“Don't you write”	
13	P04 _m → ACB	<i>ah jibinda en même temps</i>	Joola Fogny , French
		“Ah we write at the same time”	
14	ACB _{m3} → P04 _m	<i>waaw</i>	Wolof
		“yes”	
15	JD5 _{f4} →all	<i>kom sa ni jimanj</i>	French , Joola Fogny
		“Like that you will know it”	
16	P03 _f → ACB _{m3}	<i>Aah kama dee na, Aimé hana ukanut kukilëk?</i>	Wolof , Joola Fogny
		“Ahh, so he died (did not do what he was supposed to do), Aimé didn't you draw eyes?”	
17	P05 _f →all	<i>halif, yo yomi wa? Bususëbu ni kubainuk</i>	Bainouk Gubëeher, Joola Fogny
		“halif, what is that? Is that the chest in Bainouk?”	
18	ACB _{m3} →P05 _f	<i>Hafit</i>	Bainouk Gubëeher
		“Chest”	
19	P03 _f →P05	<i>hafit c'est le dënë</i>	Bainouk Gubëeher , French, <i>Wolof</i>
		“chest that is the chest”	

in writing and fully covers the needs of the participants using literacy in that way. Additionally, written multilingual texts were readable and understandable for other attendees and the teachers as long as they shared the same languages as their linguistic repertoires.

5 Multilingual individuals in monolingual systems

The two above examples clearly show how versatile and multifunctional speakers' language use is, and their linguistic practices prove to be distinct from monolingualism, even if all the interlocutors present share the same language(s). Imposing only strict monolingual language use on these repertoire users is often perceived as a burden for them and leads to non-application of certain languages due to the fact that their use is too distant from their social and linguistic reality. It is also for this reason that the usage of, for instance, monolingual French interactions is restricted to official settings and is seldom used in the private sphere. From a European perspective, the language use of the speakers in [Examples 1](#) and [2](#) seems to be highly multilingual and extraordinary, yet for the speakers themselves, multilingualism is the most common and most effective way to communicate.

Examining real-life linguistic behaviour in two villages and two very different settings in the Casamance, a conflict between official language policies and linguistic realities is evident. In countries like Senegal, the monolingual structures only function and entail advantages for a very small group of people who are mainly part of the country's elite. Through a high proficiency in standard French, individuals gain a superior social status, enhanced opportunities in education, better accessibility to information and even easier connections to the Global North. A 'French identity', however, is not sought after by the majority of the population, and, as is the case all over the world, certain personal cultural and linguistic orientations are privileged. But, even if an official career is aimed at, becoming part of this prestigious elite is challenging. For children, support for and access to essential learning and financial preconditions have to be provided to give them a realistic change. Even though the usage of French increases in urban centres due to the tighter distribution of French language institutions, opportunities for adolescents who come from a lower social class to integrate into the French-speaking elite are relatively low.

The examples from the Casamance above by no means constitute an exception in Senegal, and even though high multilingualism does not exclude proficiency in standard French, in such contexts, languages that are most widely required are used the most, and French does not play a significant role in many peoples' personal lives. In contrast, the majority of Senegal's population demonstrate a wide range of skills and

competence in several languages and end up being diminished and disadvantaged by not having their wide-ranging abilities recognised.

5.1 Adapting the research to the setting

Many terminologies, concepts and perceptions originating in the Global North or from people who were socialised and/or trained in Western societies often need to be readjusted in settings of the Global South. It must be emphasised that approaching a certain situation as a researcher with definite ideas and desired outcomes for a research project influences the results. Enforced by the assumption that certain (Western) contexts are replicated all over the world, the leading researchers might interfere with the data in a way that affects the analysis—a fact that needs to be counteracted in order to gain real insight into sociolinguistic situations that can then, in turn, affect politics, education and, hence, development.

The closer we look, the more diverse settings become, and an integration of the various perspectives to get a better in-depth insight into actual linguistic behaviour becomes obvious. As researchers educated in Western institutions, we have to question our own approaches first, as for example often-used standard sociolinguistic interview questions like ‘what language(s) do you speak?’ can create confusion for participants. In Western educational ideologies, students are trained to name and enumerate the languages they speak, a conceptualisation that is only applicable in systems where languages are learned in a separated, delimited and mainly written way. Yet, in a setting where speakers acquire languages orally in various mixed forms informally, the distinction of languages follows other socially driven assessments, often combined with the urge to respond to a researcher’s enquiry in a way that pleases them (see also [Goodchild 2016](#)). Furthermore, the official system and language policies can affect the speakers’ self-perception, which can go so far that in certain contexts, their multilingualism is degraded and only European languages are listed as ‘languages spoken’, with the others dismissed as ‘dialects’. Unfortunately, the ideology that a high proficiency of a certain language is needed so it can be part of one’s linguistic repertoire seems to be widespread, and passive comprehension or being able to use languages for certain contexts only is often disregarded, even though the languages still play a huge role for repertoire users (see also [Kristiansen 2010](#); [Singer & Harris 2016a](#)).

Most people in Senegal are highly proficient multilinguals, which is the manner of speaking that is most effective for their lives, in which they encounter different people and are mobile over even short distances, which can demand a different application of multilingualism. Opportunities and possibilities that multilingual language users have due to the diverse application of their linguistic repertoires cannot be provided by monolingualism in their contexts. The fluid and unrestricted

translanguaging practices presented above might look unstructured to people from the outside; as intensive interviews fortified by ethnographic data have yet proven, motivations behind the transformation of multilingualism are controlled and shaped by external and internal factors (Goodchild & Weidl 2019; Weidl 2018). A monolingual discourse cannot be ruled out in a private sphere as certain cultural or social contexts require language use based on one language—this monolingual discourse still allows fluid languaging practices and, even though they are often perceived as being monolingual by the speakers, prove to be multilingual from a researcher’s perspective (Goodchild 2018; see Weidl 2018: 257–8). In research, a multiplicity of analyses fuelled by the inclusion of different perspectives must be considered to obtain in-depth results that do justice to the manifoldness of language use in its social environment.

6 Conclusion

Lived sociolinguistic realities in the Global South vary widely from settings of the Global North, which are preoccupied by widespread monolingual idealisations (Ndhlovu & Makalela 2021). Yet, official structures affecting the Global South are clearly influenced by (ideas originating from) the Global North. This often implies that people with less active skills in (written) standard languages are, in the current institutional system, clearly disadvantaged, irrespective of the fact that linguistic skills are a multidimensional affair and language proficiency cannot be meaningfully collapsed into yes/no answers in real life. In Senegal, highly multilingual individuals marginalised from the official system due to low access to standard French can be found all over the country and might even constitute the majority of the population.

Yet, all the speakers presented in this paper are multilinguals with diverse identities who linguistically adapt with impressive ease within contexts and social constellations according to experiences, assessments of the context and common knowledge. Their multilingualisms naturally maintain small-scale language ecologies as well as cultural heritage, whereas systematised monolingualism often threatens especially small and nationally more ‘insignificant’ groupings. For speakers who did not grow up in a sphere that is dominated by monolingualism, multilingualism is the only normal way of conversing, and restricted adaptation to one language is impractical and unnatural.

The conception of an insufficiently far-reaching understanding of multilingualism in many under-researched or misconceived settings is based on a nation-state model, in which stakeholders argue for a reinforced focus on one or view languages to

solve problems; however, the contrary might be the case and even trigger wide-ranging social and cultural discrimination. The integration of a Senegalese language in Senegal would in certain settings, for instance, offer potential for the same issues already faced due to monolingual French structures, a fact that must be taken further into consideration. For many individuals in the Casamance (and the Global South), there is no compelling necessity to study one language formally, since this entails restrictions and would not reflect their lived experiences and realities, nor is there a realistically increased chance that proficiency in a standard language would secure better economic conditions.

In research, it is indispensable to encourage more in-depth approaches that reflect and adapt to linguistic and cultural realities and consider the inclusion of various perspectives (going beyond the view of a trained researcher) as a necessity. Against this background, the conceptualisation of mono- and multilingualism can then be reconsidered in superdiverse, translanguaging contexts in which people move fluidly through their individual use of languages.

Rounding off an overall picture, a general, more thorough and deeper understanding of multilingualism is needed, in which multilingual varieties, possibilities and applications are more broadly accepted, and certain prohibitions or discrimination due to multilingual language use no longer take place. Empowerment towards a positive awareness of multilingualism and diversity could have lasting effects on language policies, education and the development of the country as a whole, as long as multilingualism is not perceived as and solidified into a burden in many sectors. As part of speakers' high proficiencies, multilingualism is the normal way of conversing, and rigorous restrictions to the application of one language are not expedient for an overall improvement of educational level impacting the entire country. Besides major institutional systems, which might to a certain extent always be monolingual, more projects like LILIEMA are needed that support possibilities that differ from but at the same time support official educational systems to empower people to flourish in their multilingualisms instead of the reverse: diminishing individuals through the attribution of low proficiency in big, standardised languages while not providing sufficient educational choices or support. In the LILIEMA project, we saw that a general linguistic empowerment in turn improves people's attitude towards writing and education as such, resulting in sustainable individual development that seems to contaminate people's close environment. The collaboration and amalgamation of research, politics and educational institutions can then make a collaborative effort that leads to a better understanding of multilingualism and hence open up new avenues for a general acceptance and better integration of speakers using and identifying with different kinds of multilingualisms that do not fit into prefabricated systems.

Acknowledgements

I would like to acknowledge and thank all the people in Senegal who are at the centre and an active part of this research and allow for better understanding of multilingualism. Furthermore, I would like to thank all the members of the LILIEMA project for their great work and especially mention Alpha Naby Mané, who passed away unexpectedly in 2021.

References

- Aronin, L. & Hufeisen, B. (2009), 'The Exploration of Multilingualism', in L. Aronin & B. Hufeisen (eds), *The Exploration of Multilingualism* (John Benjamins Publishing Company), 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263111000283>
- Assises de l'éducation du Sénégal (2014), *Assises de l'éducation du Sénégal*. 1–146. http://ekldata.com/VsEYubtB_tfL25iiSwpfrX-x4o0/Rapport-Final-des-Assises.pdf
- Barry, A. (1987), 'The Joola Languages: Subgrouping and Reconstruction', in *Languages and Cultures (Issue February 1987)*. School of Oriental and African Studies.
- Biagui, U.A. (2006), *Le patrimoine historique et culturel Baïnouk: un appui au développement et à la diversification du tourisme culturel au Sénégal*.
- Bichler, G.A. (2003), *Bejo, Curay und Bin-bim?: Die Sprache und Kultur der Wolof im Senegal; (mit angeschlossenem Lehrbuch Wolof)* (Lang).
- Björklund, M., Björklund, S. & Sjöholm, K. (2013), 'Multilingual Policies and Multilingual Education in the Nordic Countries', *International Electronic Journal of Elementary Education*, 6(1): 1–20.
- Blackledge, A. & Creese, A. (2010a), *Multilingualism: A Critical Perspective* (London, Continuum).
- Blackledge, A. & Creese, A. (2010b), 'Translanguaging in the Bilingual Classroom: A Pedagogy for Learning and Teaching?', *Modern Language Journal*, 94(1): 103–155. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2009.00986.x>
- Blommaert, J. (2008), *Grassroots Literacy: Writing, Identity and Voice in Central Africa* (Abingdon, Routledge). <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203895481>
- Blommaert, J. (2011), 'Small Print: Reflections on Multilingual Literacies in the Global South', *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education*, 41(2): 293–299. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03057925.2011.547281>
- Blommaert, J. & Backus, A. (2012), 'Superdiverse Repertoires and the Individual', in I. de Saint-Jacques & J.-J. Weber (eds), *Multimodality and Multilingualism: Current Challenges for Educational Studies* (Rotterdam, Sense Publisher), 1–33. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-6209-266-2_2
- Blommaert, J., Rampton, B. & Spotti, M. (2015), 'Language and Superdiversity', *Language and Superdiversity*, 1–286. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315730240>
- Busch, B. (2015), 'Linguistic Repertoire and Spracherleben, the Lived Experience of Language', in *Working Papers in Urban Language & Literacies*, 148: 1–16.
- Calvet, L.-J. & Dreyfus, M. (1990), 'La famille dans l'espace urbain: trois modèles de plurilinguisme', *Plurilinguismes*, 3: 29–54.
- Canagarajah, S. (2011), 'Translanguaging in the Classroom: Emerging Issues for Research and Pedagogy', *Applied Linguistics Review*, 2: 1–28. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110239331.1>
- Canagarajah, S. (2012), *Translingual Practice: Global Englishes and Cosmopolitan Relations* (London, Routledge). <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203073889>
- Canagarajah, S. & Wurr, A. J. (2011), 'Multilingual Communication and Language Acquisition: New Research Directions', *The Reading Matrix*, 11(1): 1–15.

- Cobbinah, A.Y. (2010), 'The Casamance as an Area of Intense Language Contact: The Case of Baïnouk Gubaher', *Journal of Language Contact: Evolution of Languages, Contact and Discourse*, 3(1): 175–201. <https://doi.org/10.1163/19552629-90000010>
- Cobbinah, A.Y. (2013), *Nominal Classification and Verbal Nouns in Baïnouk Gubëeher* (PhD thesis, SOAS, University of London).
- Davis, W.D. & Dubinsky, S. (2018), 'Language and National Identity', in *Language Conflict and Language Rights: Ethnolinguistic Perspectives on Human Conflict* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press), 99–131. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781139135382.010>
- De Jong, F. (2007), *Masquerades of Modernity: Power and Secrecy in Casamance, Senegal* (Edinburgh, Edinburgh University Press). <https://doi.org/10.3366/edinburgh/9780748633197.001.0001>
- Deumert, A. & Lexander, K.V. (2013), 'Texting Africa: Writing as Performance', *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 17(4): 522–46. <https://doi.org/10.1111/josl.12043>
- Di Carlo, P. (2017), 'Towards an Understanding of African Endogenous Multilingualism Ethnography, Language Ideologies, and the Supernatural', *International Journal of the Sociology of Language, Section 2*: 1–20.
- Di Carlo, P., Good, J. & Diba, R.O. (2019), 'Multilingualism in Rural Africa', *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Linguistics*, 1–47 <https://doi.org/10.1093/acrefore/9780199384655.013.227>
- Diallo, I. (2010), *The Politics of National Languages in Postcolonial Senegal* (New York, Cambria Press).
- Diouf, J.-L. (2003), *Dictionnaire wolof—français et français—wolof* (Paris, Karthala).
- Dreyfus, M. & Juillard, C. (2004), *Le plurilinguisme au Sénégal. Langues et identités en devenir* (Karthala).
- Dumont, P. (1982), *Le français et les langues africaines au Sénégal* (Paris, Karthala/AACT).
- Edwards, J. (2012), *Multilingualism: Understanding Linguistic Diversity* (London, Continuum).
- Evans, M. (2003), Ni Paix ni Guerre: The Political Economy of Low-Level Conflict in the Casamance, *Background Research for HPG Report*, 13: 1–22.
- Evans, N. (2018), 'Did Language Evolve in Multilingual Settings?', *Biology & Philosophy* 32: 905–33. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10539-018-9609-3>
- Fall, A. (2013), 'L'école et la nation au Sénégal de 1960 à nos jours: L'histoire d'un malentendu', in B. Falaize, C. Heimberg & O. Loubes (eds), *L'école et la nation: Actes du séminaire scientifique international* (ENS Éditions), 455–66. <https://doi.org/10.4000/books.enseditions.2419>
- Goodchild, S. (2016), 'Which Language(s) Are You For?' 'I Am For All the Languages.' Reflections on Breaking through the Ancestral Code: Trials of Sociolinguistic Documentation', *SOAS Working Papers in Linguistics*, 18: 75–91.
- Goodchild, S. (2018), *Sociolinguistic Spaces and Multilingualism: Practices and Perceptions in Essyl, Senegal* (PhD thesis, SOAS, University of London).
- Goodchild, S. & Weidl, M. (2019), 'Translanguaging Practices in the Casamance. Senegal Similar But Different: Two Case Studies', in A. Sherris & E. Adami (eds), *Making Signs, Translanguaging Ethnographies: Exploring Urban, Rural, and Educational Spaces* (Bristol, Multilingual Matters), 133–51. <https://doi.org/10.21832/9781788921923-011>
- Haut, D. (1995), *Codeswitching in Gambia: eine soziolinguistische Untersuchung von Mandinka, Wolof und Englisch in Kontakt* (Köln, Köppe).
- Irvine, J.T. & Gal, S. (2000), 'Language Ideology and Linguistic Differentiation', in P.V. Kroskrity (ed.), *Regimes of Language: Ideologies, Politics, and Identities* (Santa Fe, School of American Research Press), 35–84. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781107415324.004>
- Johnson, N.K. (2005), 'Senegalese "Into Frenchmen"? The French Technology of Nationalism in Senegal', in W. Safran & J. A. Laponce (eds), *Language, Ethnic Identity and the State*, 135–58. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13537110490450809>
- Jørgensen, J.N., Karrebæk, M., Madsen, L.M. & Møller, J.S. (2011), 'Polylinguaging in superdiversity', *Diversities*, 13(2): 23–37.
- Juillard, C. (1991), 'Comportements et attitudes de la jeunesse face au multilinguisme en Casamance (Sénégal)', *Cahiers Des Sciences Humaines*, 27(3–4): 433–56.

- Juillard, C. (2001), 'Le jeu de l'alternance dans la vie quotidienne des jeunes scolarisés à Dakar et à Ziguinchor (Sénégal): Variation dans l'usage du français et du wolof', *Cahiers d'Études Africaines*, 41(16): 667–96. <https://doi.org/10.4000/etudesafriaines.115>
- Keese, A. (2016), 'Wolof and Wolofisation: Statehood, Colonial Rule and Identification in Senegal', in *Ethnicity and the Colonial State* (Leiden, Brill), 84–157. <https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004307353>
- Kemp, C. (2009), 'Defining Multilingualism', in L. Aronin & B. Hufeisen (eds), *The Exploration of Multilingualism: AILA Applied Linguistic Series (AALS)* (Amsterdam, John Benjamins Publishing Company), 11–26. <https://doi.org/10.1075/aals.6.02ch2>
- Kristiansen, T. (2010), 'Attitudes, Ideology and Awareness', in R. Wodak, B. Johnston & P. Kerswill (eds), *The SAGE Handbook of Sociolinguistics* (London, SAGE), 265–78. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781446200957.n20>
- Léglise, I. (2017), 'Multilinguisme et hétérogénéité des pratiques langagières. Nouveaux chantiers et enjeux du Global South', *Langage et Société*, 2–3(160–1): 251–66. <https://doi.org/10.3917/ls.160.0251>
- Lexander, K.V. (2010), *Pratiques plurilingues de l'écrit électronique : alternances codiques et choix de langue dans les SMS, les courriels et les conversations de la messagerie instantanée des étudiants de Dakar, Sénégal* (University of Oslo).
- Li Wei. (2018), 'Translanguaging as a Practical Theory of Language', *Applied Linguistics*, 39(1): 9–30. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amx039>
- Lüpke, F. (2016), 'Pure Fiction—The Interplay of Indexical and Essentialist Language Ideologies and Heterogeneous Practices: A View from Agnack', *African Language Documentation: New Data, Methods and Approaches*, 10(10): 8–39.
- Lüpke, F. (2018), 'Multiple Choice: Language Use and cultural Practice in Rural Casamance between Convergence and Divergence', in J. Knörr & W.T. Filho (eds), *Creolization and Pidginization in Contexts of Postcolonial Diversity* (Leiden, Brill), 181–208.
- Lüpke, F. & Bao-Diop, S. (2014), 'Beneath the Surface? Contemporary Ajami Writing in West Africa, Exemplified through Wolofal', in K. Juffermans, Y. M. Asfaha & A. Abdelhay (eds), *African Literacies: Ideologies, Scripts, Education* (Cambridge, Cambridge Scholars Publishing), 86–114.
- Lüpke, F., Biagui, A.C., Biai, L., Diatta, J., Mané, A.N., Sagna, J.F. & Weidl, M. (2021), 'LILIEMA: Language-Independent Literacies for Inclusive Education in Multilingual Areas', in P. Harding-Esch & H. Coleman (eds), *Language and the Sustainable Development Goals: Selected Papers from the 12th Language and Development Conference* (The British Council), 79–87.
- Lüpke, F., Stenzel, K., Cabalazar, F.D., Chacon, T., da Cruz, A., Franchetto, B., Guerreiro, A., Meira, S., da Silva, G.R., Silva, W., Storto, L., Valentino, L., van der Voort, H. & Watson, R. (2020), 'Comparing Rural Multilingualism in Lowland South America and Western Africa', *International Journal for the Sociology of Language*, 1–78. <https://doi.org/10.1353/anl.2020.0002>
- Lüpke, F. & Storch, A. (2013), 'Repertoires and Choices in African Languages', in Y. Matras (ed.), *Language Contact and Bilingualism*, Vol. 5 (Munich, Walter de Gruyter). <https://doi.org/10.1515/9781614511946>
- McLaughlin, F. (1995), 'Haalpulaar Identity as a Response to Wolofization', *African Languages and Cultures*, 8(2): 153–68. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09544169508717793>
- McLaughlin, F. (2008), 'The Ascent of Wolof as an Urban Vernacular and National Lingua Franca in Senegal', in C.B. Vigoureux & S.S. Mufwene (eds), *Globalization and Language Vitality: Perspectives from Africa* (London, Continuum), 142–70.
- Ndhlovu, F. & Makalela, L. (2021), *Decolonising Multilingualism in Africa: Recentering Silenced Voices from the Global South* (Bristol, Multilingual Matters). <https://doi.org/10.21832/9781788923361>
- Ngom, F. (2003), 'The Social Status of Arabic, French, and English in the Senegalese Speech Community', *Language, Variation and Change*, 15(3): 351–68. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0954394503153045>
- Ngom, F. (2017), 'Ajami Scripts in the Senegalese Speech Community', *Journal of Arabic and Islamic Studies*, 10(0): 1–23. <https://doi.org/10.5617/jais.4599>
- O'Brien, D.C. (1998), 'The Shadow-Politics of Wolofisation', *The Journal of Modern African Studies*, 36(1): 25–46. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0022278X97002644>

- Otsuji, E. & Pennycook, A. (2010), 'Metrolingualism: Fixity, Fluidity and Language in Flux', *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 7(3): 240–54. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14790710903414331>
- Phipps, A. (2019), *Decolonising Multilingualism: Struggles to Decreate* (Bristol, Multilingual Matters). <https://doi.org/10.21832/9781788924061>
- Simpson, A. (ed.) (2008), *Language and National Identity in Africa* (Oxford, Oxford University Press).
- Singer, R. & Harris, S. (2016a), 'What Practices and Ideologies Support Small-Scale Multilingualism? A Case Study of Unexpected Language Survival in an Australian Indigenous community Ruth Singer and Salome Harris', *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 216(241): 163–208. <https://doi.org/10.1515/ijsl-2016-0029>
- Singer, R. & Harris, S. (2016b), 'What Practices and Ideologies Support Small-Scale Multilingualism? A Case Study of Warruwi Community, Northern Australia', *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 204: 163–208. <https://doi.org/10.1515/ijsl-2016-0029>
- Stavans, A. & Hoffmann, C. (2015), *Multilingualism* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press). <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781316144534>
- Swigart, L. (2000), 'The Limits of Legitimacy: Language Ideology and Shift in Contemporary Senegal', *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology*, 10(1): 90–130. <https://doi.org/10.1525/jlin.2000.10.1.90>
- Toivanen, R. & Saarikivi, J. (2016), 'Linguistic Genocide or Superdiversity?: New and Old Language Diversities', in R. Toivanen & J. Saarikivi (eds), *Linguistic Diversity and Language Rights*, Vol. 14 (Bristol, Multilingual Matters). <https://doi.org/10.21832/9781783096060>
- Tomàs, J. (2005), *La identitat ètnica entre les joola d'Oussouye* (411).
- UNESCO (2016), *Global Monitoring Report: Education for People and Planet: Creating Sustainable Futures for All* (UNESCO).
- UNESCO (2019), *Data for the Sustainable Development Goals: Senegal* (UNESCO).
- Vertovec, S. (2007), 'Super-Diversity and Its Implications', *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 30(6): 1024–54. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01419870701599465>
- Vigouroux, C.B. (2011), 'Magic Marketing: Performing Grassroot Literacy', in J. Blommaert, B. Rampton & M. Spotti (eds), *Language and Superdiversities* (UNESCO & MPIMMG), 53–70.
- Watson, R. (2018), 'Different Types of Multilingual Joola Discourse in Brin, Lower Casamance'. Talk at ACBLPE.
- Weidl, M. (2018), *The Role of Wolof in Multilingual Conversations in the Casamance: Fluidity of Linguistic Repertoires* (PhD thesis, SOAS, University of London).
- Weidl, M. & Goodchild, S. (forthcoming), *Multilingualism Triangulated in Practice and Analysis: A New Method for Researching Multilingual Contexts*.
- Weidl, M., Lüpke, F., Mané, A.N. & Sagna, J.F. (forthcoming), 'LILIEMA: A Sustainable Educational Program and Research Project Embedded within Social Realities of Multilingual Speakers and Writers', in H. Lehtonen & J. Saarikivi (eds), *Action Linguistics! Reinforcing Linguistic Diversity and Language Awareness through Participatory Research*.
- Zarete, G., Lèvy, D. & Kramsch, C. (2011), *Handbook of Multilingualism and Multiculturalism* (Éditions des archives contemporaines).

To cite the article: Weidl, M. (2022), 'Which Multilingualism Do You Speak? Translanguaging as an Integral Part of Individuals' Lives in the Casamance, Senegal', *Journal of the British Academy*, 10(s4): 41–67. <https://doi.org/10.5871/jba/010s4.041>