



Multilingualism in a post-industrial city: policy and practice in Manchester

Yaron Matras & Alex Robertson

To cite this article: Yaron Matras & Alex Robertson (2015) Multilingualism in a post-industrial city: policy and practice in Manchester, *Current Issues in Language Planning*, 16:3, 296-314, DOI: [10.1080/14664208.2015.1048925](https://doi.org/10.1080/14664208.2015.1048925)

To link to this article: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/14664208.2015.1048925>



Published online: 29 Jun 2015.



[Submit your article to this journal](#)



Article views: 54



[View related articles](#)



[View Crossmark data](#)

Multilingualism in a post-industrial city: policy and practice in Manchester

Yaron Matras* and Alex Robertson

School of Arts, Languages and Cultures, University of Manchester, Manchester, UK

(Received 24 October 2014; accepted 30 April 2015)

Manchester (England), one of the first industrial cities, is now home to over 150 languages. Ethnic minority and migrant communities take active steps to maintain heritage languages in commerce and through education. The paper introduces a model for a holistic approach to profiling urban multilingualism that relies on triangulating a variety of quantitative data sets, observations, and ethnographic interviews. We examine how responses to language diversity reflect an emerging new civic identity, but at the same time rely on private and voluntary sector initiative: While the city officially brands itself as multicultural to attract foreign investment, language provisions are local, responsive, and de-centralised and often outsourced, and aim primarily at ensuring equal access to public services rather than to safeguard or promote cultural heritage or even to cultivate language skills as a workforce resource that is vital to economic growth. In such a complex and dynamic setting, there is a need for a mechanism to continuously monitor changes in language profiles and language needs.

Keywords: Manchester; multilingualism; immigrant languages; economic growth; language policy

1. Introduction

The city constitutes a setting where complex layers of social identity and power converge in demarcated spaces. Local authorities, services, and economies reflect and respond to this perpetual change and the language diversity that it brings about. As a result, the city has become an increasingly popular focal point of research on multilingualism. Three major themes can be identified in contemporary studies of urban multilingualism. The first addresses the factors that bring about and facilitate language diversity. These include the history of settlement of migrant communities as well as explicitly formulated policies that contribute to the vitality of immigrant, “heritage”, or community languages (e.g. Clyne & Kipp, 2006; Extra & Yağmur, 2005; García & Fishman, 1997). Particular attention has been given in this connection to the role of community-based institutions such as supplementary schools (e.g. Edwards, 2001; Extra & Vallen, 1997; Lamb, 2001), most recently from a discursive perspective that analyses the role of plurilingual practices in constructing identities (Blackledge & Creese, 2010), as well as to heritage language teaching in a broader perspective (Gándara & Rumberger, 2009; García & Wei, 2014; Puskás, 2012; Rosén & Bagga-Gupta, 2013). A second theme concerns responses to language diversity. Studies

*Corresponding author. Email: yaron.matras@manchester.ac.uk

such as Morse (2003), Leimgruber (2013), Clyne and Kipp (2006), Lo Bianco (2003) and Kraus (2011) have all dealt with ways in which policy responds to heterogeneous identities and the role of language in participation and equal access to services. A central issue is the availability of quantifiable data on language needs in the form of census or school-based surveys (Barni & Extra, 2008; Extra & Yağmur, 2011; Salverda, 2002). A third theme concerns the implications of urban multilingualism for the conceptualisation of linguistic identity. This is informed by the realisation that globalisation has brought about a fundamental change in the conditions that create, maintain, and drive multilingualism (Aronin & Singleton, 2008; Blommaert, 2010; Maurais & Morris, 2003). Constant change and complexity cannot be analysed through the traditional prisms of one-to-one mapping of language and space or time, but require instead a dynamic and adaptable model (cf. Blommaert, 2013; Mac Giolla Christ, 2007). The resulting paradigm shift is characterised alternatively as “post-nationalism” (Heller, 2011) – the view that language is no longer a stable marker of identity that is negotiated at the national level, or as “superdiversity” (Blommaert & Rampton, 2011; Duarte & Gogolin, 2013; Vertovec, 2007) – the loss of predictability of connections among groups and sectors, their mobility, and their participation routines within larger communities. Below we examine quantitative and qualitative data on languages and institutions’ responses to language needs, in order to “profile” a multilingual city and the emergence of a civic identity that “brands” multiculturalism and embraces global outreach and superdiversity.

2. The setting: the role of multiculturalism in Manchester’s regeneration

Once a thriving hub of industrial innovation and the global centre of the cotton trade, Manchester pioneered developments in engineering and manufacturing, as well as the very model of factory capitalism (cf. Dicken, 2002). International migrants began to arrive and join the workforce of this booming metropolis towards the second half of the nineteenth century; however, the industrial downturn, economic depression, and World Wars of the twentieth century hit the city hard. Faced with a need to reinvent and regenerate, Manchester began a shift towards a service-based economy, which today is manifested in the presence of financial, professional, digital, and creative services. In this transition, Manchester retained much of its international workforce. It also continued to attract new generations of migrant workers, British Commonwealth citizens, refugees, professionals responding to staff recruitment campaigns, and EU citizens. In the decade between 2001 and 2011, Manchester’s population grew from 422,900 to 503,100. This growth rate of 19% is the highest of any city in the UK save London. It compares to a national growth rate in the UK of just 7%, and a rate of 4% in the North West of England. The greatest increase is among those aged 20–24, with a 25% rise (by 41,100 persons) over the 10-year period. Greater Manchester’s student population alone has grown by 36,700 since 2001 (Census 2011, 2013); many of these graduates remain in the city to begin their professional lives, widening and strengthening the parameters for the city’s regeneration.

The 2011 Census gives some insights into the city’s ethnic and linguistic diversity. According to the self-reported Census data, 25.2% of the city’s population were born outside the UK, with 15.8% having been resident in the city for less than 10 years. Authorities, services, and businesses embrace the city’s multiculturalism not only as an indelible feature of its identity but as an asset and a strategy. In a series of analyses and forecasts concerning the region’s growth and development, Manchester City Council explains:

Manchester has long embraced the breadth and diversity of its population and celebrates the values that bring people of different backgrounds together as Mancunians. (Manchester City Council, 2013)

Migration is a huge strength of the city. It has contributed to enhancing the culture, economy and the reputation of Manchester as an international city. (Manchester City Council, 2014)

By entwining the city's diversity with the "reputation of Manchester", it is clear that Manchester City Council recognises the value that potential investors place on established international links. In the period between 2012 and 2013, the University of Manchester had 8990 international students enrolled across its undergraduate and postgraduate programmes (University of Manchester, 2014a). The University's website similarly underlines the attraction that a vibrant, multilingual, and multicultural society holds for an incoming student:

Beyond the University you'll find that the city of Manchester is a diverse and modern place where a taste of home is never far away. The city is one of the most multicultural in the UK, with nearly 200 languages spoken here. (University of Manchester, 2014b)

These students not only pay, for the majority of undergraduate courses, tuition fees of roughly £15,000 per year, but they also bring the trade of visiting family members who spend in the city's hospitality and retail sectors. Major city centre retailers like Selfridges and Harvey Nichols recruit part-time Chinese-speaking staff and display product signs in Chinese in the seasons surrounding the Chinese New Year and summer holidays.

Manchester's Investment and Development Agency Service (MIDAS) seeks to attract and support inward investment in the city by promoting its economic strengths. It too confirms that a multilingual, globally minded workforce is highly attractive to potential investors and thus advantageous in terms of economic growth. MIDAS' website is available to read in nine languages other than English, and states:

With an influx of international students and foreign nationals, Manchester's diverse labour pool continues to grow, offering many multilingual capabilities that add global value to businesses at a realistic cost. (MIDAS, 2014a)

MIDAS reports that over 2000 foreign-owned companies and 350 customer care businesses with international orientation operate in Manchester (MIDAS, 2014b). Recent examples of major investment include the relocation of a large proportion of the BBC's activities from London to the MediaCityUK site on Salford Quays, the largest purpose-built media location in Europe. This move constituted a symbolic and economic boost for the region's media services and saw the arrival of 854 relocated staff as well as the recruitment of 254 staff members from the Greater Manchester area. In 2011–2012, Salford-based BBC departments spent £6.2 million on hotels, taxis, flights, rail, and hire cars alone. Manchester's Airport City is another prime example of investment, with British-Chinese business partners confirmed to be spending £800 million on the forthcoming development of the airport site. The five million square feet of business space is expected to promote international economic ties, particularly links with China, and to create over 16,000 jobs (Monaghan, 2013).

The presence in Manchester of a growing young population of second- and third-generation immigrants who are proficient in English, having been through the local education system, but who continue to maintain community language skills, also offers private interpretation and translation companies a high local recruitment potential. In 2011 a Manchester-based company, Applied Language Solutions, signed a contract with

the UK Ministry of Justice to provide interpretation services to HM Courts and Tribunals Service. The company attempted to reduce costs by lowering travel payments and qualification requirements among their interpreters, a model that led to discontent among the wider interpreter sector, subsequent boycotting by many industry professionals, and an overall failure to deliver an efficient service (Bowcott & Midlane, 2012). In the Commons Select Committee inquiry into the affair, one reason cited for the failings was the lack of consideration of the nationwide translation of the model; what had appeared to work in Manchester, capitalising on the city's multilingual potential where "most minority languages were near at hand", proved ineffective in other regions (House of Commons, Justice Committee, 2013).

3. Triangulating data on Manchester's languages

Sound estimates of languages, language needs, and spatial concentrations of speakers are of key interest both to those entrusted with planning municipal services and to a general public (cf. Extra & Yağmur, 2005, 2011; Salverda, 2002; Simpson, 1997). Yet Manchester does not have any central system to collate or compare data sets on languages. The only freely accessible data set is the National Census, though the Office for National Statistics releases correlation tables only selectively. Data from the 2011 Census have been released during 2012–2013 on language by location (post code), as well as on levels of proficiency in English by location and date of arrival in the UK (see Gopal & Matras, 2013a, 2013b), but these two data sets cannot be correlated. Data held by local institutions are accessible in principle through direct requests. We have been able to draw on a number of those, and linking them for the very first time provides us with an integrated picture not just of the presence of languages in the city, but also of language needs (Table 1).

The principal instrument used by the local authority to gather data on languages is the School Census (see Simpson, 1997 for a discussion of its value for "ethnic demography" and planning services). On an annual basis, schools enter data on pupils, including "first language". The format allows staff to enter a single language for each student from a preset list drafted at national level by the Department of Education. Data on multiple home languages are therefore lacking, as is any indication of usage patterns or proficiency, which leaves the notion of "first language" ambiguous. Some languages, like Yiddish, do not even appear on the list. Manchester's School Census for 2013 records altogether 23,897 pupils as speaking a "first language" other than English, from a total of 70,220 (34%), and lists altogether 152 languages. Our own pilot survey (Robertson, Gopal, Wright, Matras, & Jones, 2013) based on face-to-face interviews with just 531 pupils in two primary and two secondary schools in Manchester in 2013 recorded 48 different languages, an indication of the high density of languages in some districts. We also established discrepancies with the official School Census for the relevant schools, which suggest that some languages are under-reported. This applies especially to minority or regional languages such as Potwari, Bravanese, Berber, and Romani, and many African languages.

The 2011 National Census for England and Wales was the first to collect written answers to the question "What is your main language?" The Census reports that 79,852 from a total of 480,738 respondents in Manchester (16.6%) listed a language other than English. However, the ambiguity of the question means that the Census data may not convey an accurate picture of either language diversity or numbers of speakers of individual languages (cf. Gopal & Matras, 2013a). Answers may reflect respondents' language of work, which they speak during most hours of the day, the language in which they consider themselves to be most proficient, or the official state language of their country of origin

Table 1. Manchester languages: the top 20 most frequently reported across several datasets.

Census 2011		School pupils' first language (Jan 2013)		CMFT interpreter requests (Jan–Dec) 2012		M-Four interpreter requests (Apr 2012–Mar 2013)	
Language	No.	Language	No.	Language	No.	Language	No.
Urdu	13,095	Urdu	6497	Urdu	6272	Urdu/Panjabi	2245
Arabic	7037	Arabic	2448	Arabic	3183	Bengali	910
Polish	6447	Somali	2095	Cantonese	2667	Polish	904
All other Chinese	5878	Panjabi	2000	Bengali	2033	Arabic	870
Panjabi	4719	Bengali	1374	Polish	1965	Persian	753
Bengali	3114	Polish	865	Panjabi	1805	Somali	648
Somali	2958	French	706	Somali	1669	Portuguese	429
Persian	2660	Yoruba	565	Mandarin	1597	Pashto	414
French	2351	Chinese	378	Romanian	1272	Kurdish	405
Kurdish	1886	Portuguese	369	Persian	1191	Romanian	404
Spanish	1869	Pashto	358	Kurdish	960	Czech	387
Cantonese	1739	Malayalam	313	Czech	838	Mandarin	359
Greek	1588	Kurdish	311	British Sign Language	628	Lithuanian	357
Portuguese	1458	Czech	225	French	452	Russian	348
Pashto	1147	Spanish	215	Russian	444	Cantonese	262
German	936	Persian	204	Portuguese	426	British Sign Language	235
Czech	933	German	179	Gujarati	316	French	218
Mandarin	851	Romanian	172	Pashto	296	Tigrinya	197
Malayalam	849	Shona	172	Tigrinya	268	Amharic	191
Russian	844	Italian	135	Latvian	242	Gujarati	158
Total “main language” other than English	79,852 (16.6% of residents)	Total “first language” other than English 2013	23,897 (34% of pupils)	Total interpreter requests 2012	30,496	Total interpreter requests 04/2012–03/2013	12,687

rather than their home language(s). The 2011 Census lists just 67 individual languages for Manchester, as well as several regional groups of unspecified “other” languages, thus offering a much less differentiated picture than the School Census. There are various indications that respondents under-report languages on the Census. For Yoruba, for example, 427 schoolchildren are recorded on the School Census for 2010, but a total of only 559 name Yoruba as their “main language” on the 2011 Census. If the figures were to be taken at face value, the comparison would suggest that 75% of the Yoruba community are schoolchildren compared to an average in Manchester of around 15%, a discrepancy that cannot be accounted for on the basis of birth rates. This pattern is consistent, suggesting ostensibly that some 29% of speakers of languages other than English are schoolchildren. From first-hand observations in the respective communities we also know that the figures for Caribbean Creole (13), Romani (29), and Yiddish (5) are unrealistically low. On the other hand, the Census lists one speaker each for Cornish and Manx, both by and large extinct languages that are undergoing some revival efforts and thus may be individuals’ principal language of identification but are unlikely to be the preferred choice in most practical everyday communication. Both under-reporting and over-reporting thus reveal the subjective dimension of the Census question on languages.

Census data include location indicators (by ward or municipal district), and School Census data name individual schools. Both data sets can therefore provide insights into the presence of languages in certain areas of the city. They show three major geographical clusters (Tables 2 and 3): The first is a South Asian group, represented in the tables by Urdu and Panjabi (as well as Bengali and Gujarati, not listed). The second is a Middle Eastern group, consisting of Persian, Kurdish, and Arabic (and Pashto, not listed). This group partly overlaps with the South Asian cluster and it also shows close overlap with Somali, which is spoken in Manchester by Muslim refugees who arrived via Sudan, Egypt, and Saudi Arabia and are often also speakers of Arabic. The third cluster consists of African languages, represented by Yoruba and Shona (as well as Lingala, Wolof, Igbo, Ndebele, Akan/Twi, Swahili, Amharic, and Tigrinya, not listed). This group overlaps with French and Portuguese, an indication that many speakers of African languages report the official state (ex-colonial) language of their countries of origin in both surveys. The comparison suggests that on the 2011 Census respondents under-reported Somali (presumably in favour of Arabic or English) and over-reported French and Portuguese (presumably at the expense of African languages).

Table 2. Correlation by ward of languages identified for Manchester in the School Census 2013 (shaded areas indicate a correlation over 0.40).

	Urdu	Panjabi	Persian	Kurdish	Arabic	Somali	Yoruba	Shona	French	Portug.
Urdu	1	0.88	0.61	0.58	0.60	0.17	-0.19	-0.05	-0.15	-0.15
Panjabi	0.88	1	0.61	0.47	0.61	0.12	-0.19	-0.08	-0.17	-0.20
Persian	0.61	0.61	1	0.64	0.78	0.63	0.00	0.04	0.19	0.01
Kurdish	0.58	0.47	0.64	1	0.72	0.62	-0.11	-0.13	0.07	0.02
Arabic	0.60	0.61	0.78	0.72	1	0.63	-0.19	-0.22	-0.10	-0.11
Somali	0.17	0.12	0.63	0.62	0.63	1	-0.05	-0.19	0.08	0.18
Yoruba	-0.19	-0.19	0.00	-0.11	-0.19	-0.05	1	0.79	0.81	0.65
Shona	-0.05	-0.08	0.04	-0.13	-0.22	-0.19	0.79	1	0.73	0.64
French	-0.15	-0.17	0.19	0.07	-0.10	0.08	0.81	0.73	1	0.78
Portug.	-0.15	-0.20	0.01	0.02	-0.11	0.18	0.65	0.64	0.78	1

Table 3. Correlation by ward of languages identified for Manchester in the National Census 2011 (shaded areas indicate a correlation over 0.40).

	Urdu	Panjabi	Persian	Kurdish	Arabic	Somali	Yoruba	Shona	French	Portug.
Urdu	1	0.92	0.55	0.65	0.49	0.15	0.13	0.23	0.18	0.16
Panjabi	0.92	1	0.63	0.60	0.56	0.09	0.09	0.19	0.16	0.07
Persian	0.55	0.63	1	0.68	0.73	0.29	0.19	0.24	0.56	0.46
Kurdish	0.65	0.60	0.68	1	0.75	0.75	0.23	0.09	0.47	0.29
Arabic	0.49	0.56	0.73	0.75	1	0.52	0.03	-0.08	0.44	0.28
Somali	0.15	0.09	0.29	0.75	0.52	1	0.29	-0.08	0.38	0.20
Yoruba	0.13	0.09	0.19	0.23	0.03	0.29	1	0.72	0.63	0.44
Shona	0.23	0.19	0.24	0.09	-0.08	-0.08	0.72	1	0.52	0.54
French	0.18	0.16	0.56	0.47	0.44	0.38	0.63	0.52	1	0.83
Portug.	0.16	0.07	0.46	0.29	0.28	0.20	0.44	0.54	0.83	1

Data on individual face-to-face interpretation requests can be considered accurate records of the approaches made to the respective sources, although they are unable to capture the complete picture of the overall demand for interpretation since many individuals rely on family members – often children – or friends for spontaneous interpreting and mediation. Central Manchester Universities Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust (CMFT) comprises eight hospitals and sees over one million patients per year. In 2012, CMFT accommodated 30,496 interpreter requests covering 81 different languages. Of the 12 most frequently requested languages, 10 are among the top 20 spoken in the city according to the 2011 Census (see Table 1). In general, we expect that interpreter requests reflect an older population and recent arrivals, both groups being typically less proficient in English as an additional language. The demand for two languages – Romanian and Kurdish – exceeds their declared proportion in the Census. This is likely to be due to over-representation in the hospital's catchment area, but it also suggests both lower English proficiency and under-reporting of these languages in Census data. By contrast, the relatively low number of requests for some languages that are among the top 20 in Manchester, including French, Spanish, Greek, and German, indicates high levels of English proficiency as well as potentially smaller families and a younger population that may not require frequent medical care in a hospital environment.

Certain hospital departments can be indicative of patient age range; interpreter requests may therefore reflect the demographics of a language community. Hakka Chinese, for example, had no requests within either paediatrics or maternity services, although Manchester's Chinatown was historically Hakka-speaking. This indicates that the language is retreating among the younger generation and that English proficiency in the community as a whole is increasing. By contrast, we see a much higher frequency of Hakka interpretation requests in the cataract department, which generally cares for an older generation. We see a similar contrast for other languages, namely Gujarati and Panjabi, while the reverse pattern – high demand in maternity and paediatric, low demand in the cataract unit – is seen for languages like Pashto, Amharic, Romanian, Kurdish, Arabic, and Polish, which indicates a relatively young population of recent immigrants (Table 4).

Manchester City Council uses M-Four, its own in-house unit that offers both face-to-face interpretation and written translation. Between April 2012 and March 2013, M-Four handled over 12,000 requests for face-to-face interpretation for altogether 80 different languages. Services in Urdu and Panjabi are consistently in demand, and an increase in demand for eastern European languages has also been reported. The list of top languages

Table 4. Per cent of total interpreter requests for language by department, for a selection of languages (CMFT 2012).

	Total requests	Maternity (%)	Paediatric (%)	Cataract (%)
Pashto	296	27.3	7.1	0.0
Amharic	149	22.1	21.5	0.0
Romanian	1272	20.4	15.7	0.4
Kurdish	960	21.0	17.0	0.5
Arabic	3183	17.5	26.6	0.6
Polish	1965	15.6	18.5	0.4
Gujarati	316	7.6	4.7	20.6
Panjabi	1805	6.9	4.6	10.2
Hakka	103	0.0	0.0	16.5

in demand for M-Four interpreter services reflects the more widespread community languages, and matches the distribution of demand at CMFT (Table 1).

Manchester libraries acquire stock in community languages on the basis of specific requests from users. Stock is tagged for language and when items are issued a digital record is kept, which identifies the language. Table 5 presents citywide stock for the top languages – those with over 100 items – for the budget year 2012/2013, along with figures on new acquisitions and issues. Stock reflects levels of literacy rather than just the number of speakers of a language. Low levels of acquisition for languages that have expanded fairly recently may reflect a lack of familiarity with request procedures, but also growing reliance on the Internet and other home-based digital media. On the whole the list reflects the prominence of Urdu, Chinese, Bengali, Polish, and Arabic, as well as Somali and Persian, as the most widespread community languages in Manchester. The absence of Panjabi stands out: The large Muslim population of Panjabi speakers uses Urdu as their written community language (and Arabic as a liturgical language), while Sikhs read Panjabi but generally maintain well-equipped community libraries in their religious centres (Gurdwaras). Low numbers of stock for Somali and Kurdish reflect both the fairly recent growth of these communities in Manchester and the lower availability of printed materials, owing primarily to political instability in the countries of origin. The Vietnamese stock represents a legacy from a community that arrived in Manchester in the late

Table 5. Manchester City library holdings in a selection of languages (Apr 2012–Mar 2013).

Language (selection)	Stock (>100)	Acquisitions	Issues
Urdu	10,005	4707	45,065
Chinese	6168	883	13,409
Polish	1023	249	2505
Bengali	916	411	2950
Vietnamese	835	0	132
Arabic	628	137	930
Persian	593	180	1006
Somali	172	102	189
Kurdish	114	14	13
Totals for all languages other than English	23,171	6702	70,483

1970s. The large gap between stock and issues, compared to the other languages, and the absence of any new acquisitions, indicates low demand for the language. A similar gap is found for Kurdish, where the near perfect match between issues and new acquisitions points to a small circle of users. On the whole, however, a growth of nearly 30% in stock in just one year shows the local authority's commitment to respond to acquisition requests. It also shows communities' willingness to engage with local institutions to cover cultural needs, though it is noteworthy that acquisitions in just 8 languages account for 99.7% of all new stock.

We have shown how triangulating data sets can provide a differentiated picture and help profile language needs. Casual observations illustrate just how relevant such data triangulation can be. In June 2013, Manchester City Council issued an information leaflet on planned changes to traffic arrangements, accompanied by a standard multilingual notice on the availability of interpreter services. It included Vietnamese and Bosnian/Serbian, among other languages, but not Polish, Persian, or Kurdish, and so was clearly based on a template that was out of date. In the same month, the municipal sport facility Manchester Aquatics Centre issued an information leaflet about its health suite protocol in Arabic, Urdu, and Panjabi. Apparently, the institution was advised that a target audience of recent immigrants from the Middle East and South Asia required this information, but was not informed that most recent arrivals who are speakers of Panjabi do not actually read Panjabi script (though most were probably able to read Urdu). A municipal procedure to optimise resources in order to cater for language needs is still missing; this derives largely from the de-centralised, local response strategy, which we shall examine below.

4. Language provision in the public sector

Cadier and Mar-Molinero (2012) present an exploration of staff opinion and reported language practices at the University Hospital Southampton National Health Service (NHS) Foundation Trust and Southampton Airport. They note a mixture of motives and gaps between top-down policy and grassroots-level practice in these two institutions. Between May 2013 and May 2014, we carried out interviews with staff at a series of Manchester institutions: Manchester City Council's Research and Performance, Adult Education, Children's Services, M-Four Translation, and Regeneration departments; Greater Manchester Police and Fire and Rescue Service, the NHS Communications and Engagement department, Jobcentre Plus (a state-run support service for job seekers), Manchester City Library, CMFT, a South Manchester General Practitioner (GP) practice, and One Education (an independent company owned by the city, to which the Council commissions education services). Questions focused on language provisions, methods of data collection on languages, coordination of practices across departments, and staff language skills. Interviews were also conducted at 25 community-run supplementary schools across the city that specialise in teaching community (ethnic minority, immigrant, or heritage) languages, with questions pertaining to school demographics, formal qualifications, staff background, funding, external support, curriculum, and resources.

The 2011 Census reports that only 3% of respondents in Manchester who reported that English was not their "main language" declared that they were unable to speak any English, while 80% stated that they spoke English "very well" or "well". This indicates a high level of functional multilingualism. Nevertheless, the demand for interpretation in public services is evident from the number of requests documented in [Table 1](#) for just two institutions, M-Four Translations (serving a range of municipal departments) and CMFT. Both have in-house interpreting services, reflecting a willingness to make an investment, which in turn

shows awareness of linguistic diversity as a permanent fixture. CMFT maintains a three-tier response system, which includes six permanent, in-house interpreting staff. A bank of staff closely support this in-house team but are not contracted to fixed hours; between these two groups, around 35% of interpreting requests are managed internally. Efforts are being made to expand this bank of supporting interpreters, as CMFT states that they are more cost effective than outsourced, agency interpreters. Roughly 65% of interpreter requests are outsourced.

Other services typically rely on outsourced interpreting. The changing profile of immigrant communities in response to legal and political changes (e.g. EU enlargement or refugee movements) creates volatile patterns of demand for languages (cf. Blommaert & Rampton, 2011; Duarte & Gogolin, 2013; Vertovec, 2007). Agencies hesitate to dedicate permanent resources for interpretation and translation and opt instead for outsourcing as an effective way of ensuring flexibility to changing needs. This intersects public sector needs with private sector supply and pushes demand for commercial interpreting and translation services. Greater Manchester Police rely on external agencies for face-to-face interpretation, particularly in contexts requiring neutrality such as suspect interviews, while Language Line, an external, three-way telephone interpreting service that can be accessed on police officers' personal phones is used in situations requiring more informal relay of an immediate message. Similarly, Jobcentre Plus uses "thebigword", a three-way telephone interpreting service. For users with hearing impairments it is available via video link in British Sign Language as well as for finger-spelling, lip-speaking, and sign-supported English. Manchester's Children Services employed a number of multilingual classroom assistants for a variety of languages including Romanian, Polish, Urdu, Arabic, Somali, and Romani until 2013, when budget cuts forced schools interested in maintaining support to rely on private contractors, often in the non-profit sector. Many public services, including the Police, Fire and Rescue Services, and GP surgeries rely on multilingual staff and sometimes on volunteers from community centres. Jobcentre Plus even maintains a database of staff languages.

Council departments such as Social Services occasionally produce leaflets in community languages (primarily Urdu, Bengali, Gujarati, Chinese, and Arabic), but officials regard regular translation of printed information as a risky use of resources and complain about low demand. Instead the Council tends to use a generic multilingual reference citing the telephone number of its interpreter facilities. As described above, it appears that the choice of languages is rarely updated. Manchester City Council's standard information letter on local applications for planning permission, for example, featured precisely the same languages in December 2013 as it had in January 2004 – Bengali, Hindi, Gujarati, Panjabi, Somali, and Urdu – in obvious discrepancy both to the overall presence of languages and the documented demand for interpreter services (cf. Table 1).

The most widespread use of multilingual printed information is within the NHS, in the form of information materials that are provided free of charge to local pharmacies. There is limited display of multilingual material in CMFT and even less in other Manchester hospitals, though outpatient departments and many GP surgeries use a standard multilingual interactive screen facility that allows patients to register for their appointments. In 2013, Greater Manchester's NHS translated an online video with instructions on how to access health services into several community languages (Hindi/Urdu, Romanian, Polish, Kurdish, French, Persian, Mandarin, Arabic, Somali, Arabic, and Bengali) (Manchester Teaching Primary Care Trust, 2014). The choice of languages was based on a consultation, including with the authors of the present paper, and so indirectly it drew on available data sets. Local GP surgeries follow a strategy now widespread on NHS websites across the UK

and insert a link to Google Translate, often flagging icons for particularly pertinent languages. The Robert Darbishire Practice, for example, based in Rusholme, one of Manchester's most linguistically diverse neighbourhoods, displays on its website translation icons for Polish, Turkish, Somali, Portuguese, Pashto, and French (The Robert Darbishire Practice, 2014).

We found more consideration of Manchester's changing demographic profile in the provision of multilingual library stock than in any other service. Multilingual stock is ordered in response to requests from the public, reflecting demand and language needs at the time of request. Information on withdrawals and requests of all library materials is used to track consumption. Manchester libraries also report comparing their stock data with census results. While other services repeatedly mention their reliance on the 2011 Census, we have found little evidence that data from the Census are actually used to plan services. There is evidence that individual sectors review their own data sets and use them to plan resources and to take decisions about the balance between in-house staffing and outsourcing of interpreter services (at CMFT and M-Four). Severe reductions in the budgets of local authorities since 2010 have increased dependency on outsourcing (cf. Cadier & Mar-Molinero, 2012). As indicated above, Manchester is in a good position to deliver private interpreter services thanks to its sizeable multilingual, educated population of professionals. At the same time, there is no evidence of attempts by agencies to exchange data sets or to share planning strategies for language provisions, and from this we can conclude that other than a generic mission statement to ensure equality of access to services, Manchester has no coordinated policy on language provisions. In this respect, the pattern is somewhat different to that observed by Cadier & Mar-Molinero (2012): The top-down mission statement is firm but vague on delivery details, while bottom-up efforts are complex and uncoordinated but largely consistent subject to availability of resources.

5. Language promotion: supplementary schools

Multilingual library provisions might be seen as a way of promoting community languages and ensuring their vitality, but from the perspective of local policy, they are a way of ensuring equal access to public services rather than a means of cultivating local languages. This is confirmed by the absence, by and large, of local authority involvement in the teaching of community languages. Supplementary schools are arguably at the forefront of language maintenance efforts. They are community-run institutions offering weekend or evening classes that complement mainstream education, usually with a focus on elements of language, cultural heritage, or religion. Over 50 communities in Manchester operate supplementary schools in some form. We conducted interviews with institutions that teach Chinese, Arabic, Polish, Panjabi, Bengali, Somali, French, Bosnian, Ukrainian, Hindi, Igbo, Persian, and Greek. We are also aware of schools that teach Gujarati, German, Korean, Nepalese, Malay, Russian, and Latvian, amongst others, but as these schools operate without permanent premises or fixed contact details, it has been difficult to obtain interviews and data. According to Manchester City Council estimates, around 8000 pupils attend supplementary schools in Manchester; approximately 5000 of them reside in Manchester, and the rest come from the surrounding area. Some schools integrate religious teaching and offer instruction in various languages for liturgical purposes, including Classical Arabic, Hebrew, and Sanskrit.

The city's supplementary schools receive no public funding. Until 2012, Manchester City Council provided small sums of money towards the running of schools, but this was since withdrawn; the Council instead runs an awards system, which informally

accredits the schools based on their submission of a detailed, written overview of their function and current profile. The Council's Children's Services department, which still has a dedicated team of around five to six people for "International New Arrivals and Supplementary Schools", organises occasional training sessions for supplementary school staff and networking meetings. The schools are funded either by community institutions or, more commonly, through fees paid by parents. Teachers are often volunteers from a range of professional backgrounds. The absence of formal teacher training can potentially impact the quality of teaching and this problem is compounded by a high rate of turnover in staff (cf. Lamb, 2001).

The schools that we interviewed have between one single tutor and 35 staff, anywhere between 25 and 350 pupils or more, and charge fees of between £15 and £175 a year per child. Most secular supplementary schools operate out of mainstream school buildings, which charge rent; this is generally the largest cost borne by the school. As the schools operate outside of normal working hours and do not have a postal address of their own, cooperation with outside agencies can be difficult. This can become particularly relevant when the supplementary schools need to liaise with examining bodies in order to administer GCSE and A-level exams¹. Many supplementary schools prepare pupils for state-recognised GCSE language qualifications, and some also offer A-level qualifications. Some, like the Bosnian and Iranian schools, offer foreign qualifications and send exam scripts to the origin countries for marking.

Accreditation of community language skills has the potential to formally flag the worth of these skills and boost motivation in the learning process, and to enrich students' employment prospects. This is seen in the policy of at least two Chinese schools, which over the past decade have shifted from teaching Cantonese to Mandarin, and in the presence of a French supplementary school that is run by and caters exclusively for a community of African background. The full extent of qualifications awarded by supplementary schools is not recorded, since these schools do not report directly to the local education authority. Through our interviews we were able to establish that at least 200 GCSE-level exams were taken in 2012 through supplementary schools in Arabic, Polish, Cantonese and Mandarin, Panjabi, Hindi, and Greek. There is some overlap with the qualifications awarded by state schools, since some supplementary schools prepare pupils for the exams, which are then administered by state schools. Some 3000 pupils at Manchester state schools sat for GCSE examinations in foreign languages in 2012. The most common languages were French, German, and Spanish. GCSE qualifications in community languages are less common in state schools. Nevertheless, data for 2012 show that 163 GCSE qualifications were awarded in Urdu, 70 in Arabic, 35 in Polish, 29 in Chinese, and 23 in Modern Hebrew.

6. Manchester's linguistic landscapes

Linguistic landscapes are one of the most obvious manifestations of the way that superdiversity transforms the appearance of cities and contributes to an incipient new civic identity. A high density of multilingual signs is found in Manchester's Chinatown (primarily a commercial area that serves the Chinese community) as well as in commercial zones of districts that have a highly diverse population, such as Rusholme, Longsight, Levenshulme, and Cheetham Hill. The most frequently encountered language in public signage outside of Chinatown is Urdu, with Arabic growing in particular in Rusholme. Signage in some languages (e.g. Somali, Sorani Kurdish) is limited to small clusters of just a couple of streets, reflecting the tendency towards high spatial concentration of speakers, while others, like Polish and Lithuanian, are found in retail and service outlets that are scattered throughout the city,

again reflecting settlement patterns. Signs in Chinese brand restaurant outlets across the city but are otherwise found in Chinatown, in a single city-centre Chinese wholesale and retail compound, and on community institutions. Community centres and religious institutions are also the principal location of public signs in Panjabi, Hebrew, Armenian, and Greek. There is occasional but declining presence of Bengali, Hindi, and Gujarati in retail and service advertisement. Polish, Romanian, Lithuanian, and Turkish are often found in advertisements for communication and money transfer services, while Russian and Malay can be observed in outlets that target international students from Central and Southeast Asia, respectively. Event advertisement employs a range of languages including Tamil, Pashto, and many of those mentioned above. Yiddish is a curious case. Greater Manchester² (especially the districts of Salford and Bury) is home to the second-largest Yiddish-speaking community in the UK, and one of the largest in the world. Based on our observations we estimate around 5000 speakers of Yiddish in Greater Manchester, though the 2011 Census records just 476. Literacy in Yiddish is very common and the language is used as both an informal and formal medium of instruction in Orthodox Jewish education from preschool to higher education (Yeshiva) level. Yet despite high geographical concentration it is very difficult to find any public signs in Yiddish outside of the corridors of community institutions, where it can be found on notice boards, memos, and the like.

We conclude our survey of multilingual policies and practice with a brief outline of the typical patterns of multilingual signage found in the city and the way in which they serve to construct and reinforce civic identity. We distinguish broadly between *communicative* language choices, which are motivated by a practical need to convey content and information, and *emblematic* choices, which serve primarily to attract emotional identification. The two are not mutually exclusive, and form, rather, opposite ends of a continuum. Manchester's linguistic landscape is largely devoid of multilingual signage provided by public sector agencies. We are aware of a handful of exceptions: We have found a Council sign in Cheetham Hill that advises on litter disposal in English and Urdu, and one in Longsight that advises "not to feed the pigeons" in English, Hindi, Urdu, and Bengali. In Chorlton, which does not show much multilingual signage, the local library, city council offices, and a public park display official signs in English and Urdu, which were apparently introduced in the 1970s, and a local police station (which was closed in 2011) displayed a notice advising on opening hours in 10 languages (English, Hindi, Somali, Urdu, Bengali, Gujarati, Chinese, Arabic, Vietnamese, Panjabi). Manchester airport, a public and private sector partnership, displays some signs in Urdu alongside multilingual information posters on customs and border controls and the universal multilingual "Welcome" banners. On this basis it seems fair to say that contrary to the typical motivation behind language provisions in the public sector, which is to support access to services and thus communication with service providers, multilingual signs sponsored by public institutions are as much an emblematic gesture of recognition of linguistic diversity. As such they are isolated, modest tokens of acceptance that the city's public spaces reflect its civic rather than strictly national identity.

Representation of a multilingual civic identity is carried primarily by private sector signage, which is usually local in the strictest sense of the term, that is, confined to individual shop and office fronts and community buildings. More widespread or mobile signage is rare. In 2013 we observed occasional advertising on Manchester buses in Chinese as well as in Hindi/Urdu in Roman script. The latter phenomenon, widely present in advertising for events and films, gives an indication of the structural transformation of language repertoires that is facilitated and licensed by the process of multilingual civic identity formation: Roman script is an economical way to address readers of both Hindi and Urdu, who

otherwise use separate scripts, as well as the second and third generations who are familiar with the spoken language but not always with its written form.

Typically, private sector multilingual signage serves, as Blommaert (2013) remarks, as a means of audience selection. However, within this function, too, we can identify the full range from communicative to emblematic uses, as can be illustrated by the following examples. Audience selection for strictly communicative purposes is found in improvised handwritten product labels and notices on opening hours. These are often monolingual (most commonly Chinese, Urdu, Arabic, or Polish) or accompanied by English. Audience selection flagging spatial demarcation is not common. Manchester's Chinatown contains dense signage in Chinese, including company labels and permanent product and services information as well as improvised, temporary, and handwritten notices, but is probably the only example of such linguistic demarcation of extensive space. Arguably, the Council's efforts from the 1970s to acknowledge Urdu in Chorlton can be seen as an attempt to promote an inclusive public space. Other demarcations are limited to clusters of neighbouring shops that display language consistency in signage, which can be found on some streets for Somali, Urdu, Arabic, and Kurdish, or to just individual retail spaces, as in the case of a supermarket that advertises "Customer parking at rear" in English and Arabic.

We consider as communicative also those signs that aim at audience selection for the purpose of marketing of audience-specific services. These attract the attention of intended audiences, but they do so by conveying relevant information: Satellite dishes that specialise in Middle Eastern channels carry promotion labelling in Arabic, a restaurant in Rusholme carries the outlet name and information on opening hours and menu in English but advertises the availability of a "family room" (referring to a mixed-gender customer facility) only in Somali and Arabic. A travel agent displays the company name and contact details in English but lists the actual services only in Sorani Kurdish and Arabic, and a fast food outlet advertises "free drinks for Uzbeks and Kazakhs" in Russian, targeting Central Asian international students. An example of multilingual marketing for the purpose of audience inclusion rather than selection is a city-centre-based taxi training school advertising its services in Rusholme with posters carrying texts of 20–30 words in English, Arabic, Urdu, Somali, and Persian, confirming bottom-up awareness of the spatial clustering observed in our data sets (see [Tables 2](#) and [3](#)).

In other cases, marketing through both audience inclusion and selection can serve primarily emblematic functions: In Rusholme, a Somali-owned café displays a "Welcome" sign in English, Somali, Arabic, and Persian (once again showing awareness of the spatial correlation); a Pakistani-owned sweets outlet displays an advert in English for "Kulfi, ice cream and faluda" while also including just the word "Kulfi" in Urdu, in Persian-Arabic script, to attract attention of Asian and Middle Eastern audiences; and a poster advertising the services of a removals and transport company lists services and prices in a text in English containing over 120 words, including the statement "Competitive prices for students", while also including in Arabic just the company name "Express cargo" (aš-šahñ as-sarīf) and the statement "competitive prices".

7. Conclusion

In its formulated policy, Manchester embraces superdiversity by branding itself as multicultural and by flagging a direct link between this civic identity and the city's prospects for economic growth and prosperity. This narrative is translated into practice in two ways: The city's message outwards is that those wishing to tie their own prospects with

Manchester can find a home in which their cultural traditions thrive. Inwards, policy is put into practice through the commitment to ensure equal access to public services. This is reflected through allocation of resources for interpreting, translation, and in some cases mediation and outreach (e.g. in the form of networking with supplementary schools), as well as by some monitoring of language needs. The process is not centrally coordinated, however. Unlike New York, San Francisco, or Melbourne, local government does not grant explicit recognition to a specified set of languages. Instead, language provisions are local, institution-based, responsive, and often outsourced, and the decision-making processes behind them are de-centralised and pragmatic. Although the policy narrative places value on language skills as a workforce resource that is vital to economic growth, no noticeable effort is made to cultivate such skills. The promotion of community languages is a community-based initiative, and the public visibility of languages relies almost entirely on the private sector. Nonetheless, it is precisely this visibility from which Manchester derives its brand. We therefore see a perfect illustration of the way in which global orientation (cf. Sassen, 2005) relies on the presence of a second generation of immigrants (cf. Glick Schiller, 2010): The sum of bottom-up, organic activities and the license that they receive from the city's mission statement to ensure equality renders a civic identity badge that is distinct, and not derived from, national policy. This is evidence that the globalised, superdiverse city is moving towards a post-national process of civic identity formation as a response to ethnic and linguistic diversity and the need to position itself as a development space in a global economy. As Blommaert (2013) remarks, this calls for a research method that takes into account the complex and dynamic nature of community relations. Above we demonstrated how such a method can draw on a variety of data sets and observations to profile urban multilingualism.

The Manchester example poses new challenges to theorising language policy and language planning. Baldauf (2006) describes a shift in the power of agencies and the emergence of "micro language planning" that does not necessarily follow the national-level planning and policy routine of status and corpus regulation, education and prestige support. The Manchester case study illustrates what Baldauf identifies as a "cultivation approach" rather than a "policy approach": it consists of local government networking with a patchwork of "micro-level" planning or decision-making processes at the level of individual, local institutions. Thus, small retail businesses decide on the choice of language in marketing (signs and sector and product labelling); larger businesses and corporations take decisions on the choice of language in customer care and so also in relation to staff recruitment; for individual schools, language may be a consideration in staff recruitment to support pupils of various backgrounds; public service providers take decisions on the choice of language in leaflets, for interpreting provisions, and in some (though rare) cases in staff recruitment; libraries take decisions on allocation of resources for new acquisitions; and so on. In this process, as Baldauf (2006) describes, practice outranks policy. Consequently, the focus of language planning analysis must shift to the role of agency. In this perspective, families who make arrangements for their children to have exposure to a heritage language through satellite television subscription, home reading, visits abroad, or even by consistently speaking a language in the home, and community institutions that obtain and manage resources in order to operate supplementary schools, are all agents whose role in the process of language planning has a greater impact than that of top-down policy.

The focus on agency reveals implications for governance and informal networks of participation in the process of language planning. Globalisation and urban superdiversity trigger a proliferation of agents, as well as of languages and communities. This leads to

a shift in agency structures. In Chua and Baldauf's (2011) "translation" model of macro- and micro-level planning, macro-planning aims to achieve a standard, while the micro-setting is characterised by diversified results. Unlike some of the settings outlined in Chua & Baldauf's typology, however, we find no indication in Manchester either of a shift away from a macro-level policy, or of a step from micro-planning towards the macro-level. Rather, we find a kind of wholesale embracing of local (micro) decision-making at macro-level, akin to the pathway identified by Liddicoat and Baldauf (2008). As we described, local government involvement in language planning is either tokenistic or de-centralised, allowing individual branches and departments to act as independent agents. Superdiversity and the need to manage continuous change in population structure thus appear to encourage a governance strategy that is, in terms of ensuring equality and participation, responsive rather than proactive: It cultivates, and relies on, bottom-up, local, and de-centralised initiatives. Unlike top-down macro-level language policy in regions such as Wales or countries like Canada, which actively seek to promote bilingualism, civic diversity policy avoids challenging the stability of practices among the monolingual majority, while still encouraging minority communities to maintain and develop their multilingual practices. In this way, language repertoires are acknowledged as the property of individuals and the informal networks that they form, rather than of institutions or states (cf. Matras, 2008, 2009, Chap. 3). As local government delegates many of the language provisions that serve to ensure equal access and support development, it becomes an intermediary rather than the directly enabling agent in the process of managing diversity.

As a final remark, we argue that the absence of an explicit effort to bridge macro-policy at the state or national level, with the management of micro-level planning at local level, opens two gaps. First, the lack of a holistic picture of language needs and language resources makes it difficult for individual local agents to plan provisions. This means that activities remain responsive and "planning" is often limited to the short-term allocation of resources but is often devoid of actual strategic considerations that are negotiated in an institutional context. This gives a new interpretation to the very notion of "language planning". Second, in the absence of an explicitly formulated macro-level policy in favour of superdiversity, we find a prevalence of what we might term a "monolingual mindset" (cf. Donakey, 2007) in the formalisation of data collection procedures, which in turn serve to inform policy. This is best represented in the framing of questions on the annual School Census and the 2011 population Census on "first language" and "main language", respectively, which fail to take into account the dynamism of plurilingual practices (i.e. the fact that an individual can show alternating preferences for different languages in a variety of settings and contexts). The challenge for the practical translation of micro-level planning into macro-level policy (in the terms suggested by Chua & Baldauf, 2011) therefore seems to be the ability of state-level agents to embrace a model of plurilingual practices and to incorporate it into the procedures for strategic planning, including data collection and assessment.

Acknowledgements

We are grateful to Deepthi Gopal for assistance in the quantitative assessment of some of the data considered in this paper (notably the calculations presented in Tables 2–4). The present paper also benefited from contributions from Philippa Hughes, Marie Wright, Laura Percival, and Deepthi Gopal as well as from students enrolled in the module Societal Multilingualism in the Linguistics and English Language programme at the University of Manchester (2010–2013).

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the authors.

Funding

We gratefully acknowledge funding support from the ESRC (Economic and Social Research Council) Impact Acceleration Accounts programme; the British Academy; the University of Manchester's Humanities Strategic Investment Fund; and Cities@manchester.

Notes

1. "General Certificate of Secondary Education", taken by students aged 14–16 in secondary schools in England, Wales, and Northern Ireland, and "GCE Advanced Level", a school-leaving qualification.
2. Greater Manchester, with a total population of around 2.6 million, includes 10 metropolitan districts, one of which is the city of Manchester, which is the principal subject of this paper.

Notes on Contributors

Yaron Matras is Professor of Linguistics at the University of Manchester. He has published widely on language contact, including studies on convergence and linguistic areas, codeswitching, and mixed languages, and has worked in a variety of areas including typology, dialectology, and language policy, with a focus on Romani, Kurdish, Domari, and German dialects. He leads the Multilingual Manchester project, which integrates research with community and policy engagement.

Alex Robertson is Research Assistant for Multilingual Manchester, based in the School of Arts, Languages and Cultures at the University of Manchester. She has co-ordinated data collection and co-authored a pilot study on the home languages of schoolchildren in Manchester.

References

- Aronin, L., & Singleton, D. (2008). Multilingualism as a new linguistic dispensation. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 5(1), 1–16.
- Baldauf, R. B. (2006). Rearticulating the case for micro language planning in a language ecology context. *Current Issues in Language Planning*, 7(2&3), 147–170.
- Barni, M., & Extra, G. (Eds.). (2008). *Mapping linguistic diversity in multilingual contexts*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Blackledge, A., & Creese, A. (2010). *Multilingualism: A critical perspective*. London: Continuum.
- Blommaert, J. (2010). *The sociolinguistics of globalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Blommaert, J. (2013). *Ethnography, superdiversity and linguistic landscapes: Chronicles of complexity*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Blommaert, J., & Rampton, B. (2011). Language and superdiversity. *Diversities*, 13(2), 1–22.
- Bowcott, O., & Midlane, T. (2012). Interpreters stay away from courts in protest at privatised contract. *The Guardian*. Retrieved July 15, 2014, from <http://www.theguardian.com/law/2012/mar/02/interpreters-courts-protest-privatised-contract>
- Cadier, L., & Mar-Molinero, C. (2012). Language policies and linguistic super-diversity in contemporary urban societies: The case of the City of Southampton, UK. *Current Issues in Language Planning*, 13(3), 149–165.
- Census 2011 – second release: Economic activity. Key messages*. (2013). *New Economy*. Retrieved July 16, 2014, from <http://neweconomymanchester.com/stories/1739>
- Chua, C. S. K., & Baldauf, R. B. (2011). Micro language planning. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning* (Vol. 2, pp. 936–951). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Clyne, M., & Kipp, S. (2006). Australia's community languages. *International Journal for the Sociology of Language*, 180, 7–21.

- Dicken, P. (2002). Global Manchester: From globaliser to globalised. In J. Peck & K. Ward (Eds.), *City of revolution: Restructuring Manchester* (pp. 18–33). Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Donakey, A. (2007). *Language planning and policy in Manchester* (Master of Arts dissertation). Manchester: University of Manchester. Retrieved from http://languagecontact.humanities.manchester.ac.uk/McrLC/casestudies/AD/AD_Dissertation.pdf
- Duarte, J., & Gogolin, I. (2013). *Linguistic superdiversity in urban areas: Research approaches*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Edwards, V. (2001). Community languages in the United Kingdom. In G. Extra & D. Gorter (Eds.), *The other languages of Europe* (pp. 243–250). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Extra, G., & Vallen, T. (1997). Migration and multilingualism in Western Europe: A case study of the Netherlands. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 17, 151–169.
- Extra, G., & Yağmur, K. (2005). Sociolinguistic perspectives on emerging multilingualism in urban Europe. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 175/176, 17–40.
- Extra, G., & Yağmur, K. (2011). Urban multilingualism in Europe: Mapping linguistic diversity in multicultural cities. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 43(5), 1173–1184.
- Gándara, P., & Rumberger, R. W. (2009). Immigration, language, and education: How does language policy structure opportunity? *Teachers College Record*, 111(3), 750–782.
- García, O., & Fishman, J. A. (1997). *The multilingual apple. Languages in New York City*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- García, O., & Wei, L. (2014). *Translanguaging. Language, bilingualism and education*. Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Glick Schiller, N. (2010). Cities and transnationality. In G. Bridge & S. Watson (Eds.), *The new Blackwell companion to the City* (pp. 172–192). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Gopal, D., & Matras, Y. (2013a). *What languages are spoken in England and Wales?* Retrieved September 1, 2014, from <http://www.ethnicity.ac.uk/medialibrary/briefingsupdated/what-languages-are-spoken-in-england-and-wales.pdf>
- Gopal, D., & Matras, Y. (2013b). *Who can and cannot speak English?* Retrieved September 1, 2014, from <http://www.ethnicity.ac.uk/medialibrary/briefings/dynamicsofdiversity/who-can-and-cannot-speak-english.pdf>
- Heller, M. (2011). *Paths to post-nationalism. A critical ethnography of language and identity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- House of Commons, Justice Committee. (2013). *Interpretation and translation services and the Applied Language Solutions contract: Sixth Report of Session 2012–2013 (Vol. I)*. Retrieved September 1, 2014, from <http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm201213/cmselect/cmjust/645/645.pdf>
- Kraus, P. A. (2011). The multilingual city: The cases of Helsinki and Barcelona. *Nordic Journal of Migration Research*, 1(1), 25–36.
- Lamb, T. (2001). Language policy in multilingual UK. *Language Learning Journal*, 23, 4–12.
- Leimgruber, J. R. E. (2013). The management of multilingualism in a city-state: Language policy in Singapore. In P. Siemund, I. Gogolin, M. Schulz, & J. Davydova (Eds.), *Multilingualism and language contact in urban areas: Acquisition, development, teaching, communication* (pp. 229–258). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Liddicoat, A. J., & Baldauf, R. B. (2008). Language planning in local contexts: Agents, contexts and interactions. In A. J. Liddicoat & R. B. Baldauf (Eds.), *Language planning in local contexts* (pp. 3–17). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Lo Bianco, J. (2003). *A site for debate, negotiation and contest of national identity: Language policy in Australia*. Strasbourg: Language Policy Division, Council of Europe.
- Mac Giolla Christod, D. (2007). *Language and the city*. Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Manchester City Council. (2013). *Manchester's State of the City report*. Retrieved July 16, 2014, from http://www.manchesterpartnership.org.uk/manchesterpartnership/downloads/file/190/state_of_the_city_report_2012-13
- Manchester City Council. (2014). *The State of the City report: Communities of interest 2014*. Retrieved July 16, 2014, from http://www.manchesterpartnership.org.uk/manchesterpartnership/downloads/file/303/communities_of_interest_2014
- Manchester Teaching Primary Care Trust. (2014). *How to register with a GP*. Retrieved August 25, 2014, from <http://www.choosewellmanchester.org.uk/in-your-area/how-to-register-with-a-gp/>

- Matras, Y. (2008). *Defining everyday multilingualism*. Conference report 'Everyday Multilingualism' (pp. 69–76). Vienna: Austrian Commission for UNESCO.
- Matras, Y. (2009). *Language contact*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Maurais, J., & Morris, M. A. (Eds.). (2003). *Languages in a globalising world*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- MIDAS. (2014a). *Workforce: Diversity*. Retrieved July 16, 2014, from <http://www.investinmanchester.com/why-manchester/workforce/>
- MIDAS. (2014b). *Invest in Manchester: Economic overview*. Retrieved August 17, 2014, from <http://www.investinmanchester.com/why-manchester/economic-overview/>
- Monaghan, A. (2013). China to invest millions in Manchester airport development. *The Guardian*. Retrieved August 18, 2014, from <http://www.theguardian.com/business/2013/oct/14/china-invest-manchester-airport-city>
- Morse, A. (2003). *Language access: Helping non-English speakers navigate health and human services*. Denver, CO: National Conference of State Legislatures.
- Puskás, T. (2012). Managing immigrant multilingualism in Swedish compulsory schools (Working Paper No. 9). Helsinki: RECODE.
- The Robert Darbishire Practice. (2014). Retrieved August 25, 2014, from <http://www.rdp.org.uk/>
- Robertson, A., Gopal, D., Wright, M., Matras, Y., & Jones, C. (2013). *Mapping community languages skills: The school language survey in Manchester*. Retrieved September 1, 2014, from <http://mlm.humanities.manchester.ac.uk>
- Rosén, J., & Bagga-Gupta, S. (2013). Shifting identity positions in the development of language education for immigrants: An analysis of discourses associated with 'Swedish for immigrants'. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, 26(1), 68–88.
- Salverda, R. (2002). Multilingualism in Metropolitan London. *English Today*, 18(1), 17–24.
- Sassen, S. (2005). The global city: Introducing a concept. *Brown Journal of World Affairs*, 11(2), 27–43.
- Simpson, S. (1997). Demography and ethnicity: Case studies from Bradford. *New Community*, 23, 89–107.
- University of Manchester. (2014a). *Facts and figures 2014*. Retrieved July 17, 2014, from <http://documents.manchester.ac.uk/display.aspx?DocID=19310>
- University of Manchester. (2014b). *Multicultural Manchester*. Retrieved July 18, 2014, from <http://www.manchester.ac.uk/study/international/why-manchester/multicultural/>
- Vertovec, S. (2007). Super-diversity and its implications. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 30(6), 1024–1054.