Minority Language Policy and Planning in the Micro Context of the City: The Case of Manchester

Mohamed Fathi Ahmed Othman[1a]

Abstract

This paper investigates service provisions in community languages offered by Manchester City Council and agencies working alongside to find out whether there is an explicit language policy in Manchester, how such a policy is formulated, how it functions, and how it is reflected in education. Data was collected through interviews with different personnel in MCC, focus group discussions with community language speakers, and the websites of various government agencies. The results show that there is an implicit rather than explicit language policy in Manchester. There exists also a language hierarchy in Manchester's language policy whereby some community languages are given precedence over others, depending on the numerical strength of speakers. The results also show that there is usually a sort of articulation between the micro and macro-levels of language policy in multilingual contexts, which is evident in Manchester, particularly in the role that supplementary schools play in filling the gap in teaching community languages in mainstream schools.

[1] Assistant Professor, Email: mohamedfathiahmed@yahoo.co.uk
  Tel: +974-77884437
[a] Community College of Qatar, Qatar

1. Introduction

The language policy in immigrant and multilingual settings represents, to a large extent, the attitudes of the majority towards the minority groups and languages (Fishman, 1985, 1991). In such contexts, language policies and practices serve two functions that can be placed on a continuum. On the one end, there is the communicative function (i.e., the practical need of service providers to covey information in order to ensure equal access to services). On the other end of the continuum comes the emblematic function which assigns policies an emotional aspect (i.e., as a sign of authorities' recognition of linguistic diversity) (Matras & Robertson, 2015). In reality, the latter function is usually a by-product of the former. That is, the main concern of local authorities in multilingual contexts is usually the communicative function. As will be shown in this study, Manchester, Britain is not an exception in this regard. The study investigates how language policy and planning (LPP) in Manchester responds to the linguistic diversity characterizing this multilingual city; this is done through in-depth investigation of service provisions in community languages offered by Manchester City Council (MCC) and agencies working alongside council services (e.g., NHS, courts, police, schools, etc.). Different studies examined LPP in other multilingual contexts worldwide, including the USA (e.g., Morse, 2003), Singapore (e.g., Leimgruber, 2013), and Europe (e.g., Extra & Yağmur, 2004). In Manchester, as well, a few studies were conducted (e.g., Donakey, 2007; Matras & Robertson, 2015). The question now is: what is exactly meant by LPP? This will be discussed below.

2. Theoretical Framework

Some portray LPP as the laws, regulations, and practices that are deliberately made by authoritative bodies like governments about languages and their use in society (Djite, 1994; Kaplan & Baldauf, 1997). It is generally through this LPP that decisions are made in multilingual cities regarding the use of monolingual or multilingual discourse strategies within public institutions (Wolff, 2010). But, two points should be clarified here.

First, not all language policies are deliberately planned or intentional (Johnson, 2013). Thus, a distinction is made between overt and covert language policies. Overt policies are those that are explicit, formalized and manifest whereas covert policies are those that are implicit, informal and grassroots (Schiffman, 1996; Shohamy, 2006). Different types of LPP, whether overt or covert, can be identified: status planning (about the uses of language in society; see e.g., Donakey, 2007), acquisition planning (about language in education and the learning of languages; see, e.g., Baldauf & Kaplan, 2005), corpus planning (about how people speak and write their language; see e.g., Liddicoat, 2005), and prestige planning (about image and social esteem of language; see e.g., Grzech, 2013).

Second, language policies are not always enacted by governments; they can emerge from the bottom-up movement (Johnson, 2013). Thus, a distinction is made between macro-level (top-down) and micro-level (bottom-up) language policies. In other words, maintaining equal access to services in multilingual contexts is not always an easy task for authorities because the political and legal changes in immigrant contexts sometimes lead to a change in the immigrants' demography (e.g., their numbers, places of concentration, etc.). This produces a constantly changing pattern of demand for languages (Blommaert & Rampton, 2011; Vertovec, 2007). It leads to a situation in which top-down policy may be insufficient or unable to meet the different fluctuating language needs and, as a result, the emergence of new bottom-up agents, at the level of individuals and community organizations, that play important roles in what is referred to as micro-language policy and planning (Baldauf, 2006).

Traditionally, however, the macro-level of LPP has predominantly been the focus of academic research which focused on large-scale, national-level government activity and often considered it the focal 'agency' operating in LPP (Ager, 2001). In such a context the local issues or the micro-levels of language planning have been marginalized (Baldauf, 2006; Baldauf & Kaplan, 2003; Liddicoat & Baldauf, 2008; Shouhui & Baldauf, 2012). Recent scholars realized that LPP can result from practices that were not

explicitly planned; it is sometimes implicit, as aforementioned (Eggington, 2002; Schiffman, 1996; Shohamy, 2006). To understand such a policy, it is important to look at the practices and agencies that go with it. Hence, recent research has taken a more critical edge reconsidering the concept of 'agency' and showing that language planning takes place at different levels, including the micro-level (Kaplan & Baldauf, 1997). Thus, studies revealed that some planning actions occur at the local level (e.g., Baldauf, 2006; Mac Giolla Chríost, 2006; Picanço, 2012), which acts either in complementary distribution with macro-level planning or as an independent activity. In this respect, Liddicoat and Taylor-leech (2014) indicate that among the contexts of language planning practices in which local bottom-up (micro-level) agents work are the local implementation of macro-level policy and addressing local needs in the absence of macro-level policy (see also Breen, 2002; Hatoss, 2006; Ricento, 2000).

The present case study investigates LPP in the micro context of the city of Manchester. More specifically, it examines service provisions in community languages offered by Manchester City Council and agencies working alongside council services (e.g., NHS, courts, police, schools, etc.) to answer the following research questions:

1. Is there is an explicit language policy in Manchester?
2. How is such a policy formulated?
3. Is there a language hierarchy in the implementation of Manchester's language policy?
4. How does the educational language policy in Manchester function?

The study utilizes a three-angle approach to investigate LPP in Manchester, as will be shown below. The first angle is the policy maker; that is, who takes the decisions regarding providing services in minority languages, to determine how such decisions are made and to know what criteria are used. As for the second angle, it represents the service provider (i.e., the various departments of MCC, courts, police, etc.), in order to obtain data on the actual provisions of services. The third angle is the service user (i.e., community language speakers in Manchester), to see their views regarding the services provided for them. This completes the circle of the community-language provision in the city.

3. Methodology

3.1. Participants and Setting

There are two types of participants in this study: interview participants and focus group ones. The interview participants (sixteen participants) included the policy makers (i.e., MCC's deputy-leader and two Councilors from MCC), as well as the service providers in MCC (i.e., two Linkworkers, the manager of M-Four Translation, the head of Library Service, the head and a staff member of the International New Arrivals, Travellers and Supplementary Schools Team). The interview participants included also two mainstream-schools' headteachers, as well as three principals and two teachers in five Arabic supplementary schools.

The focus group participants (service users) were twelve individuals. They were chosen from the researcher's community- the Arabic community, and all of them were from the researcher's direct acquaintances. They had varying educational levels: two PhDs, four BAs, and six high-school diplomas and lower degrees. They also had different lengths of stay in Manchester: three of them had been in Manchester for ten years, four for six years, and five for three years.

3.2. Instrumentation

3.2.1. Semi-Structured Interviews

A total of sixteen semi-structured interviews were carried out with the above-mentioned participants (nine in MCC, two in mainstream schools, and five in supplementary schools). That is, the researcher interviewed MCC's deputy-leader and two Councilors (see appendix for sample questions) in order to get information about how decisions regarding minority language provisions are taken (i.e., the policy making as mentioned above). The researcher also interviewed two Linkworkers, M-Four Translation's manager and Library Service's head (i.e., the service providers) to gain insights into the status-quo of ethnic languages in the services that the council provides (see appendix). There were also interviews with the head and one of the staff of

the International New Arrivals, Travellers and Supplementary Schools Team (Henceforth INATSS) which were aimed at eliciting information regarding the educational support they provide for new arrival children and the teaching of community languages in mainstream education and in supplementary schools.

In addition, interviews were made with the headteachers in two mainstream schools to elicit, for instance, whether schools offer community languages as subjects, and whether such language learning is compulsory or optional. The researcher also interviewed three principals and two teachers in five Arabic supplementary-schools to elicit information regarding issues such as whether their schools are registered in MCC, whether the Council requires them to use specific curricula, and whether they receive subsidiaries or support from the Council. The researcher used to work as a teacher in three of these schools.

3.2.2. Focus groups

As explained above, being a member of one of the immigrant communities in Manchester (the Arabic community), the researcher managed to carry out recorded focus group discussions with community leaders and members of his own community (i.e., service users) on the provisions of community languages in the services of MCC, NHS, courts, police, and other government agencies (see appendix for sample questions). The total number of these focus groups was four. Each focus group consisted of three participants with varying characteristics, as aforementioned.

3.2.3. Online sources

The interviews and focus groups were the primary instruments in this study. However, some use of a number of online sources was made, as well (e.g., Equality and Human Rights Commission, 2014; Home Office, 2005; UK Public General Acts, 2000; Council of Europe, 1950). These provide useful information on the services available for community language speakers in Manchester. They also contain documents explaining the rights of ethnic minorities with regard to the use of their native languages in government institutions (e.g., courts, police, etc.).

3.3. Procedure

The study was informed by the qualitative research paradigm; therefore, it was decided to have different verifications of the findings. This process is referred to as triangulation (Stake, 2006; Yin, 1994). Thus, different techniques were utilized to collect the data, as illustrated above: semi-structured interviews, focus group discussions, and online sources. The questions used in the interviews and focus groups were designed by the researcher to precisely address the study's research questions and cover the above-mentioned three angles. Also, these questions had many shared items to further raise the credibility of the participants' reports (see Yin, 1994).

All interviews and focus group discussions were recorded using an audio recorder. Each interview lasted between twenty and twenty-five minutes and was conducted in the workplace of the interviewees. Each focus group lasted between thirty and forty minutes, and they were carried out at different places (e.g., participants' homes, workplaces, etc.). The focus groups and the Arabic schools' interviews were administered in Arabic, the native language of the participants.

4. Results

The data show that different services are provided in community languages in Manchester:

4.1. Linkworker Service

MCC has what is called Manchester Advice whose primary job is to provide advice to people living in Manchester. Manchester Advice has different teams, and one of them is the 'Linkworkers' team that consists of bilingual employees employed for the purpose of providing advice for speakers of community languages; it is the 'First Tier' of advice for ethnic minorities within the council. Link workers service tries to cover all the primary community languages in Manchester, such as the Asian languages, Somali, and Arabic. Speakers of community languages with no Linkworkers speaking them are dealt with in the Advice Centre at the Town Hall, where interpreters are provided for them.

In an interview with one of the Link workers, she said that they provide different kinds of advice (on housing, education, health, etc.) in different languages. People know about the Linkworkers services through letters/leaflets sent to them from the council containing information translated into the different community languages about how to access the service, for example, 'to receive advice in (language X) or to get help from the council, please call the Linkworkers service on (the phone number of the Linkworker of the relevant language)'. Also, government departments and public services have the phone numbers of the Link workers.

Link workers collect customers' feedback using a form that is handed out to customers whenever they finish a piece of work with them. This form is then sent to the service performance team who collate this information and advise the Linkworkers accordingly. The feedback is then taken into consideration during regular service planning meetings with the Linkworkers and it influences their plans. Moreover, as a service within the council, the Linkworkers inform the council about issues within their target communities and how these can best be addressed.

4.2. M-Four Translation

M-Four translation is a part of MCC whose main function is providing translation and interpretation services in the different languages to other agencies and departments (e.g., courts, NHS, solicitors, etc.). That is, it sells its services to such agencies which pay the fees to MCC. For example, if an immigrant has a problem in a hospital or a court, M-Four is contacted to get an interpreter; the request can be for a male or a female interpreter. M-Four also translates leaflets, booklets, and flyers in the different languages for MCC and other agencies. M-four is responsible as well for giving training to the free-lance translators who work with it upon request. It also gives training for MCC's staff to raise their awareness of the linguistic and cultural diversity that characterizes Manchester (interview with the M-Four manager). During this training, MCC's staff get the necessary cultural and linguistic knowledge that enables them to do their job efficiently. As an example of this cultural knowledge that is given to those

staff who deal with Muslim communities, in general, is: 'when entering a mosque, take your shoes off.'

According to its deputy manager, M-Four covers a broad range of known languages. The demand is the main criterion employed by M-four to decide which languages they provide services in. For example, in 1992, when M-four was founded, there was a need for 5 languages only (all of them were Asian languages), but circumstances changed and Somalis, Albanians, and Bosnians started to come to the UK; then since 2000 Iraqis and Afghanis started to arrive as well. With the expansion of the EU, speakers from Western Europe started to move to the UK (e.g., Romania, Czech, and Poland). Now after Brexit, other changes in language provision are expected. Thus, M-four keeps adapting to newcomers. The demand determines, as well, the employment of full or part-time translators and interpreters. For example, for a language like Arabic M-Four has one full-time translator residing in office, in addition to more than 10 free-lance Arabic translators and interpreters (males and females) who work upon request. There are more than this for other languages such as Urdu or Somali due to their larger numbers.

4.3. Library Service

The Library Services Department (or the Central Library) of MCC is the headquarters of all libraries. In an interview with the Access to Services Coordinator (ASC), she stated that the main aim of the libraries is to provide materials (e.g., books, audios, DVDs, etc.) to everyone in Manchester in his/her language, "including minority language speakers since one of the main groups is people whose mother tongue is not English."

The Library Services Department has a Community Access Team that consists of a number of coordinators (e.g., Vietnamese, Chinese, etc.). The coordinators ensure that there are materials in the relevant community language that each one is responsible for. Community languages that are not assigned a coordinator are the responsibility of the ASC. For example, after the interview with her, the ASC invited the researcher to help in choosing Arabic books since she was responsible for the

provisions of Arabic materials. The researcher participated, with other Arabs, in choosing these books. The participants went through a list of book titles from an Arabic Bookshop and decided what should be purchased.

MCC provides an annual budget for community language materials. Urdu and Chinese get the largest budget since their communities are very large. There is also an annual budget to spend on updating the Farsi and Arabic materials, and smaller amounts for other languages. Thus, the provisions of community language materials depend on the size of every individual community.

4.4. Education

Provisions of community languages in education will be explored in the International New Arrivals, Travellers, and Supplementary Schools Team (INATSS), mainstream schools, and supplementary schools.

4.4.1. INATSS

INATSS was established in 2008 as part of a new structure at MCC after the former Diversity and Inclusion Team was disbanded. It was designed to provide educational language support services for new arrival children in Manchester, to assess their language support requirements for successful inclusion into mainstream education, to oversee and promote additional non-mainstream educational provisions such as Supplementary Schools, and to provide support for children with special educational needs.

The core team providing this service consists of five Education Development Officers responsible for the different districts of Manchester, in addition to a team of full-time Language Assistants who speak different languages (e.g., Somali, Farsi, French, Arabic, and Urdu). These Language Assistants are recruited through the local authority (MCC), in consultation with the Educational Development Team. The Traded Services unit at MCC provides additional language support staff for INATSS that cover for those languages not spoken by its full-time language assistants.

The service provided by INATSS is aimed at providing support for children who speak a foreign language as their primary language, such as children from refugee families, and families seeking asylum in the UK. It focusses on the attainment and attendance of a child in the classroom and providing English language acquisition support to speed up his/her integration into the education system. As English is the main language of education in the UK, INATSS concentrates on preventing a child's lack of proficiency in English language becoming a barrier, but it also aims to actively promote bilingualism for the child wherever possible. This is done either through bilingual support in the classroom if suitable staff can be provided, or by providing more generic English acquisition support for a school if it is required.

INATSS support begins with deciding the required language for the child; then the child is supported through an induction period. During this period, Language Assistants work closely with teachers and classroom assistants to ensure that the child is able to follow and understand subjects and to participate as far as possible. As the child progresses both in language acquisition and school integration, this intensive support is usually phased out when the school decides it is no longer needed and replaced with more generic support, although the child is entitled by law to have intensive support throughout his/her education if necessary. Home-School liaison is also carried out by the Language Assistants to discuss homework and attendance requirements with the family.

4.4.2. Mainstream Schools

According to the Education Development Officer of the Central East District in INATSS, there are approximately 160 languages spoken in Manchester's mainstream schools. In some schools, the number of non-English students exceeds the number of English students, as emphasized by the headteachers.

Exam Boards, such as AQA (Assessment and Qualifications Alliance) and Edexcel, provide a wide range of examinations in both GCSEs and A-Levels, which cover many community languages (Urdu, Arabic, Punjabi, etc.) and modern foreign languages (French, Spanish, German, etc.). For children aged 7-11 (Key Stage 2) and 11-14 (Key Stage 3), the National Curriculum stipulates that tuition in modern foreign languages is compulsory (Long,

Danechi & Loft, 2020). Community language speakers can similarly be entered for GCSE or A-Level courses and examinations in their languages, but this is dependent on whether the teaching staff at the school can provide tuition in such languages. Within the Manchester area Urdu, Arabic, and other community languages are offered in GCSE and A-Level in a number of schools (e.g., Levenshulme High School, Manchester Academy, etc.), but given the vast linguistic diversity present at some Manchester schools, it would prove impractical and costly to provide optional language tuition in all languages (interview in INATSS). If a school can offer a community language as an option to its pupils, then the school is responsible for all costs associated with sitting an exam in the language. But if the language is studied at a supplementary school, then the child's parents are responsible for the subsequent costs of the examination.

4.4.3. Supplementary Schools

According to INATSS, within the remit of MCC, there are currently over 100 supplementary schools representing over 50 communities in Manchester. Most of them are registered with the council but may not all be necessarily active. However, as emphasized by the headteachers, the council has no legal control over the schools' services, and schools are not legally required to register in it. The council monitors and carries out regular visits to 65 of these schools, representing around 8000 pupils under the supervision of some 500 volunteer staff (INATSS). It also carries out quality assurance of supplementary schools and provides some limited training for the staff in areas such as classroom management, teaching, and learning. However, supplementary schools receive no public funding; they mainly depend on the fees paid by students.

Supplementary schools teach ethnic culture, religion, and different community languages including Chinese, Polish, Somali, Persian, and Arabic. The Arabic-speaking community, for example, runs a number of council-registered schools that provide Arabic language support, including Al-Manar school (in Burnage), Al-Hijra school (in Whalley Range), Al-Noor School (in Burnage), Saudi school (in Chorlton), and two Libyan schools

(one in Cheetham Hill, and one in Crumpsall). Both of the Libyan schools teach the Libyan curricula taught in schools in Libya, but one of them is sponsored by the Libyan government and is open to students for free; the other is private and requires fees. The Saudi School teaches the Saudi curricula and is sponsored by the Saudi government, but requires fees from students. Al-Noor School, Al-Hijra School, and Al-Manar school teach curricula from the Arab world (e.g., Jordan). These schools also teach GCSE and A-Level in Arabic. Teachers are employed from the Arabic-speaking community in Manchester; therefore, as a member of this community, the researcher had the chance to work in three of these schools. Similarly, in other supplementary schools, the teachers are often volunteers recruited from the relevant community and sometimes receive small amounts of money in return for their teaching. Therefore, there is generally a shortage of qualified teachers and a high percentage of turnover among them, which can affect the quality of teaching in such schools (Lamb, 2001).

4.5. The National Health Service Manchester Primary Care Trust (NHS PCT)

Community language speakers can receive assistance for medical care in their native language through interpreters (males and females) who are provided free of charge in hospitals and health centers. Services of those interpreters are obtained through different bodies, such as MCC's M-Four Translation Department, and free-lance interpreters. In some hospitals (e.g., the Central Manchester University Hospitals), there is a translation and interpretation department (also called link workers department), which provides interpreters for the hospitals. Moreover, the publications in hospitals and health centers in Manchester usually contain a question translated into different community languages, which asks whether a patient has difficulty speaking or understanding English. Under this question, a telephone number is provided so that a patient can call to receive help in his/her native language. This was confirmed by community leaders during focus group discussions. Also, the GP surgeries and NHS websites insert a link to Google Translate with icons for languages.

4.6. The Court System and Police Services

Articles 5 & 6 of the *European Convention on Human Rights* (Council of Europe, 1950) stipulate that if anyone, arrested or charged, cannot understand or speak the language used in the court or police, he has the right to get the free assistance of an interpreter. In order to provide such support, both legal services draw upon the services of qualified interpreters from a list of recommended registers, such as the National Register of Public Service Interpreters.

Interpreting services for the police are also provided by M-Four Translations and Language Line, a national telephone interpreting service. Further information in various community languages can also be accessed from the Home Office website, in particular the 'Notice of Rights and Entitlements' document (Home Office, 2005). This document explains a person's rights whilst he/she is in police detention and is available as both a text and audio version for different community languages.

To sum up, we have seen above that MCC and agencies working alongside provide different services in community languages in Manchester. What do these practices and activities reveal about LPP in Manchester? This will be discussed below.

5. Discussion

The discussion below handles the research questions of the study:

5.1. Is there an Explicit Language Policy in Manchester?

Based on the above data, Manchester's language policy is characterized by a number of features. First, MCC and agencies working alongside council services are aware of the linguistic and cultural diversity characterizing Manchester, and they try to meet such diversity in the different services they provide. In this respect, training is given to the different departments within MCC to raise the linguistic and cultural awareness of its employees. This is important since the lack of such awareness in service providers' staff is one of the reasons for the problems that minority language speakers have in accessing services (Pugh & Williams, 2006). The local authorities in Manchester provide, for instance, male and female interpreters since they are aware that there are sometimes conservative communities who may have a problem dealing with the opposite sex.

One of the motives for offering services in community languages in Manchester is the desire of local authorities to avoid any misunderstanding that may result due to the language barrier, especially in such areas as hospitals, courts, and police. There exists what Ager, commenting on Britain's official policy towards linguistic minorities, called a "practical acceptance of the need to use some languages in order to communicate with minorities" (1996, p. 53). However, as emphasized by the different personnel in MCC, the main reason for service provisions in community languages is to maintain equal opportunities among the inhabitants of Manchester (see also Matras & Robertson, 2015). As part of the Race Relations (Amendment) Act (UK Public General Acts, 2000), local councils are legally required to provide equal access to their services. Although there is no direct reference to language provision in this act, the advice of bodies such as the Equality and Human Rights Commission (2014) (including the former Commission for Racial Equality) indicates that failure to provide access to local authority services in languages other than English would deny access to those services for certain users. Therefore, to comply with the legal requirements set out in the Act, language provision is indirectly implied, and local authorities must provide their services in all required languages.

Thus, there is no explicitly-mentioned language policy; rather, there is an implied policy. In other words, there are guidelines from the central government which emphasize the principle of equal opportunities; then the local implementation of such guidelines requires provision of services in community languages. Hence, it can be said that Manchester's micro-level language policy is a by-product of the central government's policy of equality. This is similar to what Pugh and Williams (2006) found in their investigation of language policy in social service organizations in England and Wales: they usually have

general equal opportunities policy rather than specific policies on language.

5.2. How is Manchester's Language Policy Formulated?

Manchester's language policy has two parts which work concurrently: a part that is concerned with offering services in ethnic languages so as to assist minorities to manage their daily life until they master English. This multilingual "policy of tolerance during the transition to English stage" (García, 1997, p. 42) is noticeable, for example, in the inclusion of new arrival students in mainstream schools, where they receive support in their native language as well as English until they develop English proficiency so that they can participate successfully in all-English instruction. It was also clearly emphasized by the manager of the M-Four Translation Department, who stated in an interview that "M-Four only provide their services to minority language speakers who do not speak English" until they achieve an adequate level of spoken English. The other part of Manchester's language policy is concerned with helping the integration of minorities by encouraging them to learn English. This is clear in the council's provisions of free ESOL courses (interview with the Deputy Leader). Such courses, according to the Deputy Leader, are aimed at helping minorities learn English to be able to manage their daily life on their own without depending on others for interpretation and integrate with society. It may be argued that the two parts of policy may contradict each other. That is, providing services in minority languages may hinder the integration of minorities who might see no need to learn English since they can carry out their dealings in public service organizations in their native language. However, according to the Deputy Leader, the council and other government bodies affiliated with it do/cannot adopt this view for the simple reason that providing services in community languages is important to maintain the principle of the legal right of all to have equal access to services.

MCC's policy towards minority communities is generally not rigid, which is evident in its services (e.g., Library Service, Linkworkers Service, etc.). Given the fluid numbers of community language speakers in Manchester and the fact that events outside the region might result in an influx of speakers requiring different languages, MCC tries to remain alert to the changing language dynamics within the city. In light of this, it does not rely on rigid policies to operate but prefers to remain adaptable to changing circumstances. For example, in the past when the war on Iraq started, the council predicted an influx of speakers from Iraq and adapted its resources to meet the increasing need for services in Arabic (interview in the M-Four Translation department).

The language policy of MCC is informed through a number of different bodies that provide council services. Service providers such as M-Four, INATSS, Linkworkers, and Library Department provide core language and support services for the council, and in return, they also provide feedback and inform the Executive regarding the effectiveness of services and how these might be improved. Input into this process is also provided by Policy and Performance officers who assess the quality of council services and report back to the Executive. Based on the information gathered from these service providers, the Executive then decides on the appropriate language provisions that the council has to provide, and as such decides language policy. This process of feedback operates in the different departments within MCC, as stressed in the interviews. For instance, M-Four Translation Department gathers feedback from both its 'customers' and 'clients'; that is, the social services which request assistance from M-Four, and the end-users who benefit from the services respectively. Through this chain, feedback reaches M-Four, and then along with the other officers who inform MCC, this feedback helps to formulate both the services which M-Four needs to operate successfully, and also inform the Executive as to the appropriate action needed regarding language policy and resources. In addition, M-Four has around two hundred community-language interpreters, and these community figures provide a valuable link between M-Four and the community, and eventually the council itself. The presence of community feedback which subsequently informs the council via consultation with its service providers, suggests that council services aim to connect

with community needs as far as possible. With the existence of such feedback, the circle of community-language provision (i.e., policy maker, service provider and service user) is complete. Such a circle works both directions (i.e., from policy maker through service provider reaching service user, and vice versa) suggesting a kind of bottom-up language planning which is important for effective provision of services. Without the user involvement, it is likely that service providers "are misdirecting resources and excluding some minority language community members from accessing or using services" (Pugh & Williams, 2006, p. 1236).

5.3. Language Hierarchy in the Implementation of Manchester's Language Policy

There is a language hierarchy in MCC and other government agencies working alongside (see also Donakey, 2007). Such a hierarchy has three levels and influences community language provisions in Manchester. At the first level, English is at the top of the hierarchy of all languages. This is evident, for example, in mainstream education, as will be explained below, in which English is the only language of instruction. In this regard, Blackledge and Creese (2010) indicate that the mainstream educational policy in the UK in general, with its emphasis on English at the expense of teaching community languages, does not mirror the multilingualism characterizing the country. Such a hierarchy is obvious as well on MCC's website. The website is overwhelmingly in English and there is a shortage of information available in non-English scripts. While this may be interpreted as a matter of convenience and practicality, it may also reflect an active policy to promote English amongst these communities in areas such as the website, whilst retaining bilingual support in the provision of documents.

At the second level of the hierarchy, modern foreign languages are given precedence over community languages. This, however, is restricted to mainstream education which is mainly controlled by the central government; in all other services priority is given to the community languages that are really spoken in Manchester (We will return to this point in more detail below).

At the third level of the hierarchy, some community languages are given priority over others. Community languages are not treated on an equal footing with regard to provisions of services in them. While all community language speakers can get services in their native language, the level of services provided is heavily bound by the numerical strength of every minority group. What is meant by the level of services is whether a minority language speaker can get instant services in his/her native language at any time without prior arrangements from the service provider, or he/she has to wait for such an arrangement to be made. In this regard, it is only the languages that have a considerable number of speakers (e.g., Urdu, Somali, etc.), whose speakers receive constant provisions and immediate services in them at any time. Thus, future demographic changes that may occur due to the constantly increasing number of immigrants in Manchester may result in alternation in the level of services provided in the different community languages.

5.4. Educational Language Policy in Manchester

This section discusses the status of community languages in mainstream education, compared to English and modern foreign languages. Spolsky (2005) indicates that the education system is one of the important domains where language policy is applied. As mentioned above, the National Curriculum, with its emphasis on English as the only language of instruction, gives precedence to English over all other languages. Thus, the mainstream educational policy in the UK and Manchester encourages minorities to learn English and deprives them of access to mainstream education in their native language. This reveals a linguistic assimilationist ideology influencing government language planning activities (Krishna & Abiodun, 2002). Moreover, without learning English, parents in minority groups will not be able to obtain information about their children's schooling because English is the official language in the school setting (Blackledge & Pavlenko, 2001).

Also, as shown earlier, tuition in modern foreign languages is mandatory in the National Curriculum for Key Stage 2 and Key Stage 3. On the other hand, although community

language speakers can similarly be entered for GCSE or A-Level courses and examinations in their languages, this is dependent on whether the teaching staff at the school can provide tuition in such languages at the school. Hence, it is clear that the educational system gives priority to modern foreign languages over community languages. This is a statement of status (Lamb, 2001) which may reveal an implicit language hierarchy whereby languages that are spoken by less powerful members of the society (i.e., ethnic immigrant groups) are often undervalued or disregarded (Edwards, 2001).

The National Curriculum is still influenced by the Swann Report of 1985 which proposes that if the mother tongue of a group is used for intra-group interaction, such as parent/child communication, it will survive regardless of the provisions made for it in mainstream education; therefore, mainstream schools should not play the role of community providers for maintaining community languages (Swann, 1985). Thus, as emphasized in the interview with INATSS, the teaching of community languages has been relegated to supplementary schools since it would prove impractical and costly to provide optional language tuition in all languages given the vast linguistic diversity present at Manchester schools. Hence, supplementary schools represent "a response to a historically monolingual ideology, which ignores the complexity of multilingual England" (Blackledge & Creese, 2010, p. 48). As Wei (2006) indicates, complementary schooling in the UK was set up since the mainstream educational system failed to satisfy the needs of ethnic minority children. Perhaps that is why supplementary schools are not controlled by MCC, have freedom over their curricula, teaching and management, and receive some support from MCC.

Hence, it is evident from what is mentioned above that community languages are underestimated in the national curriculum. This has negative pedagogical implications on children of ethnic minorities since they are deprived of access to free-of-charge mainstream tuition in their ethnic languages. Consequently, only those who afford to send their children to supplementary schools guarantee a chance for their children to learn

their native language and culture. Moreover, it may lead minority children to see their ethnic language as inferior or not prestigious, which negatively influences their motivation to learn and maintain it (Lamb, 2001). Finally, it develops a misconception, among the minority and majority children alike, that some languages are superior to others, which may negatively affect their desire to learn languages in general. As Hymes (1992) indicates, all languages are equal and all should be allowed to flourish and to be maintained.

Thus, such a biased situation needs to be changed through revised educational policies that promote the teaching of both community languages and modern foreign languages (Lamb, 2001), as it contradicts the super-diversity characterizing Manchester and opposes the principle of equal opportunities. This means that the argument of the Swann Report that minority languages are the responsibility of ethnic groups is invalid. As Nelde indicates, language planning depends greatly on the education system "whose impact may be stronger than the impact of the legalization of multilingual and multicultural prerequisites" (2000, p. 443).

To sum up, the present study of LPP in Manchester reveals that the city is characterized by an implied, rather than explicit, language policy. There is no such overt government recognition of certain languages as in a city like New York. This agrees with what scholars indicate that micro-LPP does not necessarily result from practices that were overtly and explicitly planned; it is sometimes covert and implicit (Eggington, 2002; Schiffman, 1996; Shohamy, 2006). Moreover, in multilingual contexts, there is usually a sort of interplay between the macro and micro levels of language planning (Liddicoat & Baldauf, 2008). Liddicoat and Taylor-Leech (2014) refer to different contexts of language planning practices in which local bottom-up agents work including, for instance, the local implementation of macro-level policy and addressing local needs in the absence of such a macro policy (see also Breen, 2002; Hatoss, 2006; Ricento 2000). This is largely evident in Manchester. For example, as shown above, MCC and other agencies like courts and police depend on link workers, translators,

and interpreters recruited from the local immigrant communities, which is aided by the existence of second and third-generation immigrants who are simultaneously skilled in English and their ethnic language. These community figures provide also, as aforementioned, valuable feedback for local authorities about their communities' linguistic and cultural needs. All this represents a kind of articulation whereby the local communities help the implementation of macro-level policies. However, this articulation is most evident in the role that supplementary schools play in addressing the local needs in the absence of government-based solutions. These micro-level planning agencies help to a great extent achieve the macro-level principle of equality and the right of minorities to receive education in their native language and maintain it, especially with regard to literacy (Fishman, 1985). Supplementary schools also provide culture education, which strengthens ethnic and cultural identity among children, a role that is absent in mainstream education. As Liddicoat and Baldauf (2008) indicate, supplementary schools originated to fill a gap in, or even to resist discrimination within, the macro-language planning context (see also Blackledge & Creese, 2010; Wei, 2006).

References

Ager, D. (1996). *Language policy in Britain and France*. London, England: Cassell.

Ager, D. (2001). *Motivations in language planning and language policy*. London, England: Multilingual Matters.

Baldauf, R. (2006). Rearticulating the case for micro language planning in a language ecology context. *Current Issues in Language Planning, 7*(2&3), 147-170.

Baldauf, R., & Kaplan, R. (2003). Who are the actors? The role of (applied) linguists in language policy. In P. Ryan & R. Terborg (Eds.), *Language: Issues of inequality* (pp. 19-40). Mexico City, Mexico: CELE/Autonomous National University of Mexico.

Baldauf, R., & Kaplan, R. (2005). Language-in education planning. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning* (pp. 1013-1034). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Blackledge, A., & Creese, A. (2010). *Multilingualism: A critical perspective*. New York, NY: Continuum.

Blackledge, A., & Pavlenko, A. (2001). Negotiation of identities in multilingual contexts. *The International Journal of Bilingualism, 5*(3), 243-257.

Blommaert, J., & Rampton, B. (2011). Language and superdiversity. *Diversities, 13*(2), 1-22.

Breen, M. (2002). From a language policy to classroom practice: The intervention of identity and relationships. *Language and Education, 16*(4), 260-283.

Council of Europe. (1950). *The European convention on human rights (Articles 5 & 6)*. Retrieved from http://www.hri.org/docs/ECHR50.html#C.Art5

Djite, P. (1994). *From language policy to language planning*. Canberra, Australia: National Languages and Literacy Institute of Australia.

Donakey, A. (2007). *Language planning and policy in Manchester* (Unpublished master's thesis). The University of Manchester, Manchester, UK.

Eggington, W. (2002). Unplanned language planning. In R. Kaplan (Ed.), *Handbook of applied linguistics* (pp. 404-415). Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.

Edwards, V. (2001). Community languages in the United Kingdom. In G. Extra, & D. Gorter (Eds.), *The other languages of Europe: Demographic, sociolinguistic and educational perspectives* (pp. 243-260). Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.

Equality and Human Rights Commission. (2014). *What equality law means for you as an education provider: Schools*. Retrieved from https://www.equalityhumanrights.com/en/publication-download/what-equality-law-means-you-education-provider-schools

Extra G., & Yağmur, K. (Eds.). (2004). *Urban multilingualism in Europe. Immigrant minority languages at home and school*. Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.

Fishman, J. (1985). *The rise and fall of the ethnic revival: Perspectives on language and ethnicity.* New York, NY: Mouton.

Fishman, J. (1991). *Reversing language shift*. Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.

García, O. (1997). New York's multilingualism: World languages and their role in a U.S. city. In O. García & J. Fishman (Eds.), *The multilingual apple. Languages in New York city* (pp. 3-50). New York, NY: Mouton de Gruyter.

Grzech, K. (2013). Planning language, planning identity: A case study of Ecuadorians in London. *SOAS Working Papers in Linguistics, 16*, 291-309.

Hatoss, A. (2006). Community-level approaches in language planning: The case of Hungarian in Australia. *Current Issues in Language Planning, 7*(2&3), 287-306.

Home Office. (2005). *Notice of rights and entitlements*. Retrieved from https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/notice-of-rights-and-entitlements-54-translations

Hymes, D. (1992). Inequality in language: Taking for granted. *Working Papers in Educational Linguistics, 8*(1), 1-30.

Johnson, D. (2013). *Language policy*. London, England: Palgrave Macmillan.

Kaplan, R., & Baldauf, R. (1997). *Language planning from practice to theory*. Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.

Krishna, S., & Abiodun, G. (2002). The case for language policies in multinational corporations. *Corporate Communications: An International Journal, 7*(4), 241-251.

Lamb, T. (2001). Language policy in multilingual UK. *Language Learning Journal, 23*(1), 4-12.

Leimgruber, J. (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, Netherlands: John Benjamins.

Liddicoat, A. (2005). Corpus planning. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning* (pp. 993-1011). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Liddicoat, A., & Baldauf, R. (2008). Language planning in local contexts: Agents, contexts and interactions. In A. Liddicoat, & R. Baldauf (Eds.), *Language planning in local contexts* (pp. 3-17). Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.

Liddicoat, A., & Taylor-Leech, K. (2014). Micro language planning for multilingual education: Agency in local contexts. *Current Issues in Language Planning, 15*(3), 237-244.

Long, R., Danechi, S., & Loft, P. (2020). *Language teaching in schools (England)*. London, England: House of Commons Library. Retrieved from https://researchbriefings.parliament.uk/ResearchBriefing/Summary/CBP-7388#fullreport

Mac Giolla Chríost, D. (2006). Micro-level language planning in Ireland. *Current Issues in Language Planning, 7*(2&3), 230-250.

Matras, Y., & Robertson, A. (2015). Multilingualism in a post-industrial city: Policy and practice in Manchester. *Current Issues in Language Planning, 16*(3), 296-314.

Morse, A. (2003). *Language access: Helping non-English speakers navigate health and human services*. Denver, CO: National Conference of State Legislatures.

Nelde, P. (2000). Prerequisites for a new European language policy. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development, 21*(5), 442-450.

Picanço, G. (2012). Language planning for Mundurukú do Amazonas. *Revista Brasileira de Linguística Aplicada, 12*(2), 405-423.

Pugh, R., & Williams, D. (2006). Language policy and provision in social service organizations. *British Journal of Social Work, 36*(7), 1227-1244.

Ricento, T. (2000). Historical and theoretical perspectives in language policies and planning. *Journal of Sociolinguistics, 2*(4), 196-213.

Schiffman, H. (1996). *Linguistic culture and language policy*. London, England: Routledge.

Shohamy, E. (2006). *Language policy: Hidden agendas and new approaches*. London, England: Routledge.

Shouhui, Z., & Baldauf, R. (2012). Individual agency in language planning: Chinese

script reform as a case study. *Language Problems and Language Planning, 36*(1), 1-24.

Spolsky, B. (2005). Language policy. In J. Cohen, K. McAlister, K. Rolstad, & J. MacSwan (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 4th international symposium on bilingualism* (pp. 2152-2164). Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Press.

Stake, R. (2006). *Multiple case study analysis*. London, England: Guilford.

Swann, M. (1985). *Education for all. The report of the committee of inquiry into the education of children from ethnic minority groups*. London, England: Her Majesty's Stationery Office.

UK Public General Acts. (2000). *Race relations (amendment) act*. Retrieved from http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2000/34

Vertovec, S. (2007). Super-diversity and its implications. *Ethnic and Racial Studies, 30*(6), 1024-1054.

Wei, L. (2006). Complementary schools, past, present and future. *Language and Education, 20*(1), 76-83.

Wolff, E. (2010). *Multilingualism and language policies in Anglophone and Francophone Africa from a sociolinguistic macro-perspective, with reference to language-in-education issues*. Keynote address at the Fifth International Expert Workshop for Ganaa, Dakar, Senegal.

Yin, R. (1994). *Case study research: Design and methods*. London, England: Sage.

Appendix.
Interview Questions

I. Deputy leader of Manchester City Council/Councilors:

- Who decides community language policy, and at what level within the council are these decisions made?
- Is there a formal committee? Who sits on the committee? When do they meet?
- Are there any national guidelines which each council in the UK adheres to regarding community language policy?
- Who decides which materials (housing advice, benefits, etc.) should be translated into community languages?
- Who decides which services should be provided, such as community libraries, link workers, INATSS, and school services?
- How are these decisions made, and what are the criteria?
- Do you receive feedback from the different departments within the Council concerning provisions in community languages? How do you, as policy makers, benefit from this?
- What budget is available for community language services, and how are these funds allocated?
- Why do you provide such services?
  - Is it the language policy of MCC and the British government to encourage and maintain multilingualism and multiculturalism in Manchester?
  - Or is it an attempt to guarantee equal opportunities for immigrants and help their integration?
  - Do you think what you provide is enough? Why?
- As a councilor, you have a certain number of community language speakers in your ward. How do you assess their needs and aim to provide targeted services for them?
- How effective do you feel that community language services and policy are within your ward and across central Manchester?
- Do you have official statistics on, for example, the number of the different community language speakers in Manchester and their distribution across the wards?
- What sociological data does the Council collect concerning them (age, origins, occupation, education, date of arrival, religion, diachronic history, reasons for coming to Manchester etc.)?

- How do you coordinate local services provided by the Council with national services, such as police, NHS, and courts?

II. Linkworker Service:

- What is your role in MCC?
- Do you provide your services free of charge?
- Where do you provide your services (e.g., hospitals, or courts, etc., or just in your office)?
- Why do you provide such services?
  - Is it the language policy of MCC and the British government to encourage and maintain multilingualism and multiculturalism in Manchester?
  - Or is it an attempt to guarantee equal opportunities for immigrants and help their integration?
  - Do you think what you provide is enough? Why?
- Do you collect feedback from customers? Why? How does this system work?
- Do you cover all community languages in Manchester?
- What criteria are employed to decide which languages to provide services in?
- What do you do with uncovered community languages?
- Do you have signs, leaflets, flyers, and booklets in the different community languages?
- Do you have male and female staff? If an immigrant asks for a female or male link worker, do you provide her or him?
- How do you recruit link workers?
- What qualifications should they have?
- Do they work full-time or part-time?
- Is it a permanent job?
- Do they receive good salaries?
- Who pays them?
- How can immigrants find about your services?
- Do immigrants have to take an appointment in advance?
- Which community-language speakers come to you more? Why?

III. M-Four:

- What is your role in MCC?
- Do you provide interpreting and translation only?
- Is it for free?
- Where do you provide your services (e.g., hospitals, courts, etc., or just in your office)?
- Why do you provide such services?
  - Is it the language policy of MCC and the British government to encourage and maintain multilingualism and multiculturalism in Manchester?
  - Or is it just an attempt to guarantee equal opportunities for immigrants and help their integration?
  - Do you think what you provide is enough? Why?
- Do you collect feedback from customers? Why? How does this system work?
- Do you cover all community languages in Manchester?
- What criteria are employed to decide which languages to provide services in?
- What do you do with uncovered community languages?
- Do you have signs, leaflets, flyers, and booklets in the different community languages?
- How many interpreters and translators do you have?
- Do you have males and females staff? If an immigrant asks for a female or male interpreter, do you provide her or him?
- How do you recruit interpreters?
- What qualifications should they have?
- Do they work full-time or part-time?

- Is it a permanent job?
- Do they receive good salaries?
- Who pays them?
- How can immigrants find about your services?
- Do immigrants have to take an appointment in advance?
- Which community-language-speakers come to you more? Why?

IV. INATSS:

- What is your role in MCC?
- Is what you provide just interpreting and translation or something else?
- Do you provide your services for children in schools only?
- Why do you provide such services?
    - Is it the language policy of MCC and the British government to encourage and maintain multilingualism and multiculturalism in Manchester?
    - Or is it just an attempt to guarantee equal opportunities for immigrants and help their integration?
    - Do you think what you provide is enough? Why?
- Do you collect feedback from customers? Why? How does this system work?
- Do you have language assistants for all community languages in Manchester?
- What criteria do you employ to decide which languages to provide services in?
- What do you do with community languages for which you do not have assistants?
- How many bilingual professionals/support workers do you have?
- Do you have males and females? If an immigrant asks for a female or male professional, do you provide her or him?
- How do you recruit those bilingual professionals?
- What qualifications should they have?
- Do they work full-time or part-time?
- Is it a permanent job?
- Who pays them?
- How can immigrants find you?
- Do they have to take an appointment in advance?
- Which community-language-speakers come to you more? Why?
- Can ethnic students be entered for 'GCSEs and A Levels' in their own native languages?
- Is entering GCSEs and A Levels in native languages popular among ethnic students?
- Among which ethnic background is it most popular? What about Arabs?
- Do schools offer those ethnic students teaching in community languages or they just give them the exams? What criteria are employed to decide?
- Who prepares exams?
- Are there any community languages that are taught in mainstream schools? Why?
- If yes, in what stages?
- Is it optional or compulsory for students to study community languages?
- What about modern foreign languages?
- What languages are taught? What about Arabic?
- Why these languages?
- Who chooses the languages to be taught in schools:
    - Is it the city council?
    - What criteria are employed for such a choice?
- Why is community language teaching provided in schools?

V. Mainstream schools:

- How many students are there in your school?
- How many of them are British, and how many are of other ethnic backgrounds?

- Do you have ethnic teachers?
- Do you consider English as the language of school? Why?
- Are ethnic students allowed to speak their native languages at school?
- Does school attempt to promote bilingualism or only English among community-language speakers? Why?
- Do you have bilingual support workers?
- In what languages?
- What is his/her role exactly? What kind of support does he/she provide?
- How do you recruit them? Who pays for them?
- Can ethnic students be entered for 'GCSEs and A Levels' in their own native languages?
- Is entering GCSEs and A Levels in native languages popular among ethnic students?
- Among which ethnic background is it most popular? What about Arabs?
- Do schools offer those ethnic students teaching in community languages or they just give them the exams? What criteria are employed to decide?
- Who prepares exams?
- Are there any community languages that are taught in mainstream schools? Why?
- If yes, in what stages?
- Is it optional or compulsory for students to study community languages?
- What about modern foreign languages?
- What languages are taught in your school?
- Why these languages?
- Who chooses the languages to be taught in schools:
  - Is it the city council?
  - What criteria are employed for such a choice?
- Why is community language teaching provided in schools?
  - Is it the language policy of MCC and the British government to encourage and maintain multilingualism and multiculturalism in Manchester?
  - Or is it just an attempt to guarantee equal opportunities for immigrants?
  - Do you think what you provide is enough? Why?

VI. Supplementary Education Department: (in INATSS)

- What is your role regarding supplementary schools?
- How many supplementary schools are there in Manchester? For example, how many Arabic schools are there in Manchester?
- What is the benefit of ethnic schools?
- What is the council's policy in connection with these schools?
  - Are they authorized?
  - Who authorizes them?
  - Does the council inspect them?
  - Does the council fund them?
  - Does the council require these schools to teach specific curricula?
- Why do you support Ethnic schools?
  - Is it the language policy of MCC and the British government to encourage and maintain multilingualism and multiculturalism in Manchester?
  - Or is it just an attempt to guarantee equal opportunities for immigrants and the right to receive education in the native language?
  - Do you think the support you provide is enough? Why?

VII. Arabic supplementary schools:

1) Principals:

- How many Arabic schools are there in Manchester?

- How many students are there in your school?
- How many Arabs are there in Manchester?
- Are Arabs in Manchester keen to send their children to Arabic schools?
- What is the benefit of such schools?
- Who funds your school?
- What is the council's policy in connection with Arabic schools?
  - Are they authorized?
  - Who authorizes them?
  - Does the council inspect them?
  - Does the council require these schools to teach specific curricula?
  - Does the council fund/support them?
- Do you think the support the council provides is enough/not enough? Why?

2) Teachers:

- Can students study GCSE in Arabic in your school?
- Are students motivated to learn Arabic? Why?
- Can they read and write in Arabic?
- Do they face any difficulties in learning Arabic literacy?
- Is the Arabic language curriculum suitable for students?
- Is it difficult/not difficult for children to receive education in Arabic? Why?
- Do you think Arabic schools are important? Why?

VIII. Library Services Department/public libraries in Manchester:

- What is your role in MCC?
- Do you have materials in all community languages?
- Which community languages do you have most?
- Is borrowing allowed?
- Is it for free?
- What do you do with uncovered community languages?
- What criteria do you employ to decide which languages to provide services in?
- What type of materials do you have (e.g., books, stories, DVDs, Videos, etc.)?
- How many?
- Are they new or old materials?
- Do you update such materials regularly?
- Who chooses the materials to be bought?
- What are the criteria?
- Who pays for the purchase?
- Why do you provide materials in community languages?
  - Is it the language policy of MCC and the British government to encourage and maintain multilingualism and multiculturalism in Manchester?
  - Or is it just an attempt to guarantee equal opportunities for immigrants and help their integration?
  - Do you think what you provide is enough? Why?
- Do you collect feedback from customers? Why? How does this system work?
- Do minorities use these library services regularly?
- Which minority uses these services most?

IX. Focus group discussions with service users

- Does the language policy in Manchester/UK encourage bi/multilingualism? How?
- Are interpreters available in MCC, hospitals, police stations, and government agencies?
- Did you make use of interpreters in government institutions before?

- Are materials in community languages available in Manchester City Council, public organization, and government agencies?
- How can minorities find about these services?
- Why do you think the local government provides materials and interpreters in community languages?
  - Is it the language policy of MCC and the British government to encourage and maintain multilingualism and multiculturalism in Manchester?
  - Or is it just an attempt to guarantee equal opportunities for immigrants and help their integration?
  - Do you think what they provide is enough? Why?
- Are there enough supplementary schools for minorities in Manchester?
- Are community languages taught in mainstream schools? Why?
- Can students study GCSE in community languages in supplementary/mainstream schools?