

WestminsterResearch

<http://www.westminster.ac.uk/westminsterresearch>

Towards a plurilingual habitus: engendering interlinguality in urban spaces

Lamb, T.

This is an Accepted Manuscript of an article published by Taylor & Francis in the International Journal of Pedagogies and Learning, 10 (2), pp. 151-165. The final definitive version is available online:

<https://dx.doi.org/10.1080/22040552.2015.1113848>

© 2015 Taylor & Francis

The WestminsterResearch online digital archive at the University of Westminster aims to make the research output of the University available to a wider audience. Copyright and Moral Rights remain with the authors and/or copyright owners.

Whilst further distribution of specific materials from within this archive is forbidden, you may freely distribute the URL of WestminsterResearch: (<http://westminsterresearch.wmin.ac.uk/>).

In case of abuse or copyright appearing without permission e-mail repository@westminster.ac.uk

Towards a Plurilingual Habitus: Engendering Interlinguality in Urban Spaces

Terry Lamb

University of Sheffield, UK

T.Lamb@sheffield.ac.uk

(final draft accepted before proofs)

ABSTRACT

This chapter focuses on the potential of the multilingual city to create spaces in which monolingual hegemonies may be challenged, inclusive, intercultural values may be nurtured, and plurilingualism may be valorized. Following a contextualisation of linguistic diversity in theories of globalisation and superdiversity, the chapter addresses discourses of deficit and power, arguing that the problematisation of multilingualism and pathologisation of plurilingualism reflect a monolingual habitus. Bringing about a shift towards a plurilingual habitus requires a Deep Approach, as it involves a critical revaluing of deep-seated dispositions. It suggests that the city offers spaces, which can engender *interlinguality*, a construct that includes interculturality, criticality and a commitment to creative and flexible use of other languages in shared, pluralistic spaces. It then proposes critical, participatory and ethnographic research in three multidimensional spaces: the urban school and a potential interlingual curriculum; networks, lobbying for inclusive policy and organising celebratory events in public spaces; and grassroots-level local spaces, some created by linguistic communities to exercise agency and maintain their languages and cultures, and some emerging as linguistically hybrid spaces for convivial encounter.

Keywords

Multilingual city; linguistic superdiversity; plurilingualism; interlinguality; urban spaces

INTRODUCTION

A central characteristic of the Deep Approach to world languages and cultures, which is the focus of this volume, is ‘value creation’ (Tochon, 2012, p. 269):

One goal of the Deep Approach is the expansion of the mind for understanding and peace building across cultures. It can reduce ethnocentrism. Language is the conduit for connectedness of humanity across continents, nations, cultures and subcultures, allowing speakers to connect the dots and gather the pieces of the puzzle of life that were dispersed due to cultural, epistemological and political fragmentation. [...] Global citizenship requires the development of virtues of imagination, empathy, and compassion within the acquisition of the other languages and cultures to create an antidote to collective egoism, ethnocentrism, and the pathology of divisiveness.

In making his case, Tochon draws on the work of the Japanese peace educator, Daisaku Ikeda, who argues that language learning must move beyond proficiency to

embrace “the intense effort at intercultural dialogue with the other”, in order to address Toda’s (1965) criticism that modernity created a “pathology of divisiveness that blinds humans to their commonalities” (Ikeda, 2010, p. 115).

In this chapter, I will explore the ways in which living *interlingually* in a multilingual city may be key to the flourishing of such values, bringing benefits to all. I will argue, however, that this requires an ontological shift away from the problematisation of multilingualism and pathologisation of those who use a range of languages in their everyday lives, and that this shift needs to permeate the very fabric of the city, including not only its policies, but also its public spaces and its citizens. In so doing, the chapter addresses the tensions between the modernist and late modernist paradigms, acknowledging the need to address the challenges of the hegemonic, reproductive social structures, which produce social injustice, exclusion and inequalities, whilst recognising the significance of the transitory and slippery languaging experiences of urban life and incorporating these into localized, grassroots-led, publicly profiled initiatives that can celebrate multilingualism, challenge assumptions and stimulate inclusive policy and practice.

I will begin the chapter with a contextualisation of linguistic diversity in theories of globalisation and superdiversity, before addressing discourses of deficit and power in relation to multilingualism, urban theory and ideology. I will argue that the interplay between power structures, historical experiences and current dispositions is endemic, producing a monolingual habitus (Gogolin, 1994, 2002) that cannot be redressed by top-down language-in-education policy alone; for multilingualism to be normalised and valued by all, opportunities for deep and critical re-education both in formal educational structures and informal public spaces are required, drawing on research evidence regarding the benefits of multilingualism for all in order to challenge solidified beliefs and practices. I will then exemplify ways in which cities can be arenas, which drive such shifts, supporting local language-in-education-(and-beyond) policy and high-profile interventions in public spaces. However, I will also argue that grassroots-led engagement in informal public spaces is essential; in activating their agency, local language communities may claim their “right to the city” (Harvey, 2012), influencing more inclusive policy development, maintaining their languages and cultures, and creating shared spaces which help to shift mindsets. Such mindsets are referred to as *interlinguality*, which involves openness to flexible use of other languages in everyday life, as well as criticality, interculturality and multilingual “entanglement” (Williams & Stroud, 2013) and which can challenge the monolingual habitus.

Throughout the chapter, I will use the term multilingualism to refer to the presence of a range of languages in social spaces (the city, the school, etc.), and plurilingualism to refer to an individual’s capacity to use a range of languages. Where I quote other authors, I will of course use their preferred terminology.

CONTEXTUALISING MULTILINGUALISM IN CITIES

Global migratory movements include shifts from country to town and, though this is by no means a new phenomenon, the extent and speed of movement is unprecedented. The impact on individuals and communities is far-reaching, but how this impact is interpreted depends on fundamental, but contested, conceptions of globalization itself

(Block, 2004). Drawing on Jacquemet's (2005) evocation of the contrasting metaphors of "flows" and "spreads", these conceptions range from euphoric neo-liberal interpretations (flows) related to free markets, progress, aspirations and egalitarianism, to dystopic neo-Marxist interpretations (spreads), in which globalisation is both a result and an escalation of Western colonialism, bringing hegemonic practices, oppression, social injustices, inequalities and language death. One characteristic of globalisation in the city is "diversification of diversity" (Rampton et al., 2015), which Vertovec (2007) has called "superdiversity". Though this is a descriptive construct, "limited in 'grand narrative' ambitions or explicit theoretical claims", its late modernist tendencies, paying "closer attention to the human, cultural and social intricacies of globalisation, focusing on very specific migrant trajectories, identities, profiles, networking, status, training and capacities" (Rampton et al., 2015, p. 4), can greatly enrich urban studies. If tempered with a critical awareness of the hegemonic forces engendering social and cultural reproduction, superdiversity as a construct can counter the limitations of binary explanations, suggesting bottom-up ethnographic and participatory approaches to research and action with linguistic communities themselves.

With superdiversity comes increasing complexity in linguistic diversity in cities, a linguistic superdiversity. References to bilingualism or English (for example) as a Second Language give way to plurilingualism and English as an *Additional* Language, reflecting the complex linguistic repertoires of many urban dwellers. Indeed, if we accept that the distinction between a language and a dialect is contested, and that different 'languages' (e.g. Bosnian, Croatian, Serbian) can be more similar to each other than different 'dialects' (e.g. Swiss German, Austrian German, Plattdeutsch), then we can grasp that "multilingualism is a matter of degree, and since we all use different linguistic varieties, registers, styles, genres and accents, we are all to a greater or lesser degree multilingual" (Weber & Horner, 2012 p. 3). The palimpsestic relationships between these diversely plurilingual people indeed move the field on to new ways of defining language use in what might be called post-multilingual cities. The presence of "stylistic agents, tailoring linguistic styles in ongoing and lifelong projects of self-construction and differentiation" (Eckert, 2012, pp. 97-98) and a new "multilingualism of entanglement" (Williams & Stroud, 2013) have shifted the discussion towards late modernist explorations of hybridity; constructs such as translanguaging (e.g. Creese & Blackledge, 2010), polylinguaging (Jørgensen et al., 2011), transidiomatic practices (Jacquemet, 2005) and metrolingualism (Pennycook & Otsuji, 2015), occurring in translocal rather than merely transnational urban spaces (Lionnet & Shih, 2005). Such research brings rich insights into the ways in which language practices are unraveling in urban contexts. Nevertheless, we must also address the Herderian ideology of 'one state, one people, one language', which penetrates most Anglophone and, indeed, other European countries in critical ways, manifesting itself as a "monolingual habitus" (Gogolin, 1994, 2002). In other words, as Jacquemet (2005, p. 261) argues, there is a need for studies which address "the progressive globalization of communicative practices and social formations that result from the increasing mobility of people, languages, and texts", i.e. "flows", "while shying away from a power-free, neo-liberal vision of globalization processes, that is, without forgetting to address the asymmetrical power relations and penetrations engendered by such flows" (p. 261). Jacquemet addresses this in part by introducing the concept of "semiotic operators" (p. 266), drawing on their diverse linguistic knowledges as an opportunity to gain agency and social mobility (such as through

employment). Such valorisation of languages as symbolic capital (Bourdieu, 1991) may well be the roots of linguistic, cultural and social empowerment that can engage with prevailing ideologies. For example, it can challenge prevailing notions of additive and subtractive bilingualism, which have developed as a result of power relations producing differential societal conceptions of language status, and which are based on languages as essentialist, separate entities rather than as socially constructed phenomena or resources to be employed in creative and critical ways (Li Wei, 2011).

DISCOURSES OF DEFICIT - DISCOURSES OF POWER

Deficit theories have permeated urban theory since Durkheim's (1997) functionalist sociology started to develop in the late 19th century, exploring the transition from a traditional (rural) to a modern (urban, industrialised) society, a space with particular socio-cultural aspects. According to Durkheimian theory the tendency is nevertheless towards societal equilibrium:

urban society's particular life-forms are seen to evolve in an organic way to form an entity with interdependent parts. On the whole cities grow, develop, change and adapt themselves in a natural way, following the laws of nature as expounded by Darwin (Lamb, 1999, p. 4).

Those who do not adapt, however, suffer anomie (Durkheim, 1997), which develops amongst individuals and groups when the underlying consensus breaks down because of social upheaval and inadequate socialisation. In other words, those who do not fit in are pathologised, seen to have some deficit that they must address.

In relation to children who speak a language at home that differs from the language of the school, the priority in such a discourse is for them to fit in by developing the capacity to use the language of the school. The place of their home language in their education will depend on its perceived status, but societal evolution will not allow any threat to the emerging consensus. For example, in the UK, bringing French or German from home is unlikely to be perceived as a threat to learning English, as they are school subjects and bring some acknowledgement of status (though they are not necessarily seen as a resource in the child's overall education). On the other hand, for a child who brings a language used by recent migrant communities, such as Punjabi or Slovak, there is a tendency to focus more on their deficit in English than on their potential plurilingualism, as their languages are seen as a barrier to formal learning. In this way, English can be seen to represent 'culture' in its original Enlightenment meaning, namely a means to raising the masses up, 'cultivating' them, "a navigation tool to steer social evolution towards a universal human condition [...] a proselytizing mission planned and undertaken in the form of attempts to educate the masses and refine their customs, and through these to improve society and advance 'the people', that is to say, those from the 'depths of society', to those on its heights" (Bauman, 2011, pp. 6-7).

Though not denying potential social conflicts within the system, Durkheim's focus was on gradual social adaptation and consensus rather than on political conflict, an orientation that could now be described as neo-liberal. Conflict theories, on the other hand, claim that there is nothing natural about urban society, that on the contrary there

are powerful forces which influence life in ways which can be either beneficial or detrimental to certain sectors of the population. Whereas neo-Marxist theories see the conflict being between those who control the means of production and those who have to sell their labour, Weberian theories examine the influence of those with political power over those without power. Pahl (1975), for example, argued that cities are controlled by faceless bureaucrats (“urban gatekeepers”), who allocate space and control the distribution of resources, such as transport and education. As cities grow in complexity, the bureaucracy increases, eroding democracy and alienating the population, but with some sections of the population affected more adversely than others. His theories contrast, therefore, with consensus theories, as they recognise that inequality can result from the decisions of powerful groups rather than simply from the weaknesses of particular sections of the population.

This ontological shift enables us to consider the positioning of the plurilingual population differently and to relocate the problem away from them towards the very structure of society itself, including its educational institutions. Social and cultural reproduction theories see schools as representative of the dominant group, reinforcing their domination. According to the neo-Marxist correspondence theory of Bowles and Gintis (1976), for example, influenced by Althusser, the school tailors learners’ attitudes to enable them to take up their allotted place in society. For some children, this means learning to follow rules, to be punctual and to carry out menial tasks, whereas the elite are taught to develop leadership qualities, to think creatively and to value autonomy. Bourdieu's theories of cultural capital and habitus, largely influenced by Gramsci's ideas on education, ideology and hegemony, are less reductive, going beyond a simple link between the school and the economy to an analysis of how culture is reproduced in order to maintain consent. Thus, Bourdieu and Passeron (1977) argue that there is continuity between the values of the school and the bourgeoisie's requirements of the school. It is easy to see how this can then lead to the exclusion of any cultural values, or indeed languages, which are at variance with those perceived as desirable in the hegemonic system. In these reproduction theories, exclusion emerges from structures and systems that maintain power in the hands of the powerful. Any shift to greater inclusion of multilingualism will require changes throughout the education system (and the wider society which perpetuates the exclusion), including the curriculum, the nature of the teaching staff, and the attitudes of the monolingual population. The linguistic diversity of society is not the problem; the problem lies in the ways in which it is positioned in society.

Challenging the problematisation of plurilingualism will require an *education for multilingualism* for all. Baetens-Beardsmore (2003, p.10) has written about the “all-pervading tendency to couple the notion of ‘problems’ to that of bilingualism, a connotation that never comes to mind in discussions on unilingualism”. In a publication entitled ‘Who is afraid of bilingualism?’ he describes how fear exists even amongst parents, despite no evidence to support these fears, though he adds that “such fears are never mentioned in accounts of multilingual societies where bilingualism is the norm” (p. 13). Baetens-Beardsmore here makes a connection between problematisation and fear. In the UK, the fear of multilingualism was confirmed by the final report of the Nuffield Languages Inquiry (The Nuffield Foundation, 2000), a major review of the state of languages in England, which led to the development of a National Languages Strategy in 2002. According to this report, the UK was “neglecting the nation’s wealth” by failing to build on diversity, stating that “the

multilingual talents of UK citizens are under-recognised, under-used and all too often viewed with suspicion” (p. 36). The Nuffield Report acknowledges that the situation in the UK “is greatly complicated by the global role of English” (p. 4), a situation shared by other countries such as Australia, New Zealand and the USA, but it goes on to assert that English is not enough.

The positioning of plurilingualism as a problem continues to have a tight hold in predominantly Anglophone countries, and is indeed endemic throughout all aspects of society, persistent and self-sustaining. If anything is pathological, in need of ‘treatment’, it is this assumption that everyone should speak English. Blackledge (2001) has referred to this as a “monolingual ideology”, pointing out that it is inherent in literacy policy in England, which considers English to be the only language with symbolic capital, and which reflects wider discourses outside education. Also writing in the UK, Li Wei (2011, p. 371) reports that “public perception of minority ethnic children, especially those who speak languages other than English at home, is that of problems”.

The situation is similar in the USA, and Nieto’s analysis of this in 1992 is still pertinent:

English is the language of power in the United States. For those who speak it as a native language, monolingualism is an asset. In our society, bilingualism is usually considered an asset only for those who are dominant in English but have learned another language as a second language. On the other hand, those who speak a language associated with low prestige and limited power as their native tongue are often regarded as deficient. (Nieto, 1992, 114)

The hegemony of English in a nation such as the USA, whose population is largely from an immigrant background, may be understood as an outcome of the project of nation-building, but this does not lessen its tendency to exclude, even in some academic circles. Souto-Manning (2006, 444) has claimed that, despite thirty years of empirical evidence of the benefits of bilingualism, education professionals in the USA “continue to propagate these discourses [of the negative consequences of bilingualism], as many continue regarding bilingualism as a deficit in their philosophical beliefs”. Her research with bilingual families also revealed that “mothers of young children still believed that efforts to learn multiple languages diminish a child’s ability to learn other things” (p. 444).

This ambivalence amongst families towards their children’s plurilingualism may also explain the increasing levels of language shift to use of English in the home, a phenomenon also highlighted in research in Australia, though the research highlights that this is more prevalent in some language groups than others, with the loss of the majority of Indigenous languages being well documented (Baldauf, 1993; Clyne and Kipp, 1997; McConvell & Thieberger, 2001). Australia has, however, experienced considerable successes in supporting multilingualism over recent decades, with an early recognition of language as a “core value” to be maintained through community-based schools and state-sponsored Saturday schools (such as in Victoria), incorporation of community languages into mainstream education (including provision of accreditation in a wide range of languages), and development of national language

strategy (Smolicz, 1984; Clyne, 1997). Clearly there have been positive, if fluctuating, language-in-education policies in Australia, but as Pauwels (2005) pointed out, these will only maintain multilingualism if families themselves initiate acquisition of their heritage language and provide a context in which it can be developed.

FROM A MONOLINGUAL TO A PLURILINGUAL HABITUS

Where then does this problematisation of plurilingualism emerge from, if it can develop even in plurilingual families and in contexts where there are more positive policies to promote it? The construct of a monolingual habitus (Gogolin, 1994, 2002) offers a way of understanding this apparent paradox. Habitus does not need legislation or oppressive policy to develop. Though power is involved in its construction, it is not determined directly by structures but by dispositions that have been dynamically created by past experiences and that, in turn, both influence current practices and condition our perceptions of these (Bourdieu, 1984, p. 170). None of this occurs consciously; it emerges from a complex web of experiences, structures and practices.

Given the pervasiveness of habitus, a considerable challenge faces any ambition to reposition plurilingualism. Nevertheless, it is possible; as Bourdieu (1994, pp. 137-138) wrote, “To change the world, one has to change the ways of world making, that is the vision of the world and the practical operations by which groups are produced and reproduced”. Attainment of symbolic power firstly requires symbolic capital, “the power granted to those who have obtained sufficient recognition to be in a position to impose recognition”. Symbolic power also needs to be “founded in reality” and is “the power to consecrate or to reveal things that are already there” and which can be distinguished through “knowledge and recognition (*connaissance et reconnaissance*)”.

In the context of a multilingual city where a monolingual habitus presides, multilingualism is certainly a reality, but, generally speaking, not recognised, partly because it is not always ‘revealed’, remaining in private spaces and therefore invisible to most. Nevertheless, I would argue that it is in cities that the greatest potential for change can be found. Interpreting Bourdieu, I would argue that cities offer two complementary ways forward: firstly, as superdiverse arenas, cities can enable multilingualism to become visible throughout the city spaces, which means that *everyone* in the city can be exposed to it, develop knowledge about it, recognise its benefits and, indeed, learn not just to tolerate but to enjoy it, to aspire to be part of it; secondly, cities are large enough, but also small enough, to support linguistic communities of all types in developing their symbolic power *themselves*, recognising the value of their plurilingualism for themselves and for the city as a whole, consecrating it, acting as ambassadors for it, and ‘imposing recognition’ of it. This shift from a monolingual to a plurilingual habitus will, of course, also involve identifying and dismantling obstacles from policy, but it is at the level of the city that “policy discourse can be created more easily” and “the constraints of national policies and constraints of national discourse can be modified or overcome” (LETPP, 2011, p. 39).

There is no shortage of knowledge about the potential benefits of plurilingualism and multilingualism for individuals and for the city as a whole, and much of this is available in accessible formats, such as pamphlets, blogs etc (e.g. Paradowski, 2008). Benefits for the plurilingual individual include: linguistic benefits, not only in relation

to being able to access information and communicate with others in a range of languages (Odoyo Okal, 2014), but also from enhanced competence and sensitivity in using all of their linguistic repertoire appropriately (e.g. Baker, 2000; Datta, 2000; Li Wei, 2011; Tse, 2001); enhanced cognitive skills, such as cognitive flexibility, concept formation, openness to diverse ways of expressing ideas, increased attentional control and working memory (Adesope et al., 2010; Bialystok, 2001; Bialystok et al., 2004; Pavlenko, 2005; Peal & Lambert, 1962); intercultural awareness, including critical awareness of their own cultural assumptions and acceptance of different perspectives (e.g. Curtain & Dahlberg, 2004); health benefits, such as delaying age-related dementia (e.g. Bialystok et al., 2007, 2009; Valenzuela & Sachdev, 2006); and of course, increased social benefits and employment opportunities (British Academy, 2013; CBI/Pearson Education, 2012). It cannot be assumed, however, that such benefits will automatically be enjoyed by plurilingual people; experiences of exclusion and rejection of their linguistic identities from schools and other public spaces can have a negative impact (e.g. Agnihotri, 1987; Cummins, 2001).

Multilingualism is also potentially a valuable resource for all (Krashen, 1999; Souto-Manning, 2006). Skutnabb-Kangas (2002) makes a number of arguments for preservation of linguistic diversity, from heritage and biodiversity arguments to creativity and innovation, and thus economic, arguments. In the UK, the British Academy has argued that researchers in the humanities and social sciences require language skills in order to be able to compete in international research; it also extends the argument to the UK's capacity to compete in the global market more generally (British Academy, 2013). In Australia, the term "productive diversity" was introduced in 1992, to represent "the advantages in effectively harnessing the linguistic and other resources of the culturally diverse community for the economic benefit of the State or Territory" (NMAC, 1999, p. 6). Hatoss (2005, p. 2), however, criticises the focus on economic benefits alone, arguing that "[i]n the context of multicultural societies, language policies need to encompass the preservation of multicultural values and multilingual skills for broader social benefits which do not necessarily translate into monetary terms". This is echoed in the consultation document for the Queensland Plan, which argues that global schools need to prepare young people for a connected future in which linguistic and intercultural skills and knowledge are essential; indeed, it sees the diversity of cultures and languages, including Indigenous ones, in Queensland schools as "perhaps the greatest asset of state schooling in rising to the challenge of preparing our students for their role as global citizens" (DETE, 2014, p. 9).

The benefits of linguistic diversity are particularly noticeable at the level of the city. A report on Utrecht (Martinovic, 2011, p. 6) reveals that the city is positioning itself as "a European hotspot for languages", and in fact promoted its multilingualism in support of its candidature to become the European Capital of Culture in 2018. Sheffield's curriculum policy in 1988 stated that the "presence [of bilingual pupils] in Sheffield schools is a benefit to all pupils" (Sheffield LEA, 1988) and in 1994 the local authority launched (and funded) the Multilingual City initiative, defining a multilingual city as follows:

A multilingual city is one where different languages become part of the organic development of the community as a whole. It is where these languages are spoken at home, in public and in education. Crucially, it

is where they are on offer to be learnt and used by anyone interested or fired by them – as well as by those who are historically and culturally bound by them. The range of languages and cultures serve to widen our daily experienced and thinking. They also lead to new ways of living so that we feel more stimulated and fulfilled. By knowing another language we acquire a key with which to open our parochial cages. Here are the beginnings of a new and more profound culture and look for the city.” (SUMES, 1994, p. 7).

In this strong statement we see values that would inform a plurilingual habitus. Subsequently, a forum was established both to support the communities in their efforts to maintain their languages and to raise the visibility and status of multilingualism across the city (Lamb, 1997). Activities included an annual conference on languages, bringing together language teachers from mainstream and complementary schools (voluntary schools run by communities at weekends and evenings to maintain culture and language), to encourage them to share practice and research, and to value all of the city’s languages (over 120 in 2012). An association of complementary schools was also formed to facilitate collaboration and mutual support as well as to afford the language communities a voice in the city.

The capacity of local authorities to fund or influence such activities was, however, eroded in the 1990s under the neo-liberal conservative Government. The forum survived nonetheless as a grassroots charitable organisation, Languages Sheffield, which continues to support multilingualism. It has, for example, developed two successive city-wide language strategies, the latest of which covers not only all education sectors, but also business and public services (health, social, translating and interpreting and police) (Languages Sheffield, 2012). Nevertheless, the challenges of implementing a city languages strategy in England are persistent, as highlighted in a Council of Europe Language Policy Profile in Sheffield (the only such Profile carried out in a city to date):

Given the complexity of the English system and the limited responsibility that the Local Authority has for secondary schools, the successful implementation of an updated City Languages Strategy will depend on the willing cooperation of all concerned. This is a major challenge (Language Policy Division, 2009).

It could be argued that “willing cooperation” suggests the development of a plurilingual habitus in the city, but, as is clear from the above statement, this is challenging in relation to formal education, particularly given the level of devolution to individual schools accompanied by central control via a draconian inspection regime. Local authority action is also difficult to enlist in other aspects of city life, as local authorities have shifted from public service providers to commissioning authorities. This does not mean, however, that all is lost. The city offers many forums and spaces which can be engaged in shifting the public dispositions that form the monolingual habitus, including policymakers at different levels, charities now delivering public services, headteachers, universities, community groups, and the public realm itself.

PLURILINGUAL SPACES AND INTERLINGUALITY IN THE MULTILINGUAL CITY

National policy can swing from one representation of multilingualism to another. For example, the change of government in the UK in 2010 immediately led to the removal of the National Languages Strategy (DfES, 2002), which had over a period of eight years funded interventions to enable a wider range of languages (including community languages) to be learnt, stating explicitly that “Languages contribute to the cultural and linguistic richness of our society, to personal fulfilment, mutual understanding, commercial success and international trade and global citizenship” (p.4).

There has, however, been significant research into the potential of the city and its spaces to address social and economic issues (e.g. Glaeser, 2011). Such research has tended not to focus on multilingualism (LUCIDE, 2014), so I am proposing that this be addressed by focusing on ways in which, despite limited powers, the multilingual city may be producing spaces, in which a plurilingual habitus can be nurtured.

In this chapter I am conceptualising space as multidimensional (Bourdieu, 1985, p. 723), including physical and metaphorical, formal and informal. Furthermore, I am construing space as dynamic, not only socially constructed (Casey, 2013) but also socially produced (Lefebvre, 1974) as an act of agency. Space is transformed and appropriated by individuals, whilst also having a significant role in shaping action (Giddens, 1979). I will conclude this chapter by setting out a research agenda, which draws on the potential of space for social (and personal) transformation, development of a plurilingual habitus and, with that, the emergence of the construct of *interlinguality*.

I construe interlinguality as dispositions, knowledge and skills dynamically related to a plurilingual habitus. A plurilingual habitus offers more than a perception of plurilingualism as normal; it represents the genesis of new relationships and commitments between languages, individuals and communities. I define interlinguality as an awakening to the enjoyment and value of all languages, a creative and flexible approach to using them as a means of understanding and communicating with others from different linguistic backgrounds, and an openness to creating the spaces not only for plurilingual encounters but also for collaborative subversion of the monolingual hegemony. In other words, it brings a value-rich, social and critical dimension to plurilingualism, involving interest in and commitment to meaningful encounters with the other, with a view to developing something new. It includes the notion of interculturalism, which involves not just the ability to interact with people from other cultures, but also to see and value the diversity of their perspectives and to mediate these differences (Byram, 2009). It also incorporates “multilinguality”, which views languages as “porous”, “located in the variability and fluidity of linguistic behaviour” (Agnihotri, 2014, p. 2), thereby acknowledging the realities and potentialities of on-the-ground practices such as translanguaging for negotiation of shared spaces.

In order to explore the potential of urban spaces to foster interlinguality, I am suggesting three types of space, encompassing physical, metaphorical and virtual dimensions, which can afford a Deep Approach to the challenge: the urban school and the metaphorical space of an interlingual curriculum; networks, bringing together diverse elements of the city’s population to lobby for inclusive policy and to organise

celebratory events in public spaces; and grassroots-level spaces, which language communities create as “spaces for manoeuvre” (Lamb, 2000) to disrupt the monolingual habitus.

The urban school reflects the multilingualism of its context. As such, its spatial dimensions are in a position to reflect this multilingualism, potentially offering an inclusive environment in which deep learning can be afforded by drawing on the plurilingualism of its community. In 1980s London, every school was encouraged to develop a multilingual policy, to which all members of the school community as well as the wider local communities were to contribute. Such policy typically included consideration of the physical environment (with diverse languages and representative semiotic landscapes), the curriculum (with the possibility of all pupils learning languages used by local communities, as well as developing more general language awareness (Hawkins, 1984) across the curriculum to challenge ignorance and prejudice), and learning opportunities for all staff, parents and the wider community. Though such developments were halted in England as a result of Government interventions in the 1990s, work has continued on plurilingual education and whole-school multilingual policy in other European countries. Examples of this include projects at the European Centre for Modern Languages in Graz, Austria: language awareness programmes, e.g. FREPA (Candelier et al., 2012); plurilingual pedagogies to enrich the ‘majority’ language curriculum (English in England, French in France etc), e.g. the Marille project (Boeckmann et al., 2011); and development of whole-school multilingual policies (Camilleri Grima, 2007). Each of these projects positions the linguistic diversity of the school as a resource for deep learning rather than as a problem. Despite the long history of such innovations, however, practice is patchy (e.g. Daryai-Hansen et al., 2014). Research is needed to explore further their potential for nurturing interlinguality.

In disciplines such as telecommunications and cyberspace, *networks* have been conceptualised as spaces, which serve as “sites of communicative action structured by a range of social relations” (Samarajiva & Shields, 1997, p. 536). Late modern urbanism is characterized by networks, which offer the dynamism and flexibility from which creativity can emerge. In several cities around the world, networks have been developed to promote the city’s multilingualism, e.g. Multilingual Chicago (Farr, 2011), by attempting to develop coherent strategy, support communities, facilitate research partnerships, and lobby for policy change. Languages Sheffield activities, for example, have ranged from development of the Sheffield Languages Strategy to involvement with the University of Sheffield on a large-scale weeklong celebration of multilingualism in central public spaces. This festival brought together a number of agencies and businesses and included poster displays in public spaces, radio debates, public talks on languages, free children’s performances in a range of languages, multilingual poetry and storytelling, and an interactive exhibition. During the week, communities celebrated their plurilingualism in the city centre, exposing the general public to multilingualism, stimulating discussion and raising not only awareness but also excitement. The impact of such network activities on the monolingual habitus nevertheless requires research.

Local communities in cities around the world are themselves engaged in developing spaces, in which they are maintaining their languages and cultures. Though research has suggested that many of these communities wish to see their languages included in

formal education, they also view their own created spaces, such as the complementary schools in the UK, as crucial to their linguistic and cultural identities (e.g. Creese, 2009; Lamb, 2001). Conversations during the Sheffield multilingual festival, however, suggested that there is a deeper level of language activity taking place informally at a local level, grassroots initiatives, which are sometimes transitory but nevertheless “spaces for manoeuvre” resisting the monolingual habitus. In a study in Cape Town, South Africa, Williams and Stroud (2013, p. 290) have explored the potential of such “(marginal) linguistic practices as powerful mediations of political (convivial) voice and agency”, drawing on two performances “*of and in the local*” (Hip-Hop and stand-up comedy). The reference to conviviality, however, contributes another dimension to these spaces. In research in the fields of geography and urban studies, this construct is usually used to describe everyday, taken-for-granted encounters in shared, pluralistic spaces and their potential for affording “autonomous and creative intercourse among persons” (Illich, 1973, p. 27). Such research nevertheless suggests that the *nature* of the encounters is significant. Some argue that transitory “light-touch, partially engaged, partially disengaged modes of social interaction” (Thrift, 2005, p. 146), or what Amin (2008, p. 6) has referred to as “free and unfettered mingling”, are significant for societal change. An example would be Hall’s study of a London “caff” as a “space of intermingling” (Hall, 2009, p. 87), Others, such as Valentine (2008, p. 325), ask:

what kind of encounters produce what might be termed ‘meaningful contact’. By this I mean contact that actually changes values and translates beyond the specifics of the individual moment into a more general positive respect for – rather than merely tolerance of – others.

The ‘change’ referred to here can be considered as a central aspect of interlinguality. With very few exceptions (e.g. Wessendorf, 2015; Williams & Stroud, 2013), however, little of this research on everyday local spaces considers the linguistic dimension. The possibility of the emergence of interlinguality in both grassroots language maintenance activity and in linguistically hybrid encounters in everyday public spaces is in need of further exploration, as here we see the potential for negotiation, voice and agency in the city. Furthermore, returning to Giddens’ (1979) point, the ways in which the spaces themselves are dynamically related to interlinguality, affording it but also being shaped by it, could offer insights into the role of urban planning in developing cultural capital and a plurilingual habitus. As Valentine et al. (2008, p. 385) state, “Space might shape hegemonic communicative practices but language can also (re)order space”.

CONCLUSION

Throughout this chapter, I have considered the potential for ‘value creation’, which is central to a Deep Approach to education for multilingualism. I have argued the need to reconceptualise pluri/multilingualism as a resource for all as part of a shift from a monolingual to a plurilingual habitus. I have argued that top-down policy is generally ineffective as the sole driver of such change. Instead, I have suggested that cities are potential arenas for change and have proposed research into three kinds of urban space (formal education, networks, and local urban spaces), where the monolingual habitus might be challenged and interlinguality may be engendered.

The chapter has also sought to bridge the binaries of modernity and late modernity and their different ontological and epistemological assumptions, suggesting the need to continue to address issues of power and agency and to put pressure on exclusionary policies and practices, whilst exploring local grassroots, informal activity. Local communities are already finding ways of subverting the hegemony of monolingualism. We need to explore these processes carefully through micro-level studies, developing new critical and interdisciplinary approaches to linguistic ethnography, which are co-produced by the communities themselves and which enable their voices to be heard.

REFERENCES

- Adesope, Olusola O., Lavin, T., Thompson, T., & Ungerleider, C. (2010). A systematic review and meta-analysis of the cognitive correlates of bilingualism. *Review of Educational Research, 80*(2), 207-245.
- Agnihotri, R. K. (1987). *Crisis of identity: A sociolinguistic study of Sikh children in Leeds*. Delhi: Bahri.
- Agnihotri, R. K. (2014). Multilinguality, education and harmony. *International Journal of Multilingualism, 11*(3), 364-379.
doi.10.1080/14790718.2014.921181.
- Amin, A. (2008). Collective culture and urban public space. *City: Analysis of urban trends, culture, theory, policy, action, 12*(1), 5-24.
- Baetens-Beardsmore, H. (2003). Who is afraid of bilingualism? In J-M. Dewaele, A. Housen & L. Wei (Eds.), *Bilingualism: Beyond basic principles* (pp. 10-27). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Baker, C. (2000). *A parents' and teachers' guide to bilingualism*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Baldauf, R. B. (1993). Fostering bilingualism and national development through school second language study. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development, 14*(1-2), 121-134.
- Bauman, Z. (2011). *Culture in a liquid modern world*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

- Bialystok, E. (2001). *Bilingualism in development: Language, literacy, and cognition*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Bialystok, E., Craik, F. I. M., & Freedman, M. (2007). Bilingualism as a protection against the onset of symptoms of dementia. *Neuropsychologia*, *45*(2), 459–464.
- Bialystok, E., Craik, F., Green, D., & Gollan, T. (2009). Bilingual minds. *Psychological Science in the Public Interest*, *10*(3), 89–129.
- Bialystok, E., Craik, F. I. M., Klein, R., & Viswanathan, M. (2004). Bilingualism, aging, and cognitive control: Evidence from the Simon task. *Psychology and Aging*, *19*(2), 290–303.
- Blackledge, A. (2001). Literacy, schooling and ideology in a multilingual state. *The Curriculum Journal*, *12*(3), 291-312.
- Block, D. (2004). Globalization and language teaching. *ELT Journal*, *58*(1), 75-77.
- Boeckmann, K-B., Aalto, E., Abel, A., Atanasoska, T., & Lamb, T. (2011). *Promoting plurilingualism – Majority language in multilingual settings*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe Publishing.
- Bourdieu, P. (1984). *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste*. London: Routledge.
- Bourdieu, P. (1985). The social space and the genesis of groups. *Theory and Society*, *14*(6), 723-744.
- Bourdieu, P. (1991). *Language and symbolic power*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Bourdieu, P. (1994). *In other words: Essays towards a reflexive sociology* (First published 1990). Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Bourdieu, P., & Passeron, J-C. (1977). *Reproduction*. London: Sage.
- Bowles, S., & Gintis, H. (1976). *Schooling in capitalist America: Educational reform and the contradictions of economic life*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

- British Academy (2013). *Multilingual Britain*. London: British Academy.
- Byram, M. (2009). Intercultural competence in foreign languages. In D. Deardorff (Ed.), *The Sage handbook of intercultural competence* (pp. 321-322). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Camilleri Grima, A. (Ed.). (2007). *Promoting linguistic diversity and whole-school development*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe Publishing.
- Candelier, M., Daryai-Hansen, P., & Schröder-Sura, A. (2012). The framework of reference for pluralistic approaches to languages and cultures – a complement to the CEFR to develop plurilingual and intercultural competences. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching*, 6(3), 243-257.
- Casey, E. S. (2013). *The fate of place: A philosophical history*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- CBI/Pearson Education. (2012). *Learning to grow: What employers need from education and skills*. London: CBI.
- Clyne, M. (1997). Language policy in Australia – achievements, disappointments, prospects. *Journal of Intercultural Studies*, 18(1), 63-71.
- Clyne, M., & Kipp, S. (1997). Trends and changes in home language use and shift in Australia, 1986-1996. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 18(6), 451-473.
- Creese, A. (2009). Building on young people's linguistic and cultural continuity: Complementary schools in the United Kingdom. *Theory into Practice*, 48, 267-273.
- Creese, A., & Blackledge, A. (2010). Translanguaging in the bilingual classroom: A pedagogy and teaching. *Modern Language Journal*, 94(2), 103–115.

- Cummins, J. (2001). Bilingual children's mother tongue: Why is it important for education? *Sprogforum*, 19, 15-20.
- Curtain, H., & Dahlberg, C.A. (2004). *Languages cultures: making the match. New languages for young learners, Grades K8* (3rd ed.). New York, NY: Longman.
- Daryai-Hansen, P., Gerber, B., Lörincz, I., Haller, M., Ivanova, O., Krumm, H-J., & Reich, H. H. (2014). Pluralistic approaches to languages in the curriculum: the case of French-speaking Switzerland, Spain and Austria. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 12(1), 109-127.
- Datta, M. (2000). *Bilinguality and literacy*. London and New York: Continuum.
- Department for Education and Science (DfES). (2002). *Languages for all: Languages for life: A strategy for England*. Nottingham: DfES Publications.
- Department of Education, Training and Employment (DETE). (2014). *Global schools: Creating successful global citizens* (Consultation draft). Queensland: State of Queensland.
- Durkheim, E. (1997). *The division of labour in society* (1893). New York, NY: The Free Press.
- Eckert, P. (2012). Three waves of variation study: the emergence of meaning in the study of sociolinguistic variation. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 41, 87-100.
- Farr, M. (2011). Urban plurilingualism: Language practices, policies, and ideologies in Chicago. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 43, 1161-1172.
- Giddens, A. (1979). *Central problems in social theory*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Glaezer, E (2011). *Triumph of the city*. London: MacMillan.
- Gogolin, I. (1994). *Der monolinguale Habitus der multilingualen Schule*. Münster: Waxmann.

- Gogolin, I. (2002). Linguistic and Cultural Diversity in Europe: a challenge for educational research and practice. *European Educational Research Journal*, 1(1), 123-138.
- Hall, S. (2009). Being at home: space for belonging in a London caff. *Open House International*, 34(3), 81-87.
- Harvey, D. (2012). *Rebel cities: From the right to the city to the urban revolution*. London and New York: Verso.
- Hatoss, A. (2005). Sustainable multilingualism as an essential characteristic of multicultural societies: the case of Australia. *Language, Attitudes and Education in Multilingual Cities*, 233-248.
- Hawkins, E. (1984). *Awareness of language: An introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ikeda, D. (2010). *Soka education: For the happiness of the individual*. Santa Monica, CA: Middleway Press.
- Illich, I. (1973). *Tools for Conviviality*. New York, NY: Harper & Row.
- Jacquemet, M. (2005). Transidiomatic practices: Language and power in the age of globalization. *Language & Communication*, 25(3), 257-277.
- Jørgensen, J. N., Karrebæk, M. S., Madsen, L. M., & Møller, J. S. (2011). Polylinguaging in superdiversity. *Diversities*, 13(2), 23-38.
- Krashen, S. (1999). *Condemned without a trial: Bogus arguments against bilingual education*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Lamb, T. E. (1997). *The multilingual city*. In J. N. Jørgensen & A. Holmen (Eds.), *The development of successive bilingualism in school-age children* (pp. 89-96). Copenhagen: Royal Danish School of Educational Studies.

- Lamb, T. E. (1999, May). *Language policy for education in multilingual settings*. Paper presented at the European Conference of the Thematic Network for Teacher Education in Europe, University of Lisbon.
- Lamb, T. E. (2000). Reconceptualising disaffection – issues of power, voice and learner autonomy. In G. Walraven, C. Parsons, D. Van Veen, & C. Day (Eds.), *Combating social exclusion through education* (pp. 99-115). Louvain, Belgium and Apeldoorn, Netherlands: Garant.
- Lamb, T. E. (2001). Language policy in multilingual UK. *Language Learning Journal*, 23, 4-12.
- Language Policy Division. (2009). *Language education policy profile: City of Sheffield*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe.
- Languages Sheffield. (2012). *Sheffield languages strategy 2012*. Sheffield: Languages Sheffield.
- Lefebvre, H. (1974). *La production de l'espace*. Paris: Anthropos. Translation and Précis.
- LETPP (Languages in Europe: Theory Policy Practice). (2011). *Languages in Europe: Towards 2020*. London: The Languages Company.
- Li Wei (2011). Moment Analysis and translanguaging space: Discursive construction of identities by multilingual Chinese youth in Britain. *Journal of Pragmatics* 43. 1222-1235.
- Lionnet, F., & Shih, S. (Eds.). (2005). *Minor transnationalism*. Durham & London: Duke University Press.
- LUCIDE (Languages in Urban Communities – Integration and Diversity for Europe. (2014). *State of the Art Report - Multilingual Cities and the future*. Retrieved from <http://www.urbanlanguages.eu/stateofheart>

- McConvell, P., & Thieberger, N. (2001). *State of Indigenous languages in Australia - 2001* (Australia State of the Environment Second Technical Paper Series: Natural and Cultural Heritage). Canberra: Department of the Environment and Heritage.
- Martinovic, B. (2011). *The Dutch city of Utrecht as a European hotspot and laboratory for multilingualism*. Utrecht: Gemeente Utrecht.
- National Multicultural Advisory Council. (1999). *Australian multiculturalism for a new century: Towards inclusiveness*. Canberra: Commonwealth of Australia.
- Nieto, S. (1992). We speak in many tongues: Language diversity and multicultural education. In C. Diaz (Ed.). (1992). *Multicultural education for the 21st century* (pp. 112-136). Washington D.C.: National Education Association of the United States.
- Nuffield Foundation. (2000). *Languages: the next generation*. London: The Nuffield Foundation.
- Odoyo Okal, B. (2014). Benefits of multilingualism in education. *Universal Journal of Educational Research*, 2(3), 223-229.
- Pahl, R. E. (1975). *Whose city?* Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Paradowski, M. B. (2008). The benefits of multilingualism. *Multilingual Living Magazine*, 3(2), 18-20.
- Pauwels, A. (2005). Mainstreaming the community language in Australia: Challenges and roles for families. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 8(1-2), 124-131.
- Pavlenko, A. (2005). Bilingualism and thought. In A. M. B. De Groot, & J. F. Kroll (Eds.), *Handbook of bilingualism: Psycholinguistic approaches* (pp. 433-453). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

- Peal, E., & Lambert, W. E. (1962). The relationship of bilingualism to intelligence. *Psychological Monographs*, 76(27), 1–23.
- Pennycook, A., & Otsuji, E. (2015). *Metrolingualism: Language in the city*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Rampton, B., Blommaert, J., Arnaut, K., & Spotti, M. (2015). *Superdiversity and sociolinguistics* (Working Papers in Urban Language and Literacies, Paper 152). London: King's College.
- Samarajiva, R., & Shields, P. (1997). Telecommunication networks as social space: Implications for research and policy and an exemplar. *Media, Culture and Society*, 19, 535-555.
- Sheffield Local Education Authority (LEA). (1988). *Policy statement*. Sheffield: Education Department.
- Sheffield Unified Multicultural Education Service (SUMES). (1994). *Sheffield multicultural city conference report*. Sheffield: Education Department.
- Skutnabb-Kangas, T. (2002). *Why should linguistic diversity be maintained and supported in Europe? Some arguments*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe.
- Smolicz, J. J. (1984). Minority languages and the core values of culture: Changing policies and ethnic response in Australia. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 5(1), 23-41.
- Souto-Manning, M. (2006). Families learn together: Reconceptualising linguistic diversity as a resource. *Early Childhood Education Journal*, 33(6), 443-446.
- Thrift, N. (2005). But malice aforethought: Cities and the natural history of hatred. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, 30(2), 133-150.
- Tochon, F. V. (2012). The deep approach and value creation - A comment on Daisaku Ikeda. In F. V. Tochon (Ed.), *Help them learn a language deeply: the deep*

- approach to world languages and cultures* (pp. 269-270). Blue Mounds, WI: Deep University Press.
- Toda, J. (1965). *Toda Josei zenshu* (The complete works of Josei Toda, 5 vols). Tokyo: Wakosha.
- Tse, L. (2001). 'Why don't they learn English?' *Separating fact from fallacy in the U.S. language debate*. New York: Teacher's College Press.
- Valentine, G. (2008). Living with difference: Reflections on geographies of encounter. *Progress in Human Geography*, 32(3), 323-337.
- Valentine, G., Sporton, D., & Bang Nielsen, K. (2008). Language use on the move: Sites of encounter, identities and belonging. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, 33(3), 376-387.
- Valenzuela, M. J., & Sachdev, P. (2006). Brain reserve and dementia: A Systematic Review. *Psychological Medicine*, 36(4), 441-454.
- Vertovec, S. (2007). Super-diversity and its implications. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 30(6), 1024-1054.
- Weber, J. J., & Horner, K. (2012). *Introducing multilingualism: A social approach*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Wessendorf, S. (2015). 'All the people speak bad English': Coping with language differences in a super-diverse context. *IRiS Working Paper Series* (9/2015). Birmingham: University of Birmingham.
- Williams, Q., & C. Stroud, C. (2013). Multilingualism in transformative spaces: contact and conviviality. *Language Policy*, 12(4), 289-311.