Working Papers in
Translanguaging and Translation

Paper 15

Heritage With No Fixed Abode: Transforming Cultural Heritage for Migrant Communities in Inner-City Leeds
Mike Baynham, Jessica Bradley, John Callaghan,
Jolana Hanusova, Emilee Moore and James Simpson

Abstract

This paper reports on the second phase of the AHRC-funded *Translation and Translanguaging* (TLang) project, on the theme of Heritage. The Key Participant for the Heritage theme in Leeds is Monika, a young Slovak Roma woman living and working in inner-city Leeds. Monika and her brother Ivan each aspire to setting up cultural spaces for the Roma people in their area. The activities they hope to initiate will safeguard and transmit to others that which is important to them – their heritage – including music, food, dance. As yet, there is no such space for the Roma in Leeds, and in this respect they are attempting to make something happen where there is currently nothing. We follow Monika in particular, as she attempts to bring her ideas into being. With the support of others, Monika tries to transform her available cultural capital into something that will preserve and consolidate heritage but will also earn her a living. This she does by starting to set up a social enterprise. Among other activities this entails the completion of a business plan. We follow her as the plan moves through stages of transformation, and in the process see her dreams and aspirations become both tangible and at the same time constrained. In the later parts of the paper we examine familiar tokens of cultural heritage, food and music, that play a part in the daily lives of Monika and her family, but which (in the case of food) Ivan is attempting to transform from cultural to economic capital, to make something that provides a living.

Executive Summary

The second phase of the AHRC-funded *Translation and Translanguaging* (TLang) project focuses on the theme of Heritage. At the Leeds site, the Key Participant is Monika, a young Slovak Roma woman living and working in and around the ward of Gipton and Harehills, in inner-city Leeds. Monika and her brother Ivan each aspire to setting up cultural spaces for the Roma people in their area. The activities they hope to initiate will safeguard and transmit to others that which is important to them – their heritage – including music, food, dance. As yet, there is no such cultural space for the Roma in Leeds: as we put it in this report, heritage has no fixed abode. In this respect Monika, Ivan, their family, and their friends and associates are attempting to make something happen where there is currently nothing. We follow Monika in particular, as she attempts to bring her ideas into being. With the support of others, Monika tries to transform her available cultural capital into something that will preserve and consolidate heritage but will also earn her a living. She does so by starting to set up a social enterprise, entailing the completion of a business plan. We follow her as the plan moves through stages of transformation, and in the process see her dreams and aspirations become both tangible and at the same time constrained. In the later parts of the paper we examine familiar tokens of cultural heritage, food and music, that play a part in the daily lives of Monika and her family, but which (in the case of food) Ivan is attempting to transform from cultural to economic capital, to make something that will bring them an income.

We seek to address the following questions:
- How can heritage be understood in contexts of superdiversity and mobility?
- What are the linguistic and semiotic practices which contribute to the remaking of heritage in migration contexts?
- How do language and broader semiosis produce cultural spaces for the development of heritage-related activities?

This report comprises seven sections. We begin by introducing Monika and her family, in the context of a discussion of Roma cultural heritage in Leeds. In Section 2, on competing understandings of heritage, we highlight the importance of space and the search for space. We draw on Lefebvre's (1991 [1974]) notions of the social production of space, and how it is negotiated and contested. Section 3 summarises our methodological approach, data collection strategies, and the data sets upon which this report is based. Section 4 is a study of Monika's personal history: here we identify how she draws on her cultural resources in her work environments, and her interactions in family and social life, and include an overview of patterns of language use in her home environment. In Section 5 we consider how her ideas about supporting the cultural heritage of Roma people are brought closer to fruition but at the same time are transformed. She is advised to set up a social enterprise, and our focus is the development of a business plan for this. In Section 6 we turn to food and music, and the part these play in the lives of Monika and her family: we examine how these are heritage resources which might also be commodifiable, might be transformed from cultural to economic capital, might become something that provides a living. The concluding Section, 7, summarises the report and its findings, noting how an understanding of heritage has been both deepened and problematized through the process of this research.

1 Introduction

1.1 Remaking heritage

This is a report of the second phase of the *Translation and Translanguaging* (TLang) project, on the theme of Heritage. We focus on Monika, a young Slovak Roma woman living and working in inner-city Leeds. Monika and her brother Ivan each aspire to set up cultural spaces for heritage-related activities for the Roma people in their area.

When we began our work on this phase, early in 2015, we had three broad questions in mind. These were around the language and communication practices, the languaging and the translanguaging, that take place in superdiverse inner city Leeds, as it relates to the theme of Heritage:

- How can heritage be understood, in contexts of superdiversity and mobility?
- What are the linguistic and semiotic practices which contribute to the remaking of heritage in migration contexts?
- How do language and broader semiosis produce cultural spaces for the development of heritage-related activities?

As the study progressed, and as we came to know more of Monika, her family, her circumstances and her aspirations, so our understanding of heritage deepened. We began to see heritage not simply as something that needs to be safeguarded from the past for the future, though this is doubtless clearly evident here. Thinking about the remaking of heritage, our second question, forced attention onto other notions of heritage which are also in play, in particular heritage *practices*. And our third question led us to an examination of heritage *spaces*, and their production. We drew on Lefebvre (1991 [1974]) and on Li Wei's theorisation of translanguaging space (2011) to develop the idea that space does not solely act as a backdrop or physical site for practice (including translingual practice), but is also co-produced by and in practice. The understanding of heritage in superdiversity was therefore deepened by the study of language and practice in the production of space.

Searches for space become searches for funding, and as our observations carried on, so we saw how heritage becomes commodified and transformed. Linguistic and discursive repertoires around the creation of space for heritage were deployed by Monika and others around her – sometimes successfully and sometimes less so, and with much negotiation. We developed our ideas about interdiscursive translanguaging: following Jakobson's classification of translation (2012 [1959]), we describe interdiscursive translanguaging as the translanguaging across discourses which occurs when there is an unfamiliar discourse that needs to be negotiated. Above all, we gained an understanding of heritage as spatialized social and cultural practice, and of how language, discourse and translanguaging practices can become heritage resources.

So our study evolved to asking questions about what we actually wanted to call 'heritage'. Does our study of heritage being re-made for a new context, and without a home, entail a redefinition of heritage? Would a new definition of heritage challenge established understandings of the term? What would it include or exclude? If heritage is social and cultural practice, what, indeed, is *not* heritage? And finally, what does this suggest about the role of heritage (as we re-define it) in the processes involved in

migration, settlement, and integration? These are some of the questions that emerged, and that we attempted to address, as we carried out the study.

In the remainder of this introduction we meet Monika and her family, through whose experiences we sought our answers, and provide an outline of the rest of the report. We begin with a preliminary overview of Roma cultural heritage in Leeds.

1.2 Introducing Monika: Supporting Roma cultural heritage in Harehills

> *My biggest dream to have something like castle, where I can have children who abandoned, and I can give them life, grow them like care home. Second part of my life is still support other people like I do now.*

So says Monika, a young Slovak woman, our Key Participant (KP) in this phase of the TLang project. Monika aspires to support East European new arrivals in Leeds, and to provide them with a space where they can participate in activities that relate to their cultural heritage.

We first met Monika at Migration Counsel, an advocacy centre in Harehills, Leeds, one of the research sites in the first phase of the TLang project (see Baynham et al. 2015: 28). At Migration Counsel, she was working as the Roma Voice Worker, organizing activities for Roma people in Leeds. We contacted Monika again before the beginning of the current Heritage phase of the project, proposing that she might work with us as our KP. After some hesitation she agreed.

From the beginning of our work on the TLang project in Leeds we have been gaining the sense that engaging Roma people in activities outside the scope of their family and their community is something that many organizations set up to support new arrivals find challenging. We also ascertained from informants in the first phase of the TLang project that getting the parents of Roma children involved in after-school projects and activities is likewise very difficult (see Baynham et al 2015). To be successful, said our earlier informants, any such activity needs to reflect the cultural heritage of the Roma people and their social habits. Working with Monika, then, would allow us to explore the theme of Roma cultural heritage as it was being re-made, newly understood and developed in the new context, the Harehills area of Leeds. Monika herself has a somewhat liminal position with regard to the Roma in Leeds. She self-identifies as Roma, most of the time. She grew up in the south of Slovakia, near the border with Hungary, and spent a good part of her childhood in a children's home (see Section 4 below). Her experiences in the children's home, where Slovakian rather than a Romani language was dominant, have – as we see later – played a large part in her understanding of her relationship to the Roma in Leeds, as well as how cultural heritage might be understood in the new migration context.

During her time as our KP, the activities with which Monika was directly involved were the Roma Voice meetings and the Women's Group. Monika's role with Roma Voice was to develop participation of Roma people at the meetings. Drawing upon her knowledge of social interaction among the Roma people, Monika advertised the meetings on Facebook, distributed leaflets translated into Slovak into schools and other places which they frequented, and worked on spreading the information by word of mouth. The

Women's Group had been set up to address issues relating to health and domestic violence. Knowing that these topics cannot be addressed directly, Monika was trying to attract the women with activities she thought they might enjoy (such as nail painting) before introducing more serious topics.

Through her contacts with Roma people and the organizations working with them, Monika was aware that most activities provided to Roma in Harehills are linked to advocacy and health. She identified a gap in terms of activities reflecting the cultural heritage of the Roma people. As Monika said: *Many kids are talented, they want to dance, they want to sing, they have nowhere to rehearse, there is no-one to stand by them. Many mums stop me, please set up an arts school for us* (LeeHerAud_20150611_JH_022). Through her contacts in the Leeds City Council, Monika started exploring the possibility of obtaining funding to provide arts and dance-related activities for the Harehills-based Roma in Leeds. How could she turn her ideas about supporting Roma cultural heritage in Leeds into a viable and sustainable venture? Monika's endeavors to formulate and clarify her ideas about the services and activities she should offer, and to secure the funding to do so, became a central focus of our observations, and an important part of our analysis.

Monika felt that the areas where she could make a positive contribution to the cultural and social life of the Roma were many – from arts and music activities for children and adults to English language classes and provision of advocacy – but were also at times rather vague. We observed how support from Leeds City Council and other agencies helped Monika develop her ideas in a structured way. Two people – Parmi, who administers Leeds City Council's Bright Ideas fund, and Sharon, from Integrity Endeavour, an agency supporting the development of small businesses – played key roles in helping Monika. During our observation period, she was advised that her ideas could be shaped into a social enterprise. To apply for funding to initiate the enterprise, she had to complete a business plan form. In this process, as we shall see, the original ideas about providing activities relating to cultural heritage were narrowed, and somewhat re-oriented towards the provision of advocacy. Moreover, the business plan form had to be completed in writing, and although Monika had developed good presentation skills, she did not feel confident to fill in the application on her own. A further strand of this report, therefore, is how she gained assistance to complete the form. We pay particular attention to the involvement of Sharon and Parmi, and to how Monika cooperated with Jolana, the researcher on the TLang project, over the form's content and language.

1.3 Monika's family
It was not only Monika who was thinking of setting up activities that would benefit the Roma community. Her brother Ivan and her sister Margita, who came to Leeds around the same time as she did, also live in Harehills (see Section 4.2), and had parallel aspirations to 'set something up', shaped by their own dreams, abilities and experience. At the time of our observations, Ivan and Margita were also being supported by Parmi and Sharon.

Margita hoped to found a cleaning company which would provide work to single mothers in the area. Initially, Monika and Margita had been thinking of working in partnership and sharing office space, but gradually they both reached the conclusion

that it would be better to work independently of one another. Ivan's idea for an enterprise centred on food and music. His dream was to open a Roma café in Harehills offering food, some of it based on Slovakian dishes, as well as music-related activities for the young people in the area. Another part of his plan was to promote music events, featuring Roma artists from Slovakia and the UK. When designing his own business plan, Ivan drew heavily on his experience in Slovakia, where he had volunteered for a charity organizing musical events for the Roma. He also gained inspiration from activities organized in other parts of Leeds and in Bradford.

During our observation period Monika and her siblings spent a lot of time together, including time in Monika's home where she lived with her then-partner Amir, and her two children Philippe and Christian. Recordings of domestic interaction have revealed great linguistic variety not just in Monika's own communicative repertoire but across the household: interlingual translanguaging is a normal part of everyday interaction. Whereas Monika and her siblings appear most comfortable communicating in Slovak, their children have a mostly passive knowledge of Slovak and prefer to speak in English. The adults all speak English, with a varying level of proficiency. Their linguistic repertoires comprise elements of English and Slovak, often side by side in the speech of Monika and her siblings, especially when talking to the children. Several members of Monika's family are also fluent in Hungarian, in addition to Slovak.

1.4 Outline
This report comprises seven sections overall. Following this introduction we discuss, with reference to relevant literature, what heritage might mean for Roma people in Leeds. We discuss how heritage might be identified in the context of this study, considering the commodification of heritage, and the social production of heritage spaces (Lefebvre 1991 [1974]).); in this section we propose an understanding of 'heritage of no fixed abode'. We follow this, in Section 3, with a summary of our methodological approach, data collection strategies, and the data sets upon which this report is based. We explain the roles of the project team: Leeds-based co-investigators Mike Baynham and James Simpson, researchers Jolana Hanusova and John Callaghan, doctoral researcher Jessica Bradley, and visiting researcher Emilee Moore. Our central analyses begin in Section 4 with a study of Monika herself, her personal history, her identity positions vis-à-vis the Roma in Slovakia and in Leeds, how she draws on her cultural resources in her work environments, and her interactions in family and social life. We also include an overview of language patterns evident in her home environment. We then turn in Section 5 to how her ideas about supporting the cultural heritage of Roma people in Leeds are brought closer to fruition but at the same time are transformed. She is advised to set up a social enterprise, and our focus is the development of a business plan for this. Our analyses extend to a study of interlingual and interdiscursive translanguaging practices as she completes the plan. We see how the plan itself becomes a key actor in the process of making her ideas real and marketable. The filling-in of the plan creates a space within which those ideas can develop; but at the same time it constrains and narrows them, pulling her away from her dreams. In Section 6 we examine familiar tokens of cultural heritage, food and music, that play a part in the daily lives of Monika and her family, but are also commodifiable, can be transformed from cultural to economic capital, can become something that provides a living. The concluding Section, 7, summarises the report and discusses its implications.

2 Heritage of No Fixed Abode

2.1 Identifying Heritage

Initially we struggled to identify the heritage theme in the life of our KP Monika. We were aware that heritage for Monika and those around her would be unlikely to appear as identifiable artefacts and practices that were the next in a chain of transmission to subsequent generations of Roma people. This was confirmed as it became clear that there was no place or space in the Harehills area and around, where she lives and works, where Roma heritage was being curated and managed. Because of a lack of a space where heritage was housed and practiced, there did not appear to be a great deal of visible evidence of what heritage might mean for Monika and other Roma in Leeds who had arrived from elsewhere.

In their book on the German diaspora in Canada, Liebscher and Dailey-O'Cain (2013) describe an interesting phenomenon: within less than a generation the regional varieties of German brought to Canada by migrants had levelled out and Standard German was characteristic. However regional variation – which could be understood as heritage – was maintained through social clubs, dance and music groups and cuisines. What is more a North German could find himself gravitating towards a South German dance group. So for the German diaspora in Canada, heritage was in place, or we could say in places, in long-established venues and meeting places. Yet for a recently arrived group like the Roma in Leeds there is no such sense of settled space or place to locate, identify and build an idea of heritage. The spaces which actually do emerge are borrowed, transitory. A hall in a primary school is used for Roma parties, until permission to use it is withdrawn due to too much noise. A pub is a focus for Roma musical events until it is closed down for infringing the licensing laws. Roma cultural activities, therefore, take place in notably impermanent spaces. As we looked around we did identify places where the borrowed space has become semi-permanent, places such as the Thornbury Centre in Bradford, where a committed worker had built up links with local Roma families and networks leading to sustained use of the building. We found nothing like this in Harehills.

Additionally, as we carried out our fieldwork, we found many arts, cultural and community organisations that would love to work with the Roma, but did not have the relevant contacts to do so. The ironical consequence was that on one hand a community desperately wants space for activities, while on the other, organisations – including 'heritage' organisations like museums and art galleries as well as community arts groups – have spaces and are longing to fulfil their diversity remit by working with the Roma, but can falter in their efforts to do so. One of the attempts to bridge this gap was Roma Voice, designed to bring together Roma people with local organizations to create a dialogue and identify needs. Our KP Monika was the worker for Roma Voice.

So we strove, with a certain amount of initial anxiety, to identify the heritage dimension of the research. It appeared to us that there was literally nothing there, except aspirations, plans and dreams, those of both Monika and her brother Ivan. And gradually it dawned on us that it was precisely these plans and dreams, the wish to make something happen and for a place to do it, that were – for Monika and for us – the heritage focus.

At this point our reading was beginning also to tell us that heritage was at best a contested construct. We came across the crucial UNESCO definition of heritage:

> **Cultural heritage** is the legacy of physical artefacts and intangible attributes of a group or society that are inherited from past generations, maintained in the present and bestowed for the benefit of future generations.
>
> **Tangible heritage** includes buildings and historic places, monuments, artefacts, etc., which are considered worthy of preservation for the future. These include objects significant to the archaeology, architecture, science or technology of a specific culture.
>
> <div align="right">(UNESCO Cairo, n.d.)</div>

This made it clear that heritage could be both visible and invisible, in high profile buildings and activities, but also in unobtrusive everyday practices. We will consider the UNESCO definition of *intangible* heritage below. We saw that heritage had taken the 'cultural studies' turn, whereby heritage is evident in the small, everyday manifestations of popular culture, and not just in the high profile iconic canons of art, architecture and literature.

A further problematizing issue for how we construct heritage comes when we consider heritage in the complex superdiverse settings in which we are researching. By definition we are talking about not one heritage but many: heritage in relation to migration and diversity takes a *multicultural* turn. It then follows that not one but many traditions become available in any given site, traditions relating for example to music or ways of eating. Many if not all established definitions of heritage are locked into the notion of an intergenerational chain of transmission, by which cultural practices and artefacts are handed down generation-to-generation. But what if there transpires some kind of market place for cultural practices and traditions? We have seen this already in the Liebscher and Dailey-O'Cain study. The North German is not stuck with North German traditions: he can sample South German. In the new setting there is something approaching a 'pick-and-mix' approach to heritage.

Deumert (forthcoming) proposes the notion of multivocal local heritage discourses and heritage practices: heritage as repertoire. In superdiverse contexts we can think of how individuals might make dynamic identifications with multiple heritage traditions. In a context where more than one inheritance is available, people can adopt and identify with cultural traditions that are not theirs by birth. Obvious examples are religious conversion and coming out. If someone becomes a Muslim they insert themselves into another tradition, acknowledge another tradition. If someone comes out and subsequently self-identifies strongly as gay, then somehow they are inserting themselves into another chain of transmission, one for example where a National Trust house where in the past two men or two women lived together as lovers becomes personal and moving. We can extend this also to affinity groups such as sports and martial arts. In the phase of the TLang research that follows this heritage phase, we study the practices around the Brazilian martial dance *capoeira* (Baynham *et al*. forthcoming). Many capoeira participants have assimilated themselves, often to a great depth, in the inherited practices of capoeira. At a certain point in our heritage phase fieldwork we were entranced by YouTube videos of Roma youth rapping effortlessly

with older Portuguese-speaking African rappers on a street corner in Harehills. Whose heritage is being practiced here? Whose transmission? So our thinking about heritage, as the research evolved, came to distrust the simplistic mode, contained for example in the UNESCO definition of one 'community' or 'culture' transmitting its heritage across the generations. We struggled to find terms for heritage in an age and in a place of superdiversity, thinking of mobile heritage, heritage on the move, heritage of no fixed abode. The lack of a space, a settled place, a *node* in the terms of Zhu Hua and Li Wei et al. (2015), is something particular to the current situation of the Roma. However the pervasive unsticking of heritage from settled chains of transmission is a much more general phenomenon, of theoretical interest because of the light it throws on superdiversity as a construct.

The idea of a multivocal approach to heritage in complex superdiverse settings, going beyond a simple notion of transmission within one community across generations, links therefore in an interesting way with the idea of repertoire. In linguistic terms, we see repertoire as the range of styles and ways of speaking which a speaker has available. We believe that there is much scope in future work for exploring the ways that cultural heritage can be understood as or in relation to repertoire; that is, we can choose to extend our repertoire in terms of what is culturally and artistically available, learn to like opera or drum and bass, just as we might extend our linguistic repertoire. As the study progresses we see how Monika and her family do not restrict themselves to a cultural heritage repertoire that is supposedly Roma in nature, that is strictly linked to Roma inheritance. They too draw upon what is available, and appropriate it in their making of a heritage for the future.

A further factor to consider in the relationship between our KP and her own 'heritage' is that she had a childhood shared between her family home and a children's home. In her interviews and conversations she attributes an important role in her formation as a person to her experience in the children's home, and perhaps surprisingly in quite a positive way. So her heritage involves influences she took from her children's home experience; in fact these are observable in the activities she plans in her project in development. So there are aspects of her heritage which are quite clearly Roma but other aspects which come from somewhere else.

All of these dimensions complicate, we would argue, the idea of heritage as a simple chain of transmission of a particular community to its subsequent generations.

2.2 Heritage housed: A focus on the 'heritage sector'
For our KP in the heritage phase, as we have already established, 'heritage' is something that is not housed in a museum or in an art gallery. We observe a heritage that is mobile, that is 'on the move', but wanting to find a home, to get housed. Here we consider established, housed heritage. We have noted above the irony that cultural arts organizations in the area, because of their inclusion policies, were more than keen to make contact with Roma and involve them in their activities. So how did the ways they understood heritage influence our thinking?

A recent collaborative research project funded under the AHRC's Connected Communities scheme investigating heritage decisions (*How should decisions about heritage be made?*) took for its definition of heritage that which 'we value: places,

buildings, objects, memories, cultures, skills or ways of life' (Graham et al. 2015). Through the data drawn from across our case study we develop an understanding of what it is that Monika *values*, and how she threads that which she values into an idea for a business enterprise. Considering heritage in this way enables us to account for its porosity and fluidity, and to account for the ways and means by which Monika develops her plan and her decision-making throughout this process.

Our case study represents an early stage, grass-roots approach to preserving heritage. It may well be that the process of migration itself enables something that has hitherto been a taken-for-granted part of everyday life to be identified as heritage. That which is valued by Monika becomes the heritage she wishes to preserve and transmit, but which also becomes transformed in the new migration context. We can contrast this with approaches by more established institutions such as those in the museums sector. Similarly, we observed top-down approaches by organisations and their representatives in their interactions with Monika around the business plan she is obliged to develop. By bringing together our data sets and ethnographic observations across the process of writing a business plan (Section 5), we start to unpack the process of *preserving heritage*. We also see an asymmetry, or even a disconnect. Heritage is 'that which is valued' by Monika, yet its preservation depends on it being shaped and squeezed into a functional and fundable business plan. Can 'that which is valued' be preserved in the business plan itself? And if it cannot be preserved in the business plan, can it be preserved for the future?

Later in this section (2.4) we consider heritage in relation to the creation of space, making reference to the work of Lefebvre (1991 [1974]). Rogers, when considering Lefebvre's trialectics of space, states (in a voice that he imagines as Lefebvre's):

> ... space is not some vacuum waiting to be filled by people, but rather it is actively constructed and produced. Societies that fail to produce their own special spaces simply don't survive – rather they recede into folklore.
>
> (Rogers, 2002: 25)

Monika's heritage project in Harehills can be conceptualised as an endeavour which seeks to produce a Roma cultural space and therefore preserve and transmit to others that which, for her, is important. Her business plan, designed to realize her dream, represents an active construction and production of space, the aim of which will be to provide a physical space for activities and support for the Roma community. The business plan is emergent and the activities tentative.

We can consider further how we conceptualise heritage for our KP Monika by reaching across disciplines to the arts, for example, and in particular from research around policy, heritage institutions, galleries, museums and libraries. This enables us to contextualise Monika's project in the wider area of heritage preservation, as constructed and produced by bigger and more established organisations and institutions. Access to heritage preservation is achieved through participation. Yet *participation* in exhibitions by 'hard to reach' or the 'least engaged' groups (Arts Council England, n.d.) is an area of concern for the sector, as noted above. In the Arts Council's 'Creative Case for Diversity' (Arts Council 2015), chair Sir Peter Bazalgette states that the 'promotion of diversity is now a collective responsibility' with an emphasis on 'challenging the barriers to

participation and engagement across socio-economic barriers and across geography'. This 'broadening' of audiences within the sector is foregrounded within the Creative Case for Diversity. Jancovich (2015) argues for a diversifying of those involved in arts and participation decision-making, in order to increase and widen access to the arts in a meaningful way. For her, changes at a funding distribution level are required to rebalance arts policymaking, and make it more 'public facing' (2015: 13). Public facing *participatory* activities formed a core part of the British Art Show (BAS8), touring across four cities (including Leeds) in 2015-16, with performances, poetic and spoken word responses and a network of connected third sector organisations and creative practitioners involved (http://britishartshow8.com). Thus, the exhibition was connected to 'communities' in Leeds through a thickened web of networks and through an ambassadorial programme. Yet, for Monika, heritage institutions were not on her radar, were not part of her personal conceptualisation of heritage, were not in her business plan, nor in how she wished to build her project.

Helen Graham (2013) interrogates and problematizes the notion of access in the museums sector through analysing the Museums for Us project at the Smithsonian Institution. Graham describes museums as 'allowing things for the past to be preserved so that they exist into the future' (2013: 64). Participation here shifts towards the question of *whose* things from the past are preserved and therefore *whose* heritage exists in the future. If this is the case, both the institutions themselves and the surrounding communities rely on participation to 'survive', to preserve heritage and to not 'recede into folklore', as Rogers (above) warns.

UNESCO defines *intangible heritage* as follows:

> The intangible cultural heritage is submitted from generation to generation, and is constantly recreated by communities and groups, in response to their environment, their interaction with nature, and their history. It provides people with a sense of identity and continuity, and promotes respect for cultural diversity and human creativity.
>
> (UNESCO, n.d.)

Heritage, in this case *that which is intangible*, is defined as something that is passed on, yet also recreated. With Monika we see a life displaced, a continuity ruptured. Nonetheless she attempts to think of heritage as something that allows her to reimagine continuity and the future for her family.

2.3 Heritage as Business
Arguably therefore, as has been suggested above, we need to understand Monika's approach to heritage, not in terms of public institutions as such, but as an attempt to transform her available cultural capital into something that will not only preserve and consolidate heritage for the future but will also earn her a living. All the heritage-related organizations we have so far mentioned are in the same position – seeking funding to continue their work, albeit at different scales. In Monika and Ivan's case, there is small scale funding available for small projects. They are in discussions with officers of Leeds City Council about this. Longer term and more substantial social enterprise funding that they seek will enable them to realize their dreams: of a centre with art activities and other things such as advice-giving for Monika, and of a café with arts and music

activities for Ivan. What a 'social enterprise' actually is, is contested: social enterprises are understood differently in different places. The UK government defines a social enterprise as 'a business that has social, charitable or community-based objectives' (https://www.gov.uk/set-up-a-social-enterprise), clearly a broad definition, and one which encompasses limited companies, charities, cooperatives, community interest companies (actually Monika's eventual concern) and other types of sole trader or business partnerships.

To gain any sort of funding for a social enterprise, a business plan is essential. In this case study the business plan thus became the focus of our understanding of what Monika and Ivan were trying to do. Another important intersection in our understanding about heritage came, therefore, when we started to identify its connections with business, the theme of the first TLang case study (Baynham et al. 2015). As well as big public institutions like museums, art galleries and libraries, we find heritage collocating with industry, business and tourism: heritage industry, heritage business, heritage tourism. Here is a definition of heritage tourism from the American National Trust for Historic Preservation:

> The National Trust defines heritage tourism as "traveling to experience the places, artefacts and activities that authentically represent the stories and people of the past," and heritage tourism can include cultural, historic and natural resources.
>
> (National Trust for Historic Preservation, n.d.)

It seems there is money to be made from heritage. Heritage can be an industry, a business. We find Monika and Ivan attempting to identify aspects of their inherited knowledge and skills which can be turned into a business, a small-scale social enterprise, something that can establish them and sustain them, while at the same time promoting activities with a specifically Roma focus. In effect they are putting their heritage, their *Roma-ness* to work for them.

We encountered something similar, though distinctly different, when we interviewed a Leeds-based artist, Zuzana Marekova, about Slovak cultural heritage. Doctoral researcher on the TLang project Jessica Bradley met Zuzana at an arts conference. Jessica identified Zuzana as someone who drew upon Slovak cultural traditions in the art she practiced in the UK, and hence would be able to contribute to a discussion on the remaking of Slovak cultural heritage in a new migration context. Zuzana, like Monika, is from Slovakia, but is not Roma. It was not until she had been living in the UK for some time that she began to consider her homeland as a source of inspiration for her art: *I fell in love with my own country and the history and thinking about how people use to live, what the traditions were, what the beliefs were, and then, taking the national costumes and the embroidery and all that* (LeeHerIn_20150731_JH_005). Folkloric elements of Slovak culture are appropriated in her artwork: traditional costumes and embroidery, all mobile and portable heritage elements which can be handed down or transformed into something different, and something to make a living from.

There are echoes here of the discussion initiated by Monica Heller (2003) on the commodification of language and identity. Heller notes a shift of understanding of language as a marker of ethnonational identity (French, in her case, in francophone

Canada) to 'understanding language as being a marketable commodity on its own, distinct from identity.' She links this to an observed commodification of authenticity, 'sometimes in the form of cultural products (music, crafts, dance, for example), and often with no link to language.' In a similar vein, Kathryn Woolard examines how Catalan culture was branded, in the context of the 2007 Frankfurt Book Fair, as 'an opportunity to project and legitimate a vision of Catalonia for domestic audiences.' In the run up to preparation for the fair, when Catalan culture itself was the guest of honour, competing visions of the place of the Catalan and Castilian languages in Catalan society were publicly pitted against each other in the media and in cultural policy circles in the three years of preparations for the Frankfurt Fair.

If a nation's language and cultural identity can be commodified, then why not its heritage? Pietikäinen (2013) and Kelly-Holmes (2013) among others have noted how minority languages have been appropriated in the service of heritage tourism, entailing a shift from identity marker to commodity. Interestingly in our study, Roma languages are typically invisible in discussions of Roma heritage (cf. Payne, forthcoming). Roma cultural heritage is available for commodification one way or another, but not Roma languages.

2.4 Heritage space and place: Lefebvre

In our report of the first case study of the TLang project, we drew attention to the aspirations of Roma people in terms of 'cultural spaces' and the 'potential for enterprise' within this area (Baynham et al. 2015: 18). With this, our second case study, we are able to observe the actual processes involved in developing an idea to access and create 'cultural' or 'heritage' *spaces*. This has also involved observing how this process is worked into a business plan for a community interest company. When considering our heritage theme, and analysing linguistic and ethnographic data around the trajectory of Monika's business plan, we have developed our framework based on the work on space of the French philosopher Henri Lefebvre (1991 [1974]).

For Lefebvre, space:

> ... has now become more than the theatre, the disinterested stage or setting, of action. Space does not eliminate the other materials or resources that play a part in the socio-political arena, be they raw materials or the most finished of products, be they businesses or 'culture'. Rather, it brings them all together and then in a sense substitutes itself for each factor separately by enveloping it.
>
> (Lefebvre 1991 [1974]: 410).

We therefore consider space not solely terms of the settings and the spaces within which Monika attends meetings and writes her business plan, but in terms of social space, drawing from Lefebvre's trialetics of space (Lefebvre 1991 [1974]; see also Schmid 2008; Rogers 2002). Key for our later analysis are the ideas that: (i) space stands for simultaneity, the synchronic order of social reality (while time denotes the diachronic, historical); (ii) social space is socially produced; (iii) 'social relations ... have a social existence to the extent that they have a spatial existence' (Lefebvre 1991 [1974]: 129); (iv) the social production of space involves three interacting dimensions or processes, the tensions between which result in the contradictory nature of social reality; (v) viewed phenomenologically these trialectics are:

- *perceived space* (*espace perçu)* – material space, sensuously perceived, resulting from articulation and connection of activities (e.g. through walking), and therefore competence;
- *conceived space (espace conçu)* – analytical, emerges at the level of discourse, plans, maps, pictures, and signs; involves the production of knowledge and therefore discursive competence; 'which are tied to the relations of production and to the 'order' which those relations impose, and hence to knowledge, to signs, to codes, and to 'frontal' relations' (Lefebvre 1991 [1974]: 33);
- *lived space (espace veçu)* – the lived experience in the practice of everyday life, not exhausted by theoretical analysis; but also, space as it might be, fully lived by the 'whole person', beyond normative orders, utopian, clandestine, subversive; the space of aspirations, dreams, impulses, which bursts forth in moments of 'presence' to trouble the settled compromises of life (Shields 1999: 161).

These are 'enveloped' together, as 'space is at once perceived, conceived, and lived' (Schmid 2008:43). According to Schmid, Lefebvre's epistemology shifts 'from the subject that thinks, acts, and experiences to the process of the social production of thought, action, and experience' (2008: 41). This shift from a subject's thinking to the social production of thought and action enables us to consider the business plan, and the interactions around the plan, as an emergent space where negotiation occurs.

For Lefebvre:

> In the immediacy of the links between groups, between members of groups, and between 'society' and nature, occupied space gives direct expression – 'on the ground', so to speak – to the relationships upon which social organisation is founded.
>
> (Lefebvre 1991 [1974]: 229)

These relationships construct the social space around Monika's plan. These relationships occupy a space that is contested, a 'contact zone' (Pratt 1987, 1992). The space becomes a site of conflict, of power relations, of translation across languages and discourses, and of struggle. Gaston Bachelard's work *The Poetics of Space* (1958) is one of Lefebvre's influences: he draws on Bachelard's focus on 'living and dwelling' (Schmid, 2008:38). Schmid argues that Lefebvre's theories are 'marked out' in Bachelard's work. For Cresswell (2015), a cultural and social geographer, the notion of *place* aligns with Lefebvre's theorisation of space as a social construct, and is 'both simple and complicated' (2015: 7). Cresswell considers place as a space 'made meaningful' (2015: 12), incorporating both the material and the imaginary. He states:

> As well as being located and having a material, visual form, places must have some relationship to humans, and the human capacity to produce and consume meaning.
>
> (Cresswell 2015: 14)

It is these human relationships that our data foreground, across the processes of producing the business plan, and the production of space. If we take Cresswell's statement that 'place is not a thing in the world but a way of understanding the world'

(2015: 18) we can ask ourselves: What does it mean to search for a place, a place in which to plan and carry out cultural activities, a place in which to meet and to be together, a place in which to build a community? How is our understanding of the world shaped by social space?

With Monika our data take us from formal spaces to informal spaces (*spatial practices*, or *espace conçu* in Lefebvre's terms). Yet the '*problematic of space*', for Lefebvre, is one that is entirely theoretical, and one which concerns 'mental and social space, about their interconnections' (1991 [1974]: 413). We observe the production of a space around the business plan, one that is socially constructed around the aspiration for Monika to direct a small community interest company and for those in institutions such as Leeds City Council to successfully advise her towards this objective. In this sense the business plan is an actor, in the terms elaborated in Actor Network Theory (Latour 2005): it makes or will make something happen.

2.5 Space and language
Lefebvre drew inspiration from the Freudian-influenced Surrealists who sought 'to decode inner space and illuminate the nature of the transition from this subjective space to the material realm of the body and the outside world, and thence to social life' (Lefebvre 1991 [1974]: 18). We see the current phase of the TLang project as having great relevance for the study of language, migration, and settlement, believing, like Malafouris, that, 'brains, bodies, and things conflate, mutually catalyzing and constituting one another' (2013: 5) and that whilst 'humans, more than any other species, make things … those things, in return, make us who or what we are' (p.8). Consequently, we engage with ecological, embodied, extended, and distributed theories of cognition (Bateson 1972; Hutchins 1995; Goodwin, 1996; Clark and Chalmers 1998; Goodwin, 2008; Clark 2011; Cowley 2011). As a logical extension of this we take a 'distributed' view of language – of language as an activity (languaging) which is ecological, dialogical, and scalar (Cowley 2011). In this account, following Steffensen (2011), language cannot be explained by reference to a 'language system' (i.e. 'a semiotic system for communication') but is 'irreducibly bound up with real-time metabolic activity (e.g. voice dynamics, gaze and task-oriented modes of action)'. Language gains its cognitive power, not from how individuals use it, but from how they adapt to socially-constructed ecological niches. Language functions metaphorically (as 'airborne synapses') in distributed cognitive systems extending beyond the individual mind/body to include other people (minds/bodies), objects, places, and cultural tools. Finally language understood in this way provides an extended ecology in which social actors may engage in languaging.

2.6 Summary
The research questions that emerge from these introductory sections are around communication practices in superdiverse inner city wards. We are interested in language practices, in languaging and in translanguaging, and how they relate to the creation and remaking of heritage. We restate our three initial questions here:
- How can heritage be understood, in contexts of superdiversity and mobility?
- What are the linguistic and semiotic practices which contribute to the remaking of heritage in migration contexts?
- How do language and broader semiosis produce cultural spaces for the development of heritage-related activities?

In seeking to produce a Roma cultural space, our KP Monika is attempting to build a heritage for the future, to take what is important and to pass it on. To do so, she must engage with the funding regimes and processes that will both support and constrain her, if she is to be successful. Space has emerged as salient and highly relevant in our analysis: she wishes to create a space for her enterprise, and the activity that she undergoes to do so happens in space. Our understanding of space hence extends beyond that of physical place, as outlined above. Space can be co-produced by language and discourse practices. Indeed according to Schmid's analysis of Lefebvre's spatial theories, 'activity in space establishes a system that corresponds to the system of words up to a certain point' (2008: 36). Attention to language in the production of space, as we will see in Section 5, therefore enables a deeper insight into the concept of heritage in superdiversity.

3 Methodology

3.1 Approach

In common with all the case studies in the TLang project, our study of translanguaging and translation in the domain of heritage in Leeds adopts visual linguistic ethnography as an approach. As discussed in the first Leeds case study report (Baynham et al. 2015), linguistic ethnography stresses the importance of reflexivity, foregrounds issues of context, and highlights 'the primacy of direct field experience in establishing interpretive validity' (Maybin and Tusting 2011: 517). It enables us to gain a rounded understanding of communicative resources, and in our case, the role of multilingualism and other forms of semiosis where multiple repertoires are in play:

> The ethnographic approach is characterised by participant observation over time, in-depth systematic data collection from various sources such as field notes, open-ended interviews and inductive analysis initiated during data collection, a focus on patterns in situated practice, and on the whole ecology of a particular setting. ... A *visual* linguistic ethnography attends to the visual and spatial semiotic dimension of meaning, bringing in attention to physical positioning, the semiotic landscape and the written environment of the fieldwork sites.
>
> (Baynham et al. 2015: 25)

This present report does not attend in detail to the visual semiotic dimension of our work: there is a separate report that focuses specifically on this area. A visual study of the history and geography of the area where our Key Participant Monika lives and works can be found in Callaghan (2015).

Our approach lends itself well to working with one Key Participant. As noted in our introduction, Monika was hesitant in accepting our invitation to work with her on the project. We therefore acknowledge that there are risks involved with working with just one KP for each phase of the study. Over-reliance on a small number of key informants carries risks: see for example the critique of Margaret Mead's work in Samoa by Derek Freeman (1999), who maintained that she had been hoaxed by some of her participants. A further risk is that relying on one key informant in an area risks isolating researchers who view that key informant in an adversarial way (Fetterman 1989). Fortunately Monika agreed to work with us, and proved to be an open, informative and cooperative participant.

3.2 Data collection and analytical strategies

Data collection with Monika was carried out mainly by TLang researchers Jolana Hanusova and John Callaghan, with contributions from Leeds-based co-investigators Mike Baynham and James Simpson, and doctoral researcher Jessica Bradley. Jolana Hanusova is an expert user of Czech and Slovak, enabling her to carry out the ethnographic observations and also to interview many participants in the languages with which they have the greatest competence. John has a particular interest in visual methods, expertise which contributed to the linguistic landscape study that accompanies this report. Analyses of different data sets, and draft sections of this report, were written by the project team, who were joined in late 2015 by visiting researcher Emilee Moore de Luca.

Timetable for data collection

Dates	Activity
March to June 2015	Observation in KP's work environments. 22 sets of field notes
May to June 2015	Observation and audio-recording (17 hours) of KP's work environments
May to June 2015	Observation and audio-recording (20 hours) of KP's home environment
June 2015	Collection of Facebook and other social media data
May to July 2015	10 interviews with KP, KP's advisors, co-workers and other stakeholders
March to June 2015	Collection of Linguistic Landscaping data: Approx. 400 photos taken in KP's home, neighbourhood, and places of work. Observation and interviews with KP, neighbourhood residents, co-workers

Individual data sets and analyses

As noted in our introduction, we made contact with Monika during the first phase of the TLang project, in 2014. At the beginning of March 2015, we started observing Monika during her working hours at Migration Counsel. We also observed and recorded Monika and her siblings Ivan and Margita during the meetings they had with those who were advising them, principally Parmi, of Leeds City Council, and Sharon, of the organisation Integrity Endeavour. Interviews took place with Monika, her family, those who supported her, and other stakeholders.

Whereas some of the meetings Monika attended were pre-planned and regular, others were arranged in reaction to the latest development of her business idea. The pattern of observations reflected the constantly changing nature of the process, leading us to observe at places and in contexts unforeseen both by us and by Monika. In the domestic environment, the decision of what data to collect was in Monika's hands. She chose to audio-record mostly everyday conversations with her children, but also her visits to her siblings, during which their business ideas were often discussed. It also provided us with an insight into Monika's social life, e.g. through the recording of Margita's birthday party. Monika's home was photographed extensively in a 'walking with video style' exercise (Pink, 2007), which included an ethnographic conversation (transcription 8,500 words).

Field notes

The team collected 22 sets of fieldnotes during the observation period, between March and June 2015. The fieldnote analysis was collated around five themes that emerged as significant in our fieldwork:

- The person and life history of Monika, and her work practices
- People and organizations which support Monika and Ivan in their search for funding
- The importance of space
- The role of space in the funding process
- In conclusion: taking a critical perspective on heritage, 'heritage of no fixed abode'

In producing the interim fieldnote report we found that there was considerable overlap between the emergent themes. The nature and definition of *heritage* for example was addressed at a number of points.

Interviews
We approached our initial interview analysis around the same five themes that emerged from our fieldwork analysis. As with the fieldwork data we found overlap across the themes. We interviewed:

- Monika herself (2 interviews)
- Ivan, Monika's brother
- Parmi, attached to Leeds City Council's migrant access project (2 interviews)
- Zuzana Marekova, an artist based in Leeds
- MH, an academic and researcher on Roma migration, based in Leicester
- JM, Catch and The Hub
- JB, Angolan rapper and music producer
- JP, Thornbury Centre / LACO project

Summaries of these interviews formed the basis of an interim interview report.

Audio recordings
Audio-recordings in the work-related environment were taken by Jolana Hanusova, whereas Monika herself was responsible for the data collection in the domestic environment. Monika was given one of the two project recorders, and was trained in its use by Jolana. During the period of the domestic recording, the two would swap the recorders regularly so that Jolana could save the domestic data. As noted above, the boundaries between the domestic and work setting were not as clear as we had imagined they might be, as many business-related activities actually took place at Monika's home (e.g. filling in the business plan form with Jolana). In total, Jolana took over 17 hours of work-related recording, and Monika provided us with around 20 hours of home-based recordings. These were then roughly transcribed by Jolana; as part of an initial overview analysis, the team identified specific extracts to transcribe in detail. These became the basis of interim audio recording reports.

Social media
Monika's use of social media was documented by the researchers over the course of the 22 observations in work and public spaces and in Monika's home between March and June 2015, and in two semi-formal interviews. We identified Monika's smartphone as her main tool for phoning, texting and accessing the internet. She also bought a computer, around a month before the end of our work with her, which she uses for activities related to setting up her business. On the internet, Monika accesses mainly Facebook and email, and mostly uses her smartphone to do this. In the analytical report on Monika's social media practices, we focus on her use of Facebook, the most prominent of her social media activities. This work will be integrated into a report of social media use across all the Heritage case studies in the four TLang project sites, which will ultimately become available in the TLang Working Papers series. In the current report we touch on Facebook in relation to online space, transnational communication, identity and heritage.

Photography and semiotic landscape
Photography, in combination with ethnographic interviewing and participant observation, was used to investigate the semiotic landscapes of the public and private settings of Monika's everyday life. Our approach was based on the assumption that social space both produces and is produced by social actors as a result of a trialectic involving the material/sensory, conceptual/discursive, and lived/imagined/dreamed (Lefebvre, 1991 [1974], see Sections 2 and 5). Visual ethnographic methods were used to explore each of these overlapping and interdependent aspects of production from the perspective of the KP and others who share these spaces. The house/home became a particular focus, both historically (through narrative) and currently, as a primal significant kind of space which may frame understandings of all spaces beyond (Bachelard 1958; Cresswell 2015), including work spaces. Details will appear in a separate Linguistic Landscaping report, focusing specifically on this area.

3.3 Researcher positionality and ethical issues
Our second case study both led on from and built upon our first in terms of its geographical location and the people and groups with whom we were working. As noted in 2.3, heritage in this case study relates closely to business, as people try to set up a business where they can transform their cultural heritage-related capital into economic capital. For Klara, the KP in the first phase of the project in Leeds, we observed through our data how heritage was preserved in the home. For Monika, we observed how heritage was woven into a business plan.

The theme of heritage, and the situation in which our key participant, Monika, found herself in – that of having to prepare a business plan – led to a different methodological approach by researcher Jolana Hanusova. Section 5 below, covering the period during which we observed Monika, follows the trajectory of this plan: over this time Jolana attended meetings with Monika, socialised with Monika and her family and spent many hours in the family home. We observe through our data the processes of putting the plan together and the advice, guidance and shaping which takes place during the interactions with the agencies supporting Monika. Jolana's role becomes one which shifts over time from that of observer to that of an advisor. Thomson and Gunter (2011) discuss the fluidity of the researcher's positioning in ethnographic research, using Bauman's 'fluid identities' (2000) to explore how their own identities shifted during a research project in school. For Jolana, her role shifted to that of assisting, advising, making suggestions towards, and even typing up Monika's business proposal. Her presence and the time she spent in different spaces, observing and participating in the multiple interactions, enabled her to gain an insight into the assembling of an application to set up a social enterprise. Monika would draw on Jolana's experiences and expertise, and would often incorporate Jolana's suggestions or comments (as well as those of Parmi and Sharon) into her developing plan. All her utterances are shaped by the voices that precede hers, and anticipate those that will follow (Bakhtin 1981): the voices of others are very prominent in the development of the business plan. We see, for example, the inclusion of *karate* at one point, which has been inspired by a conversation with Jolana, who herself practises karate.

Jane Wills' (2012) research on London Citizens was conducted from the position of being engaged with the organisation, and having established a relationship with the group over a decade. Wills talks of an 'epistemology of engagement' (2012: 120), and

writes about the insights she gained from this insider positioning. Jolana's increasing involvement allowed for what Wills describes as a 'more emotional style of learning', which, in turn, also characterised our own team discussions around and analysis of the data. For Wills, this epistemology is aligned with that of Gibson-Graham and their call for 'performative ontological' projects (2008: 613), which seek to explore our own resources and methodologies as researchers and the possibilities for these when conducting research outside the academy.

3.4 Transcription conventions
A variety of analytical approaches is taken to the transcribed audio data, ranging from thematic analysis to detailed conversation analysis to ethnopoetics. Hence the format and level of detail in the transcriptions we are using also varies. Where relevant and appropriate, a note is made at the beginning of an analytical section to explain any particular details in the transcription. Typically, when quoting directly from interviews and fieldnotes, we use italics, and a note is made of the source interview according to the convention developed for the project. Much of the audio data is transcribed in plain text, with the original in the left-hand column and the translation in the right. As with the interview and fieldnote data, project-specific codes are used to identify the source. Thus *LeeHerInt_20150723_JS_01* refers to the first Leeds-based heritage case study interview carried out by James Simpson on 23 July 2015; *LeeHerAud_20150619_JH_019* refers to the 19th audio recording made by Jolana Hanusova on 19 June 2015.

4 Monika

4.1 Introduction

Monika makes a very interesting Key Participant in terms of her attitude towards her Roma heritage and the position she occupies in relation to the Roma community living in Harehills. Through our data, we look into how Monika's Roma heritage and personal history is reflected in the way she works with the community and her personal life.

4.2 Personal history

Monika grew up in Southern Slovakia, a region with a significant Hungarian minority. Monika's family is Roma. Her mother (but not her father) identifies as a Vlax Roma, the second-largest group in the common classification of the Roma people of Slovakia and the Czech Republic (see Baynham et al. 2015 Section 2 for a discussion of the Roma in the Czech Republic and Slovakia). At the age of 4, Monika was placed in a children's home, along with some of her siblings. Although Monika once described the circumstances of being taken from her parents as somewhat traumatic, she speaks about the time in the children's home in very positive terms, claiming she has made many friends there with whom she is in contact even today. Monika says she especially liked the environment where all the children, Roma or not, were treated equally, the sense of mutual support in the home, as well as the sports activities and trips the home organized for the children.

The fact that she was placed in care, however, did not mean that Monika lost contact with her Roma family and Roma heritage altogether. She mentions that during the holidays she would occasionally visit her father, who worked as a caretaker and taught her some cooking. She had little or no contact with her mother through her childhood, however.

Monika lived in the children's home until the age of 18, in 2006. When she had to leave, she was given a sum of money. Once she had spent this, wondering what to do next, she decided to move to Leeds with her then-partner, to live with her biological mother. She lived with her mother for only a short time before finding her own place. It was around this time that Monika's sons Philippe and Christian were born. In the following years, some of Monika's siblings moved to Leeds as well: her brother Ivan and sisters Margita, Lenka and Milena. Monika then started working as a volunteer and later as an employee at Migration Counsel, and moved to a house just outside Harehills, where, at the time of the study, she was living with her partner Amir and her two sons.

4.3 Monika's cultural background

At the time when we were working with Monika, she had been living in the UK for nine years, since she was 18. After her arrival in the UK, Monika had to construct a new life. When considering the culture that she might have brought with her, the country of origin (Slovakia) and ethnic background (Roma, gypsy) come to her mind. She has little sense of common culture, just individual ways of choosing how to live; when talking she stresses her individual choices, rather than the influence of lived experience, and expresses a dislike of defined cultural norms that should be followed, although she does recognize that some things are passed down in a family.

```
J:  But would you call that culture, that you're passing on?
M:  Yeah, I can call this culture, but if you say culture then lots
    of different things about culture, you know?
J:  For example?
M:  No one explain that to me, words that mean culture, example,
    yeah?
J:  So you don't have a clear idea yourself.
M:  No. So and second when you said earlier again -if you explain it
    then I can answer it, but if you don't explain me, then I just
    don't know.
```

She brought with her the experience of the children's home, and her Roma heritage, as she knew it from her very early childhood and through the relationship she had with her father. In the UK, Monika was in contact with her mother and siblings, many Roma people in Harehills, as well as people of other nationalities and ethnicities living in the superdiverse neighbourhoods of the ward. Monika shared the experience of migrating into the UK with many of these people. In addition to this, Monika's particular ways of being and doing (her *historical body* or *habitus* – Bourdieu 1984) have also undoubtedly been shaped by her work environment and her professional contacts, just as she contributes to shaping them.

Monika's Roma-ness

Despite her background and despite having Roma parents, Monika says that it was only after her arrival in the UK that she started learning about the Roma and their ways. For example, it was only in the UK that she became aware of the distinctions between the different Roma groups (e.g. Vlax and non-Vlax). Directly following her arrival Monika was in contact with her mother and later also with her siblings. We should note however that most of them had been placed into care like Monika and therefore did not grow up amongst Roma either. Monika also had a close friend who identified as Vlax Roma, who she saw a lot during the time of our observation.

It is relevant to note that Monika discusses 'the Roma' as if they were a homogeneous group, using formulations such as 'my people' or simply 'them' or 'us'. This extends to how she talks of habits or behaviours of the Roma as a whole, and from which she – at times – distances herself. Reyes (2004) discusses stereotypes as a circulating resource in conversational interaction. She traces how:

> Asian American teen participants invoke Asian American stereotypes, orient to them in various ways, and reappropriate them to: 1) position the self and other relative to stereotypes; 2) construct stereotyping as an oppressive practice to resist or as an interactional resource to celebrate; and 3) bring about interactional effects from widely circulating stereotypes (e.g., Asian storeowner) that are different from those from locally circulating typifications (e.g., Asian minivan driver).

> (Reyes 2004: 173)

There is clearly the potential for further future work (beyond the scope of this report) on how 'the Roma' are identified, stereotyped and constructed, by Roma and non-Roma alike, in ways analogous to Reyes' Asian Americans. In this section however we only

note occasions when Roma-ness and Roma stereotyping appears to be used as a discursive resource to accomplish social actions.

Monika positions herself openly as Roma, and her openness in claiming a Roma cultural and ethnic heritage is in contrast with the frequent cases of denial of Roma ethnicity in the Czech Republic and Slovakia as a result of discrimination of this group. Monika's Facebook profile contains a great number of 'likes' relating to Roma identity and cultural heritage in some way, indexed through the words *Gipsy*, *Cigáni*, *Romské*, *Rom* and *Romane*. The picture of the Roma flag superimposed on a fist with a raised thumb links to the page *jsem hrdý na to že jsem Rom* (I'm proud to be Roma).

It is probable that Monika's awareness of her Roma heritage was increased by working at Migration Counsel, through which she participated in events promoting the rights of Roma as well as other migrant groups. In addition to this, an open and positive attitude towards Roma heritage was essential in her work as Roma Voice Worker, where she found herself in a mediating role, representing Roma to the British authorities as well as acting as a role model for the Roma community. Although we cannot be sure about what her attitude would have been had she stayed in Slovakia, it is very likely that after moving to the UK, Monika started looking at her Roma identity with new eyes (cf. the experience of Slovak artist Zuzana Marekova; see Section 2 above). Migration for Monika, might have clarified and crystallised, but possibly also problematized, a hitherto taken-for-granted sense of identity, in her case a Roma identity. She remains ambivalent, however.

Monika's position in the Harehills Roma community
As mentioned, Monika did not grow up within a Roma family and consequently her childhood and youth were different in many aspects from that of other Roma. Monika occupies a liminal position as a Roma woman in Harehills, not feeling entirely an insider. Moreover she senses that she behaves differently in certain situations than other Roma people might. In the extract below Monika explains how the time in the children's home affected her parenting behaviour. In this and similar transcribed extracts of audio data, the original is on the left and a translation on the right. Note the use of 'our people' juxtaposed with the personal pronoun 'they' (both highlighted in bold) to speak about the Roma:

JH hele ale mě přišlo děsně zajímavý jak řikala včera tá... za Zoe, ten ten klub pro ty mladý.

M uh-uh. Jenže nevim jestli naši by išli k druhým. Já som to zkúšela ich tlačit na zumbu, nejdú.

JH ale mladý lidi sou jiný

M ale teraz rodič jich musí pustit. To je na víkend.

JH to je, to je na víkend, jakože tam přespěj?

M ona to vysvětlovala akože tam spia. Preto som jí povedala, to ani nieskúšaj. Ona to chcela nabídnut tomu chlapcovi, ne, osmnáctiročnému

JH jo, no no no no no

M a ona na víkend, že, ji hovorim, to nieskúšaj. To je zbytočně ti to budem prekladat teraz. On ti aj tak poví, ne, musim sa spitať mamy, a čo poví mama?

JH ani omylem (laughs)

(...)

56:33 – 57:10

M já bysom moje trebas poslala, keby som si uveril-, overila tu spoločnosť

JH no

M kdo to robí, keby som byla stopercent istá že sú tam dospelí ľudia pri nich

JH no jasně

M a všecko... insurant a všecko majú.

JH nó

M já by som moje deti poslala, aj na štrnáct dní, já som chodila.

JH na tábory? Ježiš já sem byla na táboře [...]

M bože, však to je nádhera

JH když mi bylo málo, no

M já som v dětskom domove čo si já pamätam byla čtyry ro-, od čtyroch rokov

JH no

M jo

JH no

M a já si pamätam my sme už vtedy chodili na výlety, sice sme tam mali výchošky

JH jasně, no

M ale sme chodili do iných *krajin*

JH hm, já vim

M a já by som chcela poslat moje děti aj tuto já nevim niekam na

JH look I found it really interesting like yesterday she was saying... Zoe, that club for young people

M uh-uh. But I don't know if **our [people]** would go to other people. I've tried push them to go to zumba, **they** won't go.

JH but young people are different

M but then the parent needs to let them go. That's for a weekend.

JH is it, is it for the weekend, like they'll sleep over there?

M she was explaining it like they sleep there. That's why I told her, don't even try it. She wanted to offer it to the boy, no, the eighteen-year-old one

JH yea, yea, yea, yea

M and she for the weekend, I tell her, don't try it. There's no use in me translating it for you now. He'll tell you, no, I need to ask mum, and what will mum say?

JH no way (laughs)

M I would even send mine [children], if I double-, doublechecked the company

JH yea

M who organizes it, if I was hundred percent sure that there are adults with them

JH yea sure

M and everything... insurance and everything they have

JH yea

M I'd send my children, even for fourteen days, I used to go

JH camping? Jesus I was going camping [...]

M god, it's beautiful

JH when I was little, yea

M I was in the children's home from what I remember four yea-, since I was four

JH hm

M yea

JH hm

M and I remember even then we were going on trips, although the carers were there with us

JH sure, yea

M but we were going *abroad*

JH hm, I know

M and I would like to send my kids even here I don't know

```
    víkend, ale já to vidím inač lebo        somewhere for the weekend, but I
    já som inač vyrástala než oni.           see it differently as I grew up
                                             different from them.
```

Monika speaks of having been placed in the children's home as being her good 'luck', and associates Roma people in Harehills with negative social habits such as lack of respect and politeness. These for her do not constitute a part of 'gypsy' heritage, which she relates to the language ('speaking gypsy') and respectful habits ('doing gypsy'):

> (LeeHerAud_20150619_JH_020)
> ```
> M:      you know, I am gypsy, but when I go Harehills I feel awful. I
>         [...] to oh, this is gypsy, and they say why you say gypsy,
>         you are gypsy (laughs)
> JH:     yea, well
> Amir:   [...]
> M:      But I don't get it because... ok, my luck was I grow up
>         different, yea. Without mummy and daddy. So they teach me this
>         way. These people, their mummy and daddy was there. Why they
>         didn't teach them good ways, still, stay gypsy, stay it, don't
>         care, speak gypsy, do gypsy, anything. Just little bit respect
>         and behaviour different. You know.
> ```

While identifying strongly as Roma, Monika distances herself actively from the stereotypical habits of the Harehills Roma that she perceives as negative. This, however, does not mean losing the links with the Harehills community altogether. In the extract below Monika is explaining her decision to take her sons from 'a proper English school' in Osmondthorpe and placing them into Harehills Primary School. Whereas in Osmondthorpe her sons were making more progress, they have more friends at the Harehills Primary, attended by high numbers of Roma pupils.

> (LeeHerFN_20150619_JH_020)
> *M comparing HH Primary and the school where they were before – Victoria, in Osmondthorpe. Victoria was a proper English school, they were making more progress, but in this school they have more friends. JH: are you happy they are at HH Primary now? M: there was something good and bad about both schools. I don't want kids to be pointing at mine and say – you are gypsy! JH: all parents send their kids to the cooperative academy. M: I have problems with HH Primary, there are too many gypsies and they teach my kids bad words.*

Monika can see the advantage of her children having contacts with other Roma, as they make friends more easily with them. However, her decision is also influenced by the discrimination against Roma she perceived in Slovakia. In this sense she is bringing with her some of the experience she felt and observed from her childhood, which contributes to structuring her current experience and outlook.

4.4 A cultural broker: Utilising cultural resources at work

Although during the time of our observation provision of advocacy was not Monika's main responsibility, she occasionally assisted as a volunteer at sessions provided by GRTAS (Gypsy Roma Traveller Achievement Service). During these sessions, Monika's Roma heritage and the shared experience of migrating to the UK allowed her to understand better the difficulties of the clients. Despite the diversity across those who identify as Roma and the differences between Monika and the people she was

supporting, the shared cultural heritage and to an extent a similar way of thinking allowed her to see below the surface of things. For instance, what at first glance can seem as lack of interest can actually be a complex mixture of distrust, personal issues and accumulation of negative experiences from the countries of origin. This enables her to communicate with the Roma clients (note again the use of *these people*, *they*) in an effective way.

> (LeeHerFN_20150619_JH_020)
> *M: it's hard to help these people, if you don't know if they want help or not. You think they don't, but they actually do! JH: sometimes I feel like people really don't want help, they look like they are not listening! M: that's what you think! And you don't know what's going on in their lives, you just see the surface. Like me – when I tell you I'm not going to work because I'm not well, you only see that – you don't see all that's behind it unless I tell you. JH: but you will tell me. M: yes, I will tell you – but they will not! JH: do you think these people need a bit of a push? M: just a human approach... but also a push, because back home they were just being told they are no good.*

In other circumstances, the link between Monika and the people she works with is the shared experience of migrating to the UK and the ensuing difficulties. Here, from a report in the fieldnotes of a conversation with a friend, note the use of the pronoun *us*: Monika includes herself amongst the group 'Roma migrants into the UK':

> (LeeHerFN_20150618_JH_019)
> *Z: School is an issue in the community, but it is linked to other issues such as problematic behaviour and financial situation. I also do fair-access meetings. I believe that schools should take into consideration more the difficulties of the families of some of the children. M: I agree, it was so hard for me when I came. But you seem to have a good view of us.*

Monika feels comfortable in both Roma and non-Roma environment, which puts her into a position where she can act as a cultural broker between the Roma and the British organizations who want to work with them. Roma are considered a 'hard-to-reach community' according to Parmi, whose job for Leeds City Council is to support migrants: there are not, she feels, enough people to facilitate contact between them and British organizations. Parmi mentions specifically *speaking the language* and *knowing about services*. Monika's fluency in both Slovak and English as well as her professional network make her stand out in her community.

> (LeeHerAud_20150513_JH_003, 39:01 – 39:15)
> ```
> P:   Because I every service knows about problems with engaging with
>      this community [Roma] and we need a lot more Monikas who speak
>      the language and know about services.
> ```

Leeds City Council recognizes the importance of working with individuals from within the community they wish to address, and its strategy is to actively look out for people who could act as cultural brokers between their community and the Council.

(LeeHerAud_20150723_JS_001)
```
P:   And that's the, I mean, the key thing that we do is train key
     people, key community leaders that do speak English and do know
     where the communities are, so they're able to cascade important
     messages to communities and help the engagement between the
     communities and services.
JS:  and how do you identify those communities, those specific
     people, how do you, where do you find them
P:   so the, the sector, those organizations that work very closely
     with communities have a very good idea of key people in key
     communities
```

In Monika's case, it was Migration Counsel that served as a link between herself and Parmi, who identified her as a suitable candidate for the training. Since then, Parmi has been supporting her at regular drop-in sessions, as well as putting her in contact with other people who might help her in other areas, such as applying for funding for her Community Interest Company (i.e. social enterprise). Without her professional network beyond the migrant Roma people in Leeds, it would have been much more difficult for Monika to learn about the existence of this support.

4.5 Family and social life

In this section we look into how Monika's family and social life both constitute and index aspects of her cultural heritage. Family is the basic unit of traditional Roma culture, and it is highly valued. The family is understood in a broader sense than just the immediate family and also includes distant relatives. In traditional Roma families, the members were connected through a network of mutual support: a well-established archetypical behaviour was the special respect paid to the elderly. The role of each family member was clearly defined, as were the roles of men and women. The families were designed as self-contained units, catering to all needs of their members – social, psychological and economic (Roma in the Czech Republic, 2000).

Although Monika did not grow up within a Roma family, we can find similarities between her behaviour towards her relatives and the traditional Roma stereotypical model. For Monika, too, family is extremely important in her life and through our domestic data we can verify that she keeps very close links with her siblings, especially Ivan and Margita. Although their mother still lives in Leeds, the three children only keep in sporadic contact. Monika, Margita and Ivan would frequently talk to each other over the phone and meet in the house of one of them or another, often bringing also their partners and children. On these occasions, the adults would sit around the table to discuss everyday issues, whereas the children would play in the other room, occasionally joining the adults.

Monika and her family also gather to commemorate important events such as birthdays with parties. Socializing, food and music is highly valued by the Roma, and at Monika's parties Roma culture is visible and audible through music, as well as being the topic of some of the conversations.

Despite occasional misunderstandings, there is a prevailing sense of strong mutual support between Monika and her siblings. However, the expectations on each side may differ. In the interview extract below, Monika shows frustration for not receiving more guidance and advice from her eldest brother:

(LeeHerInt_20150724_JC_003)
JC: *Who is the oldest in your family?*
M: *Brother.*
JC: *And does the oldest have a special responsibility?*
M: *I wish, I wish! Sometime I just wish that he'd tell me that – go do something, or don't do this, or…*

Bringing up children

Family and family stability emerge as key themes when Monika discusses how she wants to help and support the Roma people who are her concern. Her own children - and being a good mother to them – are of extreme importance to Monika. In the past, they were her motivation to overcome the difficulties in her life. Having managed to secure a stable life, Monika says: *I believe it's… if it's… tell me if it's not God there, how come I am still alive, how come I have children? You know?* (LeeHerIn_20150702_JC_001). To an extent, as we see in Section 5, it is this sense of family stability (which she is experiencing for the first time) that is the inheritance she wishes to pass on.

During the time of our observation, Monika was going through the process of separating from her then-partner, and was also experiencing numerous misunderstandings with her siblings. Her children (aged 6 and 7), therefore, signified for her the stable point in her life. In fact, in the extract below, Monika defines 'family' as only herself and her children, and explains that everybody needs to respect her and her two sons when entering their house.

(LeeHerInt_20150724_JC_003)
JC: *Why did you choose to put 'family' here?*
M: *The sign? It's because everybody have to respect my kids and me if they come to my house so…*
JC: *so when you say 'our family' you mean…*
M: *Me and my kids…*

Monika's identity as a mother is also foregrounded on Facebook: pictures of Monika and her two sons are numerous and they often feature as her profile picture.

How could we describe Monika's way of bringing up her children? Monika cannot build on a personal experience of growing up in a family. However, she does recall her

mother's parenting behaviour towards her before she was removed from her at the age of four. Monika describes her way as too permissive:

> (LeeHerFN_20150619_JH_020)
> *JH: I remembered this lady who won't put her child in the kindergarten because they'd suffer. M: yes, when actually it's good for them. But I was like that too – you wouldn't believe how spoilt my kids used to be. But it's no good – my mum did not educate me, she would just put everything right under my nose.*

Monika recalls her mother's way of bringing her up when speaking with Jolana about one of the Roma clients, which suggests that her mother's model of parenting might be common amongst the Roma. Monika admits having repeated her mother's way with her own children, but then abandoned it – a fact that we can interpret as a move away from the way of bringing up children stereotypically characteristic for the Roma.

Also the time she spent at the children's home appears to have influenced her parenting. Monika reflected on what she liked about the home and what she did not, and which of the aspects of the life there she would like to pass on to her children. Life in the home was characterized by many rules, which she felt were not always sufficiently explained to the children. Monika seeks not to repeat this pattern when bringing up her own children and explains to them the motives of her decisions and teaching them about the practicalities of daily life, such as managing one's money.

> (LeeHerAud_20150611_JH_022)
>
> | | |
> |---|---|
> | M (...) ale já ich aj učím. Já jim aj vysvětlim, pozri Phile, dněska sem zaplatila veľa peniez na nájem, elektriku, voda. | M but I teach them as well. I also explain to them, look, Phil, today I've paid lots of money for rent, electricity, water. |

The time at the children's home was divided into time for eating, playing, etc. Monika, on the other hand, is trying to give her children the space and freedom she herself did not have, including the freedom to make mistakes and learn from them.

> (LeeHerInt_20150724_JC_003)
> *(...) childhood is important for kids, if they do mess, if they clean, if they do naughty, if they fix it, they learn now, so when they grow up, they no going to do same mistake. But if I don't let them now and they grow up they're going to do what I didn't let them (...)*

4.6 Language use in the family
Monika's family environment is highly multilingual – the languages actively used by Monika's broader family (siblings and partners) are Slovak, English, Hungarian, Czech, as well as Asian languages spoken by Monika's (now former) partner Amir. Some of the family members have high competence in two languages (e.g. Margita and her partner are bilingual in Slovak and Hungarian), others speak several languages with a varying degree of proficiency.

The use of languages differs between Monika's generation (Monika, Margita, Ivan and their partners) and the generation of the children (Philippe, Christian, Jennifer): whereas all adults with the exception of Amir prefer to communicate in Slovak, the

children are most comfortable speaking in English. The children understand Slovak to a certain extent; however, there were only a few occasions when they used it actively. The adults were proficient in English to varying degrees; Monika was fluent whereas Margita and Ivan sometimes needed assistance to understand it. In Margita's household (Margita, Frank, Jennifer), mainly Hungarian was used as the language of communication. None of the people in Monika's family speak Romani apart from a few words (see below).

Monika's use of languages

Much of Monika's language use involves the fluid movement between languages which we characterise here and elsewhere as *interlingual translanguaging* (Baynham et al 2015). Translanguaging takes an internal view of speakers whose mental grammar has developed in social interaction with others (García 2016). It supposes just one linguistic system with features of two or more societally defined languages that are integrated throughout (García and Li Wei 2014: 13-15). When people translanguage they sometimes use these features – which are simply their own – in ways which align with societal constructions of 'a language'. Often though they use them differently, to produce new practices, in ways which emphasise the artificiality of boundaries between languages. This is most evident when languages and cultures come into contact.

For example Monika uses Slovak to speak with her siblings as well as other people from the Czech Republic or Slovakia. Her Slovak, however, is heavily influenced by the Czech language. The same happens with her siblings. Monika says: *we don't speak proper Slovakian, we don't speak proper Czech, we mix* (LeeHerAud_20150506_JH_001). She sometimes calls this language *Czechoslovakian*. She says that she only started mixing the two languages together after moving to the UK, as a result of being in contact with people from the Czech Republic. Another possible source of influence could have been the language spoken by some of the Roma – mixing of Czech and Slovak being one of the characteristics of what has been called the 'Romani ethnolect' (Borkovcova 2007).

In any case, the boundaries between the two languages, and in fact the two countries, are not as clear-cut in Monika's perception as they might have been had she stayed in Slovakia. Monika sometimes speaks about the Czech and Slovak language or the Czech Republic and Slovakia in an interchangeable way. For example when asked if she is still in touch with her friends in the Czech Republic, Monika answers *yes*, although her friends are from Slovakia (LeeHerInt_20150724_JC_003). In the context of the UK, the mutual intelligibility of the languages and the historical and cultural affinity between the two countries work as a unifying factor.

English phrases and vocabulary feature frequently in Monika's speech, especially when talking to her children (see below). Monika's language is also characterised by some use of Romani vocabulary, e.g. *gadžo/gadži* (a non-Roma man/woman), *love* (money), *more* (man). These words are occasionally found in the repertoires of the Czech and Slovak non-Roma population, but not as frequently as in Monika's speech.

Communication between Monika and her children

Monika uses both English and Slovak to speak to her children. Initially, she only used English, but after the arrival of her sister and brother, she also started speaking to them in Slovak, so that the children can communicate with the rest of the family.

Whether Slovak or English is dominant within an interaction depends on several factors, such as who is present in the conversation: if it is her partner, Monika is more likely to use English, while with her family, she will use predominantly Slovak in most cases. It might also be influenced by the topic of the conversation and her mood. Monika says on one occasion, laughing: *sometimes, when I'm upset then… just my language. He [Amir] knows that, when I speak my language that mean that is no good*. (LeeHerAud_20150506_JH_001).

Monika often uses the two languages in a fluid way, combining the elements of Slovak and English within the same phrase or moving smoothly between the two languages, as in the following extracts (original version on the left):

> (LeeHerAud_20150619_JH_013)
> ```
> M Phil, careful. Kde je telefon,   M Phil, careful. Where's the
> Christian?                         phone, Christian?
> ```

> (LeeHerAud_20150619_JH_013)
> ```
> M dej si socks, lebo ich zase   M come on, put on the socks, or
> zabudneš. A jak si obuješ        you'll forget them again. And how
> boty. Dělej, tam sú, socks.      will you put on your shoes. They are
>                                  over there, socks.
> ```

> (LeeHerAud_20150621_JH_015)
> ```
> M Philippe put t-shirt on! Phil –   M Philippe put t-shirt on! Phil –
> t-shirt! Na, Philippe. Já nechcem   t-shirt! Here, Philippe. I don't
> abys byl nemocný.                   want you to be ill.
> ```

These are instances of interlingual translanguaging: Monika draws upon the communicative repertoire that she has to hand, to achieve successful interaction, without functional separation (García and Li Wei 2014). Even so, the children's understanding of Slovak language is not sufficient for them to understand everything that their mother says to them and her English does not allow her to express everything she would like to. Monika feels that this situation is not ideal and it might prove a challenge in the future.

> (LeeHerInt_20150724_JC_003)
> *M Yeah, I try to explain them, I try with my language but I see that they don't understand my language, then I have to struggle in English so yeah, it's not going to be easy to grow them up this way, but I'm trying.*

5 Translanguaging and Cultural Transformation in a Business Plan

5.1 Introduction

In this section we focus throughout on the development and writing of Monika's business plan. We do this for a number of reasons. First and foremost, as we have already identified, a central concern for Monika is to transform her thoughts, dreams and aspirations relating to her own cultural heritage – that is, the development of a Roma space – into reality. After finding her benefits withdrawn and herself designated 'self-employed', turning her ideas into a money-making business became Monika's central concern and the main focus of her activity during and beyond the research period. Second, we very soon realised that the business plan lay at the heart of a web of people, places, objects, texts, and discourses which at the time constituted the fabric of Monika's everyday life. Third, we also discovered that the process of developing the business plan produced a particular dynamic, one which seemed of great relevance to our enquiry, involving as it did a collision of cultures which were not only different but in some ways perhaps untranslatable, and therefore irreconcilable.

Wittgenstein observed that he did not get his picture of the world by satisfying himself of its correctness. 'No: it is the inherited background against which I distinguish between true and false' (1969: 94). And such inherited world pictures, he suggested, rest on certain propositions which are exempt from doubt, 'if they are ever formulated' (*ibid*.: 88). These 'foundational beliefs' ('so anchored that we cannot touch them') form the basis for action and thought. They are, as he put it, the 'foundation walls ... carried by the whole house' (*ibid*.: 248). This seems an apt (and aptly spatial) metaphor through which to approach our overall topic, that of migration, translanguaging, and transformation of cultures. Migration, above all, is an issue of space – losing and regaining. And always it raises the question Wittgenstein asked of himself: 'What if you had to change your opinion on even these most fundamental things?'(*ibid*.: 512). In this section, in following the development of the business plan, we are keen to discover if Monika, our KP, is ever in a position to respond with the philosopher: 'You don't have to change. That is just what their being "fundamental" is' (*ibid*.). And if so, what is the cost?

As for the business plan itself, the actual digital form Monika was required to complete in order to gain funding for her social enterprise project (see Appendix 1), we find it useful to view this as a 'contact zone', a social space where 'disparate cultures meet, clash, and grapple with each other, often in highly asymmetrical relations of domination and subordination' (Pratt 1992: 4). In exploring the contact zone we expand on Mary-Louise Pratt's concept by drawing first on the Scollons' idea of the 'site of engagement' as a 'nexus of practice', a point in spacetime at which historical trajectories of people, places, discourses, ideas, and objects come together to enable some action which in itself alters those historical trajectories in some way as those trajectories emanate from this moment of social action' (Scollon 2001: viii). Here the Scollons are using the term discourse in the same way as Blommaert (2005: 3): 'all forms of meaningful semiotic human activity seen in connection with social, cultural and historical patterns and developments of use.' Nexus analysis thus introduces both historical and spatial dimensions into our study, allowing us to connect one event in spacetime with many others on different scales of time and place. It also enables us to explore the contact

zone, not merely as a spatio-temporal event but as a social ecology containing a wide range of phenomena, including minds, bodies, objects, and social space. In line with our research aims and methods and our heritage theme, we also recall Lefebvre's theory of the social production of space (Lefebvre 1991 [1974]; see also Schmid 2008; Rogers 2002, as discussed in Section 2.4), as involving three interacting dimensions or processes: *perceived space*, c*onceived space*, and *lived space*. We also take from Lefebvre the idea that social life moves forward both as a project and as the consequence of past efforts, even forgotten efforts, and must therefore be studied by means of a 'progressive-regressive method' (Lefebvre 1991 [1974]). Nexus analysis, with its focus on the spatio-temporal trajectories of 'historical bodies' (the vehicles of habitus) is ideally suited to this. Compatible with this approach too is the 'distributed' view of language which we adopt throughout the TLang project: of *languaging* as an ecological, dialogical and scalar activity (Cowley 2011; see Section 2.5).

Armed with these theoretical and methodological tools we turn to the business plan and the interactions through which it is produced. Here we draw on detailed transcripts of the work-based audio data associated with turning the heritage-related initiatives into the business plan. It is about how Monika's discussions with two particular individuals, Parmi (Bright Ideas fund of Leeds City Council) and Sharon (Integrity Endeavour), help shape what Monika does, and specifically how she subsequently completes the business plan form. Analysis of their interaction reveals how Parmi and Sharon attempt to mould her ideas, and at the same time support her. First, we examine extracts of interaction between Parmi and Monika, which has been ongoing for some time (Section 5.2). Then we turn to a business discussion between Sharon and Monika, showing how support from an outside agency operates interactionally (5.3). Following this we look at examples of business plan talk in domestic settings (5.4). Finally we bring in examples from the talk that is going on as Jolana helps Monika fill in the business plan form (5.5). This section indicates how Monika's discussions with these people and objects (including texts) eventually contribute to the completion of the form.

Our aims here are, generally, to gain a better understanding of translanguaging and cultural transformation in public and private settings. More specifically, we are concerned with the question of heritage. We recall that our general research questions rest on (1) the understanding of heritage in contexts of superdiversity; (2) the linguistic and semiotic practices which contribute to the remaking of heritage in such contexts; and (3) how language and semiosis produce cultural spaces for the development of heritage-related activities. The detailed questions we seek answers to in this section, as they relate to our general research questions are:
- What kinds of things do we see in our data which we call 'heritage'?
- In what ways do these things problematize our conventional understanding of heritage and push us to redefine it?
- On the basis of what we see in our data, how *do* we (re)define heritage?
- Then, how do the things we redefine as heritage fare in these interactions? Can we see them as resources or impediments to action? Are they abandoned, retained, adapted? Do they disappear from some contexts but still appear in others?
- And finally, what does all this suggest about the role and fate of heritage (as we re-define it) in the processes involved in migration, settlement, and integration?

5.2 Translanguaging and transculturing heritage in a business plan

We begin our analysis by looking at a meeting between our KP, Monika, and Parmi, a Commissioning Officer employed in the Adult Social Care Department of Leeds City Council (LCC). Parmi is currently working on the Migrant Access Project, which, with the involvement of statutory and third sector partners across the city, aims to alleviate pressures placed on statutory services by recently-arrived migrants, and at the same time help those new migrants 'settle in'. *The key thing that we do*, says Parmi, *is train key people, key community leaders that do speak English and do know where the communities are, so they're able to cascade important messages to communities and help the engagement between communities and services* (LeeHerInt_20150723_JS_01).

The meeting takes place in mid-May, towards the end of our observation period, in the kitchen area next to Parmi's office in an LCC building in the city centre. There are chairs and several circular tables set out for meetings and/or refreshments. Today, Monika is here to talk to Parmi about developing a business plan, by means of which she hopes to gain Council funding for a social enterprise project. The exact nature of the project is the main subject of this discussion. Also present are Margita, Monika's sister, who is also hoping to develop a business idea, and Jolana, one the TLang researchers. All four participants in this interaction are bilingual or multilingual. All speak English, though with different levels of expertise. Czech, Slovak, and Hungarian are the other languages in play. As Jolana explains to Parmi during the meeting: *I speak Czech, Monika speaks Slovak, and Margita speaks Hungarian and Slovak. I speak to them in Czech. They answer in Slovak* (LeeHerFN_20150513_JH_010). Parmi, however, speaks none of these Central European languages. She is of Indian background: her main expert language is English, and she also speaks Panjabi and Hindi.

In this section our analysis is based on audio recordings of our key participant's interactions in the focal events, and also on audio recordings made in other public and private (including work-related and home) settings, and on fieldnotes, interviews, and photographs collected throughout the observation period. (All quotations relating to this event are from the audio recording LeeHerAud_20150513_JH_003 unless otherwise stated.)

Waiting for Parmi to join them, Jolana and Monika are engaged in small talk in Czech/Slovak, 'catching up'. Margita is silent. After a minute or so Parmi sits down at the table. Short pauses are marked with a (.) and longer pauses with the time in seconds.

```
Monika:   How are you Parmi?
Parmi:    Yeh, not bad. What about you?
Monika:   Getting there ((laughs))
Jolana:   ((laughs))
Parmi:    Good.
Monika:   Did you met my sister before?
Parmi:    Yeh yeh.
(1.7)
Monika:   ((nervous laugh))
Parmi:    (I have.)
(2.4)
Monika:   Did you see already Bxxx baby?
Parmi:    No. She's going to go mad with me. Haven't even (.) had the
```

```
            time yet.
Monika:   I didn't.
Parmi:    Have you been?
Monika:   No.
Jolana:   ((Filling in consent form with M, speaking quietly in
          Czech/Slovak))
Monika:   She don't talk to me because (.) him, yeh.
Parmi:    Ohhh. Are you still with him?
```

When Parmi sits down at the table Monika immediately breaks off her conversation with Jolana to greet her. In doing so she stops using Czech/Slovak – which she knows Parmi does not speak – and speaks English. Then, to Parmi's enquiry *What about you?* she replies, *Getting there*. This colloquialism, though marked as unusual and unexpected by her own laughter and Jolana's more fulsome amusement, is on reflection entirely appropriate and reveals considerable sociolinguistic expertise. It is a highly appropriate response to Parmi's question in terms of the business in hand ('I am moving forward with my project but have not finalised it'). In addition, through its informality it constructs solidarity with Parmi and demonstrates to the others her own social status vis-à-vis Parmi. Monika is after all here as one of the 'key community leaders who do speak English', and, if not equal in power to Parmi, then is at least enjoying a relationship based on some degree of interdependence.

Following this exchange of greetings – by which so much is achieved – Monika offers to introduce Parmi to her sister. This turns out to be unnecessary and leads to two periods of silence, for which Monika seems to assume primary responsibility. Her answer to this interactional 'trouble' is the introduction of a social topic: visiting a new-born baby and its mother. And here again solidarity is constructed and displayed, this time by an exchange involving a mutual friendship and complicity in a social duty unfulfilled. It is the shared histories and knowledge underlying this exchange which make possible the next grossly underdetermined pair of utterances in which Monika explains why she has not visited her friend (*She don't talk to me because (.)*), then after a brief pause, and summing the whole situation up in a single pronoun, *him, yeh*. Parmi's emotion-filled response (*Ohhh. Are you still with him?*) displays her understanding of the situation: the 'stolen' man, the aggrieved woman, Monika's predicament. By conspiring with Parmi to discuss and share opinions and feelings about others not present, Monika again constructs affiliation (Glenn 2003).

It is at this point we have to remind ourselves that Monika and Parmi are engaged in a business meeting and, in fact, only know one another through such interactions. Yet clearly they share quite intimate knowledge of one another's personal lives, with further work being done here to reinforce their relationship, chiefly as a result of Monika's efforts. Throughout the first extract, rather surprisingly, we see that it is Monika not Parmi who takes responsibility for managing the preliminary phase of the business meeting. In doing so she positions herself as a confident social actor, empowered by highly developed communicative and interpersonal skills. What is clear from our ethnographic data, however, is that up till now Monika's life has been almost entirely devoid of business dealings, being chiefly centred on life in the care home and subsequently within her family, a close circle of friends, and her work with third-sector organisations. We must assume, therefore, that it is the repertoire(s) of social practices acquired in these settings that Monika is drawing on here as she initiates the development of her social enterprise project and the business plan which will, hopefully,

bring it into being. Central to these repertoires is a high level of sociality; and it is this impulse to sociality and the practices that realise it which enable Monika, as Clawson puts it, to make 'what would otherwise meet a strict definition of weak ties feel and function like stronger ties' (2005:258).

We might argue that what Monika is doing here in the first extract, consciously or unconsciously, and among other things, is putting on a display of credentials (i.e. the mobile social and cultural capital brought along in her 'historical body' (Scollon and Scollon 2004)) by means of which she intends to establish herself her as a well-qualified candidate for the business in hand, i.e. social enterprise funding. She is, in other words, performing her assets, since, beyond a small social network, access to her community, and a growing reputation among council and third sector workers, performable assets are the only assets Monika has. It is tempting to suggest that in employing this strategy Monika is motivated by the desire (or need) to turn her social and cultural capital into economic capital. However, the nature of Monika's understanding of and relationship to (what we refer to as) economic capital is rather complicated, and, as our data suggests, intimately tied up with identity, group membership, and heritage. And what is important here, personal intimacy notwithstanding, is that in terms of economic capital Monika and Parmi inhabit completely different social and cognitive worlds – worlds that must, however, be reconciled in the contact zone of the business plan.

Coming up with 'the big idea'
Following the above exchange, for the next 40 seconds or so, Monika and Parmi continue their conversation, though Monika listens to and sometimes joins in the conversation in Czech/Slovak between Jolana and Margita regarding the consent form. Monika thus continues to 'manage' the social event, until Parmi, with a reprise of the earlier exchange, this time in a more intimate and confidential tone (*Are you OK?*), takes control of the conversation and steers it into a new phase: the business meeting proper. (*Are you working? […] What you looking for? What d'you want to do?*) Monika explains that this is the reason she has come: the Job Centre has stopped her money. Now *[t]hey just educate for me*, i.e. put me on training courses, *so I don't receive nothing*. Moreover, she now finds herself self-employed. *I didn't know I am self-employed. I just find out. So now I thinking I am already register for self-employed I think to make some little office […] So that was big reason to come here and try to get your help*.

Monika's 'biggest idea' for self-employment is to open a dance school. *But for that I don't have money*, she says (laughing), arguably to pre-empt Parmi's response. Parmi encourages Monika to limit herself to *one idea*. Monika is unable to do this. From the dance school she moves on to:

> *some office where I can support clients with my advocacy*
> *do some parties*
> *people will come to me and I can help them call job seekers*
> *I will do like drop-ins*
> *my job's gonna be get them some ESOL classes*
> *zumba classes*
> *carnival*
> *advising them*
> *take them somewhere*
> *support them to go to GP*

to be their hand

 In her current work for a third sector provider of bilingual advocacy, Migration Counsel – previously paid, now voluntary – Monika has been frustrated by the restrictions placed on her, restrictions which prevent her from addressing what she sees as the real and immediate needs of her clients. *Two years and I-. There seems to do nothing*, i.e. no progress has been made, nothing achieved. *Because they sometimes need the person and I always tell them, "This is not my job. I cannot go with you." And then they feel like abandoned*. Monika's desire is to provide a kind of total support for clients, holistic, unrestricted by bureaucratic or financial considerations. Moreover, she is disinclined to subject herself to such restrictions. *I don't wanna do every day same. It's just boring*, she laughs. When necessary she plays her trump card: *Because I have contacts so I can, you know - .*

But the clients and her own job satisfaction are not Monika's only concern. The need for Monika, her brother, and sister to become self-employed has to a certain extent had the effect of splitting the family. *So we was thinking, everybody separated to make some business*, she tells Parmi. But, though Monika is here to talk about her own project, she cannot help but express this in terms of supporting members of her family and extended family. Through her own *office* (i.e. business) she can give her sister *some job for cleaning* and *her [sister's] boyfriend to painting*, and *[m]e and my brother start trying to get his kitchen*. Generally when Monika refers to her siblings she uses relational titles (*my brother*, *my sister*) rather than names, and it is relationships not identities which seem most important to her. And not just within the family. When Parmi suggests that Monika should cut down on her unpaid work for Migration Counsel, in spite of her frustration with the organisation, she says, *I just somehow if I start talk to him about me starting own business I feel like abandon him … I still wanna support him*. That word 'abandon' again appears, followed by its antithesis, 'support'.

Parmi, for her part, appreciates and believes she understands Monika's commitment to what Parmi calls her *community*. She also appears frustrated when something can't happen so quickly, wanting to be able to support somebody as and when they need it rather than, '*Come to the office next week*' (LeeHerInt_20150723_JS_001). And Parmi believes that [if statutory] services are to adapt their policies to meet the needs of the communities, they're going to have to change the way they work (LeeHerInt_20150723_JS_001). Yet the conflicting and mutually incomprehensible demands of the human and the bureaucratic persist, along with their antithetical tendencies – to treat as whole and immediately present, or to conceptualise, atomise, commodify, and defer. However sensitively it is mediated by Parmi, even in this case the bureaucratic fails to embrace or even comprehend the lived experience and underlying assumptions of the 'other', due to its insistence on narrow circumscription of aims, financial accountability, and profitability:

> *Start with one small idea*
> *Look at one thing at a time*
> *You're not getting paid*
> *You need the money*
> *You can't start your own business unless you've got some money and are gonna make some profit or you're gonna put it back into the [business]*

Monitoring. Looking at how many people you're visiting?
Gathering that evidence and being able to say that actually we've saved this
organisation this much money because otherwise interpreting would have cost this
much

And so the conversation continues, without any real sign of convergence in positioning
(i.e. translation of cultures), until, after ten minutes, Monika raises the issue of a
dedicated space, for her the *sine qua non* of her project.

```
Monika:     (0:10:13.8) My little office like this
            something. Little computer, one phone.
            You know whaddi mean? [And I—      ]
Parmi:                           [And and what] what
            if you have Migration Counsel on the day
            that it was free, for example?
Monika:     But I don't wanna be same office because
            they will think still I'm same and I
            don't wanna give them same service. [I
            wanna give them better--       ]
Parmi:                                         [Well
            you can you can call your—] you can give
            you can give your— You can say that
            you're working for the same organisation
            but I've got two different roles. On this
            day, this day, this day ((tapping desk
            three times)) advocate.
Monika:     But they [are there] every day.]
Parmi:               [Look at— ]
Margita:            [Ludia tam už nechcú  ] chodiť    People don't
                                                      want to go
                                                      there anymore
Monika:     People don't wanna go anymore in that
            office,
            and they open every day.
            [Just they don't have advocacy] every
            day.
Margita:    [Jak povíš sťažuje, sťažují si] ((to JH)) How do you say
                                                      complain? They
                                                      complain?
Jolana:     People complain.
Parmi:      People want the advocacy.
Margita:    Yeh, každý si sťažuje ako na toto že oni  Yeh, everyone
            tam veľa nepomáhaj, ludia tam nejsú       complains that
                                                      they don't help
                                                      much. There are
                                                      no people
Parmi:      English.
Margita:    Oh, sorry ((laughs))
Parmi:      ((laughs))
Margita:    People- too much people complain with
            Advocacy, because comin' no (.) [(no her
            come)—]
Monika:                                     [No
            interpreter]
Margita:    [no interpreter]
Parmi:      [They they want] somebody to [go with
            them], yeh?
Margita:                                 [xxx   xxx
            xxx ]
```

```
Jolana:   Mmm.
Monika:   And then even they don't accept that
          service because some advocate
          misunderstood, they think, and they [do
          mistake ]
Jolana:                                        [Mm.
          Mm.     ]  Mm
Monika:   [And they's] the fault. You know what I
          mean?
Jolana:   [You know- ]
Monika:   [Is the    ] (to give me) and it's a- a-
          I- a a the is identified is two years
          now. And is hard to tell. I tried to tell
          to Damian but Damian tried to tell to
          Saeed. Saeed is always somewhere else
          because he have a lot of things, another
          things. Bxxx she's just a contact or I
          don't know. And then they don't know how.
          Interpreter. The (x). So people looking
          for some else place, you know, someone
          else.
Parmi:    Mmm
```

Lefebvre observed that:

> Social relations … have a social existence to the extent that they have a spatial existence; they project themselves into a space, becoming inscribed there, and in the process producing that space itself. Failing this, these relations would remain in the realm of 'pure' abstraction—that is to say in the realm of verbalism, verbiage and empty words.
>
> (Lefebvre 1991 [1974]: 129)

Monika appears to understand this very clearly: that if her project is to move beyond the realm of verbiage and empty words it must be spatialized – become *espace perçu*, in Lefebvre's terms. Her requirements are minimal: a little office, a computer, a phone, and ideally, located in the Harehills area where her clients live and are reluctant to stray from. Parmi suggests using space at Migration Counsel (in Harehills). Monika rejects this idea on the grounds that, in the minds of her clients (and, apparently, in her own), space is inseparably bound up with the practices which go on within it. Basing herself at Migration Counsel will therefore mean she becomes identified with Migration Counsel practices. Monika, however, is determined to provide something better. Parmi disagrees with this assessment and suggests that Monika can make it clear she has two separate roles – presumably orienting to two different sets of professional norms, her own and those of Migration Counsel. Monika cannot accept this pragmatic splitting of roles, which seems to her a splitting of identities: one characterised by the integrating impulse of lived experience, the other (in *her* mind) by bureaucratic conformity and empty words. She insists she will not be able to differentiate herself from Migration Counsel staff because *they are there every day*. It is at this point the conversation reaches the crisis to which, with its clash of cultural outlooks, personal affiliations, and affective stances, it has been heading since its outset.

Garfinkel (1967) observed that it is when 'trouble' occurs that we find our best opportunities to discover the underlying features of social interaction. The interactional

trouble here (as opposed to the intersubjective trouble, which has been present throughout) is caused by Margita's sudden intervention in the conversation – after silence of over 10 minutes. More precisely, it is the manner of her intervention: 'self-selecting' as next speaker at a point where her turn inevitably overlaps that of her sister (thus constituting an interruption), as well as overlapping Parmi's turn, Margita brings about the first real breakdown in turn taking; then, in electing to speak in Slovak, Margita effectively excludes Parmi – arguably the key participant in this interaction – from the conversation. Jolana observes in her fieldnotes that *Margita's English is reasonably good* but that *she likes to switch into Slovak when the topic is a difficult one* (LeeHerFN_20150513_JH_010). Here it seems it is Margita's affective stance vis-à-vis the topic rather than a 'languaging' relationship which precipitates this first extended contribution by anyone in a language other than English, indicating, arguably, Margita's considerable focus on and commitment to the propositional content of the conversation at this point, even though strictly speaking this has nothing to do with her own business project.

Margita has heard her sister struggling to make Parmi understand that Parmi's social construction of the Migration Counsel space and the *Roma community's* construction are deeply at odds. Her contribution here seems designed to support her sister, but coming directly to the point, without any more finessing: *People don't want to go there anymore.* However, in her eagerness to be heard her apparently spontaneous use of Slovak undermines her purpose. Monika translates, clarifying *there* (*that office*) and adding that, even though Migration Counsel are open every day, *Just they don't have advocacy every day*. But while Monika is saying this Margita overlaps again. Having been made aware, perhaps, of the need to use English by Monika's translation, in an aside to Jolana she co-opts the researcher to give herself voice (*How do you say complain? They complain?*). Meanwhile, Parmi's summary (*People want the advocacy*), designed to display understanding, does the exact opposite. People don't want Migration Counsel advocacy, they want *real advocacy*. Margita, however, is still pursuing her own line of thought: *Yeh, everyone complains….* At this point Parmi rather quietly says *English*. Margita apologises and laughs, apparently surprised to find she is still using Slovak. Then, with further help from Monika, she makes her point: people complain about Migration Counsel. The interpreters don't turn up. At this point Monika takes over and, with sympathetic noises from Jolana, explains that the advocates are incompetent, and that though she identified the problems two years ago and informed senior managers nothing has changed. So now *people looking for some else place … someone else*.

Our interest in this section is to see what happens to the conflicting worldviews which collide in the contact zone of the business plan and the social spaces (places, people, objects, discourses, etc.) which are connected with it. What we seem to be seeing throughout the above conversation is people learning to anticipate one another's interactional responses, and in cases complete them, without ever achieving what Husserl called intersubjectivity, the notion of the possibility of being in the place where the Other is (see Duranti 2009, 2010). Humans, suggested Husserl, transform their worlds into particular kinds of 'phenomena', both experientially and theoretically. One of the ways they do this is socially through the education of attention, often involving languaging. However, humans can also be resistant to attempts to change to these transformations, i.e. to 'phenomenological modification' (Duranti 2009).

5.3 Interaction with Sharon

Monika's development of her business plan brings her into contact with a range of support organisations and their representatives. Here we look at a meeting which took place a month after the one with Parmi, this time with Sharon. Sharon is Monika's designated contact at Integrity Endeavour, a Harehills-based agency, which among other things aims to "[i]ncrease employment opportunities and promote social inclusion through the provision of help and advice for getting a job and the provision of assistance in launching a business." (from its website). In these extracts we see how Sharon's support is directed towards modifying the ways Monika thinks and talks about her project. Later we will investigate how these attempts at modification influence Monika's completion of the business plan form. The meeting takes place in Sharon's office in Harehills. Jolana's fieldnotes set the scene thus:

> (LeeHerFN_20150608_JH_017)
> *I introduced myself to Sharon and explained to her my role. Sharon is a Caribbean-heritage lady in her late 40s (?), very nice and professional, with a calm way of speaking. She seems dispassionate yet she has a very personal approach. The other people in the room were Margita, Amir (Monika's partner) and Monika's son, who has had an infection on his foot so couldn't walk or go to school. He was sitting on the sofa, watching things on a tablet, not really caring about the people around.*

In the interaction Sharon deploys a number of discourse strategies that aim to focus Monika's thinking about what her business plan will look like, and at the same time outline and clarify the support which she can offer. We give examples of these from Sharon's talk, and then present one of her extended turns, where they are also evident. Here we use a technique borrowed from Hymesian ethnopoetics (Hymes 2003; Blommaert 2007) to organise the transcription. This draws out the formal / aesthetic / poetic patterns in the talk, which appear to be salient, privileging them over the topic or theme-based content (though topics and themes will also be examined). In particular an ethnopoetic technique enables attention on the repetition in the turn and its rhythmic nature. All the transcripts are from recording LeeHerAud_20150608_JH_010; 07:28 – 12:35.

Questions: Sharon uses a questioning technique to test Monika's responses, and to force her to think more deeply about an issue. Through the use of questioning, Sharon pushes Monika to thinking in a more focused way about how her enterprise will be funded.

```
P:   The question is who's gonna pay for it
M:   lottery
S:   but this is the point I've made, when that money is finished,
     where is the next batch of money gonna come from? You see what I
     mean
```

Directives: As well as questions, Sharon uses directives (a class of illocutionary speech act [Austin 1962]), saying *I want you to* and *you're gonna* to command Monika to behave in particular ways and to do particular things. She appears to be taking control of Monika and of how Monika will develop her plans. Here are two examples:

```
those are the things I want to, on your business plan template that
I'm gonna send you, I want you to be very clear on is that one pound
donation gonna be enough to do your rent, your rates, your
electricity, your staffing.Because this is what burns us out in the
UK

but what you're gonna say to the GP is, what you're gonna say to the
GP is, if you buy from me I will cut down the amount of time this
person comes. Because each time they go it's costing the GP
```

Probing: To further test the logic of Monika's responses, Sharon probes them by bringing up further points for Monika to think about.

```
M:  mostly I would get voluntary, I will apply for voluntary staff
    from jobseekers or something
S:  again, let me, let me, I'm gonna be, I'm being honest with you so
    you know, you know, what happens with volunteers is, they will do
    and do and do but volunteers have to live as well.
M:  yea, sure
S:  they have to eat, they have to drink. So after a while volunteers
    they go. You see what I mean. So you're constantly having to find
    volunteers. So [...]
```

The development of a hypothetical example
We can see the use of questions and probing in the following extract. But this long turn is most notable for the development of a hypothetical narrative about a package that Monika will create, based on the idea of an advocacy service, which she will then sell to GPs, ultimately to save them money.

```
1   you'll need to find the wages
2   so the point I'm gonna make to you is
3   I hear exactly what you're saying
4   but what I'm gonna
5   the point I'm gonna make to you
6   is that advocacy service
7   what I'm I'm gonna help you to do is
8   package it in such a way that for example
9   you're gonna tie it into the benefits
10  benefits agencies
11  you're gonna say to them
12  I've got a package here
13  cause they're struggling
14  and they want to get people off benefits
15  and you're gonna say to them
16  look at this amazing package I've got here
17  if you refer people to me
18  I can get people off benefits by doing a, b, c, d, e
19  you see what I mean
20  or you package
21  or have a package here
22  because the GPs are struggling
23  because people from our communities and your communities
24  they keep on going for antidepressants
25  they can't sleep
26  they this and that
27  so the GPs are spending a lot of money on GP visits
28  if you go to the GP
29  and say with the package you've got here
```

```
30  you can cut down the amount of people going to them
31  if you refer people to me
32  that's what I'm gonna help you to think about
33  … that's what I'm gonna help you see
```

Davies and Harré define positioning as a discursive process whereby 'people are located in conversations as observably and subjectively coherent participants in jointly produced storylines (1999:37). In lines 2, 4, 5 and 7 Sharon positions herself as the person with knowledge to impart, and the person who is going to help Monika, in the storyline of Monika's business: *the point I'm gonna make to you / what I'm I'm gonna help you to do is …* . The business idea itself is introduced in line 6: an advocacy service. This is the way one of Monika's dreams is thought about in contemporary Britain. Indeed how else can someone support other people if not through an advocacy service? Sharon explains from line 7 that she is going to help Monika *package it in such a way that for example* (line 8): the business idea will be packaged ready for sale. From line 9 Sharon uses many directives (*you're gonna tie it into benefits*), a class of illocutionary speech act (Austin 1962): Sharon uses *I want you to* and *you're gonna* to command M to behave in particular ways. She again appears to be firmly positioning herself as the one who will take control of the way in which Monika will develop her plans. In line 12 she moves into the first person, speaks for Monika, animating her imagined words in a hypothetical narrative (*you're gonna say to them / I've got a package here*). The package by now has become a noun, an item, a more tangible something to sell. The supposed customers are organisations in whose interests it is to get people off benefits, and hence save money (lines 16-18). In line 20 a development of the idea is offered relating to saving money by keeping people from going to the GP and being prescribed antidepressants. The rationale for the idea is strengthened by repetition: or / or; because / because; *they / they / they* (lines 20-26). Again (lines 28-31) the narrative builds up to the first person: Sharon eventually uses direct speech (line 31), animating Monika's words as she sells the imagined advocacy package to the GP.

In terms of topics and themes, we see the now familiar emphasis on the realities of third sector service provision in an era of neo-liberalism – detailed here in more graphic terms. Money: making money through cutting costs for others. Buying and selling services. And here, the repeated reference to packaging (six times). Whether Sharon means *combining* or *wrapping up* is unclear. Then there are rent, rates, electricity, staffing. *[T]hat's what I'm gonna help you see*, says Sharon. To which Monika replies: *My big idea was like if I could be a real advocate*. And elsewhere her responses sound equally tangential – though in fact they are restatements of her own preoccupations. At other times her answers seem as if snatched from the air.

```
Sharon:  The question is who's gonna pay for it?
Monika:  Lottery
```

Sometimes they are inaudible: ((Mutters something.)); ((Speaking in a low voice in the background.))

Monika is a much less powerful social actor than Sharon in this event: if Sharon positions herself reflexively as the person who will help, then Monika is positioned by Sharon, interactively, as the person who needs to adapt to the local 'business' environment. Also present with Sharon and Monika at this event are Monika's sister and

then-partner, and elsewhere in the meeting Sharon, in her role as modifier of perceptions, says: *The three of you need to think as business people*. She is articulating the hegemonic underlying assumption of the third sector discourse: that nothing can happen without money.

5.4 The home/work divide

Venue: Monika's house. From Jolana's fieldnotes: *Informal chat between JH and Monika about Monika's cats; Monika saying she's expecting 15 pounds from Parmi for travel expenses; breastfeeding, and then about asthma that Christian suffers from and what medication he's taking for it. Monika then starts showing JH the jewellery that she bought on e-bay that she is planning to display on sale in her office.*

Here we observe the porosity of the home work divide. The conversation topics shift across from those related to Monika's home life (including breastfeeding and her son's asthma) to the jewellery that Monika is intending to sell, once she has received her funding and obtained her office space.

RN LeeHerAud_20150619_JH_019

16:03 JH: no a jak to vypadá s tim kanclem, tvojim, to ti nikdo neřek ještě, jestlti by pro tebe měli ňáký místo zadarmo	JH: how does it look like with your office, noone has told you yet if they'd have some space for you for free
Monika: ještě som nepitala sem sa. Ale na budúcí týždeň už pošlu registráciju, a potom už iba čakám mesiac. A potom už mužem žadať. A ona mi vravila že ak buděm registrovaná, už těch 6500 mi požádá.	Monika: I haven't asked yet. But next week I will send off the registration, and then I'm just waiting for a month. And then I can apply [for the funding]. And she told me that once I'm registered she can ask for those 6500 for me.

Monika and Jolana then start to talk about the office space and the business plan.

Monika: funding že tam je, a ona ho chce spustit mě, těch 6000.	Monika: there is a funding, and she wants to release it for me, those 6000.	
(...)		
JH: a to je Parmi anebo Sharon?	JH: and that's Parmi or Sharon?	
M: Sharon. Na vykopnutí, víš? Či jak to mám povedať.	M: Sharon. For kick start, you know? Or how should I say it.	Vykopnutí: lit. translation, calque

Monika continues to discuss the funding with Jolana, which she wants to *kick start*. We see, therefore, interdiscursive translanguaging, and how the discourse of the institutions and funding bodies starts to enter Monika's home vocabulary. The merging of the home/work space, or even the lack of official office space for Monika, further supports this fluidity and blurring of boundaries between work and home.

Monika: deveť. Ale ona povedala že hlavně nechť vypíšem svoj napad, víš, toto a hlavně nápad do toho. A zvyšok ona už může dát ňák do	Monika: nine. But she said I should describe most importantly my idea, you know, this and primarily the idea in it. And the rest she can somehow put together.

```
kopy.
JH: Hmm. Hmm, ale víš co je        JH: Hmm. Hmm,but you know, it's good
dobrý, přijít tam prostě            to go there with something, and then
s něčim, a něco jakoby upravit     adapt it than just
než to prostě
Monika: právě, lenže já som aj      Monika: that's right, but I was
skúšela toto ňák vyplňovat, já      trying to fill this in somehow, I
nevim... nevim jak to dát do        don't know... I don't know how to put
kopy, jak sa vyjadriť abysom        it together, how to express myself so
neopakovala to isté furt.           that I'm not repeating the same thing
                                    all the time.
```

The shaping of Monika's business plan and the space it both inhabits and creates arises not solely in the institutional spaces occupied by Sharon and Parmi. We also observe how Jolana, the TLang researcher, becomes part of this space, her liminal status to the family and to the organisations involved positioning her in such a way to be able to contribute. Monika and Jolana write the business plan together (see below), with Monika using Jolana to guide her through the process. Jolana, perhaps placed in a position of authority due to her professional experience, gently guides Monika, shaping the plan. Here she advises Monika to prepare something for the next meeting: *Hmm. Hmm, but you know, it's good to go there with something, and then adapt it than just.* Jolana's role as researcher then becomes one of advisor, of co-collaborator, and of confidante (cf. Gunter and Thomson, 2011; see Section 3.3).

```
JH: prosimtě jak se ti to          JH: how is that your business
jmenuje, tan tvůj byznys            called, please
Monika: Vision Advocacy and Employment CIC  [kik]
(JH types it, CIC as kick)
Monika: CIC [kik] ako CIC [sí-     Monika: CIC [kik] like CIC [C-I-C]
aj-sí]
JH: jo ja sem... takhle?            JH: well I have... like this?
Monika: to je zkratka, to je        Monika: it's an abbreviation, it's
Community Ins... čo to bolo?         Community Ins... what was it?
JH: nevim (laughs)                  JH: I don't know (laughs)
Monika: community interest... company?
JH: asi jo. Jo jo jo.               JH: perhaps so. Yea yea yea.
```

We find out the proposed name for Monika's business, 'Vision Advocacy'. It is a type of social enterprise, a community interest company (CIC is the abbreviation). We observe here how Monika uses the terminology of the social enterprise sector, but mistakes the C for a K. We see too how Jolana is also working in a discourse which is unfamiliar.

```
Monika: T našla jednu z Rumunska,  Monika: T found one from
ktorá by chtěla pre mňa pracovat    Romania, who would like to work
ako živnostnička. Takže bysom já    for me as self-employed. So I
nedávala za ňú pension a takéto,    would not be paying her pension
víš                                 and these things, you know
```

Here Monika is talking about the methods she will use for employees in her social enterprise. Monika herself, and her siblings, have occupied a particular space in their employment in the UK – that of precarity. From this statement, we see how the employment conditions that she has experienced herself shape how she anticipates employing staff for her business. We see the continuation of a precarity which has characterised her own life in the UK.

M health, housing. Všetko do toho musime dať	M health, housing. All that we need to put in there.	
JH jo. Health and housing	JH yea. Health and housing	
M lebo oni budu specificky platit tym čo maj health [...] education [...]	M because they will be specifically paying those who have health [...] education [...]	
JH education		
M víš? Na ty dve veci ti dajú viac peniaze lebo keď iba budeš pomahať benefitmi.	M you see? For these 2 things they will give you money more likely than when you are helping with benefits.	
JH jasně, no	JH sure, yea	
M musim to tak ňak.... zkomoliť.	M we have to... work it in somehow.	*'zkomolit'* means to garble, M using it in the wrong sense
JH to zrovna ti podle mě, když to napíšeš takle, jako že, takže I will be providing advocacy for the Eastern European community, I have worked with the Roma community... se mi to tam opakuje, with the Roma before as the Roma Voice Worker at the Advocacy Support and I know that this community has issues in areas such as access to benefits, health, housing, education and other.	JH Well I'd say that if you put it this way, like, so I will be providing advocacy for the Eastern European community, I have worked with the Roma community... se mi to tam opakuje, with the Roma before as the Roma Voice Worker at the Advocacy Support and I know that this community has issues in areas such as access to benefits, health, housing, education and other.	

In the above extract, Monika demonstrates how she has shaped her plan through the series of meetings with Parmi and Sharon. She has understood that there are certain topics, areas, or themes, that she needs to weave into her big idea in order to access funding. Here we notice a shift from the discourse of welfare, of advocacy, of precarity, to one of health and housing. Clearly, these are important concerns for newly arrived migrants. Access to suitable housing and the knowledge of how to navigate the health system, especially for those with children, like Monika, is crucial. A focus on these shifts the business plan away from welfare. Parmi and Sharon have advised that Monika needs to be able to demonstrate how she will create a business that is fundable and that is sustainable (see Section 5.3, where Sharon proposes that Monika offers a *package*). They have shaped her to consider a wider range of areas than advocacy. *For these two things they will give you money more likely than when you are helping with benefits*. We see again how the shaping of the plan, and the translation of discourses begins to reproduce itself in Monika's own ideas for her business.

5.5 Jolana and the business plan
Finally we come to the writing of the business plan. This was undertaken in several stages. First we focus on two early attempts in which Monika is supported by Jolana.

Earlier draft
This interaction was recorded at Monika's house during the school half-term holidays, so Monika's two sons were at home, as was Margita with her daughter, while Monika's partner was sleeping upstairs after a night shift. The cat had just had four kittens and these were running around the house.

When Jolana arrived, Monika showed her an A4 pad with her handwritten notes for a business plan. These included a rough design for a building with space downstairs for an office and space upstairs for activities. Clearly, space is an integral part of Monika's conceptualisation of her project, even at its earliest stages.

As for the conditions under which this early draft was produced, Jolana wrote: *The conversation was often going off-topic (talking about children, partners, Migration Counsel) and I felt I should give it more structure, so I took a pen and M's notepad and started writing down the frame of their business* (LeeHerFN_20150528_JH_014).

Interpersonal issues
One of the first things Jolana tried to establish was the identity of the business plan's addressee.

> (LeeHerAud_20150529_JH_008)
> ```
> JH jak to chce ta, ten business    JH how she wants it, the business
> plán to budete psát pro koho,      plan you will be writing it for
> pro tu Sh-, erm...                 whom, for Sh-, erm...
> M Sharon                           M Sharon
> JH Sharon nebo pro koho            JH Sharon or for whom?
> M já ani nevim pre koho, asi pre   M  I don't even know, for everybody
> každého (laughs)                   I guess (laughs)
> ```

Scollon (1998), following Goffman (1981), observes that in interaction social actors follow a strict sequence of concerns, first attending to the *channels* of communication, then to identities and relationships (see also 'positioning' [Davies and Harré 1990]), and only finally to *topics* (see also Halliday 1973), with positioning being prioritised. '[A]ny social encounter … has as its logical first and interactionally ongoing highest priority to position the participants in the social encounter in relation to each other' (Scollon 1998: 33). Theorists of textual positioning go even further: e.g. Chandler (2007: 187) claims that 'in order to make sense of the signs in a text the reader is obliged to adopt "a subject position" in relation to it'. As we have seen, in certain settings Monika is a highly effective social actor who has little difficulty in communicating with others in English. Given her high level of sociality, the invisibility of her 'interlocutor/s' in the social space of the business plan may be particularly disconcerting.

Genre issues
Proponents of distributed language (see Cowley 2011; Section 2.5) suggest that languaging is an activity which gains its cognitive power, not from how individuals use it, but from how they adapt to socially constructed ecological niches (Steffensen 2011) with their own complexes of communicative activity (genres) regimented in patterned

forms (registers) which function to encode cultural phenomena such as attitudes, modes of argumentation, positioning, and so on. Discourses of space, and the genres and registers through which they operate, ultimately foreground issues of discursive competence (Lefebvre 1991 [1974]). Clearly Monika is unfamiliar with the genre of the business plan: *I don't know how to write it. It's hard. I don't know how to express myself.* (These meta-commentaries expressed in Slovak.) Beyond this, we could also say she is unfamiliar with the entire neo-liberal discourse of applying for funding for setting up a social enterprise. Margita, who is helping Monika and Jolana write the business plan, puts her finger on the problem.

(LeeHerAud_20150529_JH_008)

Margita: kto by byli tvoji klienti a takéto, a toto robí aj mně problém, já jsem to [...] študovala aj na netě aj v tom časopise to je rozpísané, tomto.	Margita: Who your clients would be and such things, and this is my problem as well, I've [...] researched it on the internet and in that magazine they write about it as well, this one.
JH jo	JH yea
Margita: ale aj tak ve škole nás [...] vo tom business pláně, na to som čakala a nienaučili.	Margita: but still at school they [...] about the business plan, I was waiting for it but they did not teach us.

In their study in a UK medical school, Baynham and Callaghan (2013) found that otherwise high-achieving overseas students performed poorly in essay assignments and in assignments about ethics in particular. The students themselves, all with science backgrounds, put this down to lack of experience of the essay genre and lack of exposure to ethical debate in their countries of origin. This lends support to the ecological view of languaging. Ongoing alignment to changing environments is, according to sociocognitive theorists, just another way of talking about learning, which is not a special form of consciousness or cognition but a default process (Atkinson et al. 2007). However, as Husserl observes (see Duranti 2009), there are clearly differences in the extent to which individuals can or choose to modify or abandon well-established ways of being (habitus). In studying the writing of the business plan we have an opportunity to scrutinise the kinds of changes (superficial or profound) that take place in an individual's world view as it comes into contact with – and becomes under pressure to align with – the new cultural and, in particular, economic modes of being (perceiving, thinking, acting, valuing, feeling) which dominate the social spaces of a business plan. Underlying this enquiry is the question: How far can a culture (i.e. an established way of doing things distinctive of a particular group) – and the (perhaps) unformulated and exempted-from-doubt assumptions upon which it rests – be translated and transformed into another culture resting on a different set of propositions? This is precisely our focus in this section of the report.

Aligning to the ecological niche
In this extract Jolana is translating Monika's utterances and previously handwritten notes, formulated in response to the business plan headings, into her own handwritten text, aiming to align it more to the genre of the business plan.

(LeeHerAud_20150529_JH_008)

JH hele takže já co tady píšu,	JH look so what I am writing here,

```
space, activities, erm, Monika...      space, activities, erm, Monika...
erm providing advocacy, jo?            erm providing advocacy, yea?
(Philippe, Monika's son, speaking in English in the background)
JH Jo takže advocacy, k tomu           JH yea so advocacy, for that you
budeš potřebovat                       will need
M interpretov voluntary môžme          M voluntary interpreters we can
zohnat                                 get
JH jó?                                 JH yes?
M akože né voluntary                   M like not voluntary
JH Hele, ty sama to nechceš dělat      JH look, you yourself don't want
                                       to do it
M jako né voluntary, ale akože já      M like not voluntary, but like I
[...] požádám funding o to že          will apply for funding and give
bysom jim dala zero hours              them zero hours contract so that I
contract čiže bysom preplatila         would pay them like travel costs,
ako keby cestovné, na fundingu         from the funding
JH [...]                               JH [...]
M to je ako to robí Damian             M that's how Damian does it
```

Here we see Jolana engaging Monika in the scaffolding process (*Look, so what I am writing…*), directing (educating) her attention (in Czech) to particular generic forms (in English), which may for Monika be no more than the empty husks of meaning (see later extracts) or may, as here, draw life from the ecological niches they have occupied in her lived experience (cf. Schutz 1971). However, in her *voluntary interpreters we can get* we see an instance of Monika's failure to align to the discourse of the business plan. She has clearly not internalised Sharon's earlier characterisation of volunteers (*they have to eat, they have to drink. So after a while volunteers they go*). And it is only when Jolana questions her (*Yes? [...] Look, you yourself don't want to do it*) that Monika seems to recall this aspect of the business plan discourse: *Like not voluntary, but like I will apply for funding*. In suggesting *voluntary* and *zero hours contract*, Monika opts for a way of treating staff which, whilst previously subject to herself (*That's how Damian [Director of Migration Counsel] does it*), runs counter to how, in her world view, people should actually be treated. This suggests a superficial (pragmatic) conformism rather than whole-hearted cultural transformation – and that writing this business plan is difficult because it remains to a large extent an abstract and artificial exercise, far removed from her economic and discursive if not her social experience . As Monika says during a later draft: *All this, it's so silly* (LeeHerAud_20150619_JH_019).

Later draft

During a later visit by Jolana to Monika's house the pair once again get to grips with the business plan. Monika has been sent a nine-page Word template, which Jolana opens up on her laptop. The document, titled 'My Business Plan', contains 12 headings with frames to hold applicants' responses, and accompanying notes to guide them through the process (see Appendix 1). The text is clearly designed to be simple, jargon-free, and user-friendly. Monika, however, is still having trouble. So Jolana and she, combining their resources and drawing on the document notes and guidelines, co-construct responses which they hope are generically (ecologically) aligned to the spaces of the template, and hence to the normative ideology which has produced them.

```
(LeeHerAud_20150619_JH_019)
M I believe that my                    M I believe that my support... how do
support... jak to dám do               I put it together
kopy
```

```
JH já bych dala I believe       JH I would put I believe that if they
that if they get support        get support
M from someone from...
JH jo, přesně (both laugh)      JH yea, exactly (both laugh)
M nevim to ňák zkomolit         M I don't know how to put it all
dokopy, už tolko papierov,      together, [I have written?] so many
tolko [...]                     papers, so many [...]

JH [typing] [...] they will...
M willing
JH (typing) they will be willing
M willing to get help
JH jo, to get help              JH yea, to get help
M and give help, lebo ako to    M and give help, or how should I say
mam dať
JH že oni                       JH that they
M že dostanú pomoc ale aj       M that they will get help and return
otočia to zpatky                it back
```

Monika identifies her difficulty as not knowing *how to put it all together* in spite of having written so many papers. It's an expression which appears in various forms throughout this conversation. In the second instance, Monika incorrectly uses the word *zkomolit* , which means *to garble*, i.e. to reproduce a message in a confused or distorted way. It is the second time she has used *zkomolit* in this conversation. Earlier, speaking of health and housing, she says:

```
(LeeHerAud_20150619_JH_019)
M health, housing. Všetko do    M health, housing. All that we need
toho musime dať                 to put in there.
JH jo. Health and housing       JH yea. Health and housing
M víš? Na ty dve veci ti dajú   M you see? For these two things they
viac peniaze lebo keď iba       will give you money more likely than
budeš pomahať benefitmi.        when you are helping with benefits.
JH jasně, no                    JH sure, yea
M musim to tak ňak....          M we have to... work it in somehow.
zkomoliť.
```

This time Jolana translates *zkomolit* as *work it in somehow*. Is this what Monika believes she is doing? Putting things together, working them in (we recall Sharon's insistent use of *package*) in a process that involves or results in confusion and distortion? Alternatively, she was searching for a better word, and chose one that does not really mean what she is trying to say. Even if is this merely a languaging error, many of us are familiar with the experience of seeing our ideas go through some kind of garbling process as we struggle to work them into a text.

In any event, whatever else is happening here Monika does seem to be adapting to and drawing on her knowledge of the funding environment when she suggests including (working in) the words *health* and *housing*, given their greater power to attract funding than *helping with benefits*.

Returning to the extract above, it is interesting to follow the turns as each speaker takes up, builds on, and sometimes modifies (at times through misunderstanding or mis-anticipation?) the utterance of the other:

I believe that my support
I believe that if they get support
from someone
from [possibly: their own community?
yeah, exactly (both laugh)

And the progression from Jolana's *they will* to Monika's *willing* and thence to *willing to get help* (thus introducing the client's perspective), and finally back to *will get help and return it back*, a proposition solidly centred in the reciprocal altruism of Monika's world view rather than that of free-market entrepreneurialism. In passing we note here the suggestion that, in interaction, habitus may insert itself through the interstices of misunderstanding and mis-anticipation.

Personal aims
Around ten days after the meeting with Sharon, Jolana and Monika are completing the section in the business plan on 'personal aims'. We have carried out a close analysis of this extract: this transcription is more detailed than others in this report, turns are numbered, and where interlingual translanguaging is evident, the turn is reproduced in italics below, with the translated text in bold. Brief pauses are marked with (.). Commentary appears in double brackets.

Monika and Jolana develop the business plan   *Setting: Monika's home*

Transcription conventions for this extract:
(.)   short pause
↑   rising intonation
(laughs)   laughter, etc.
(( ))   editorial comments
<*italics* **bold**> translated text in <angle brackets, *italics* **bold for Cz/Sl**>

```
    1.   JH   Ok erm my personal aims and objectives erm (.)
    2.        jo tak tady v těch v tom vysvětlení pod tim
    3.        like to prove your capabilities provide security
    4.        for your family or something you have wanted to do
    5.        for a long time but just not had the chance
    6.        so it's like what you want to get out of it
    7.        <Ok erm my personal aims and objectives erm
    8.        yea so here in this explanation underneath
    9.        like to prove your capabilities provide security
    10.       for your family or something you have wanted to
    11.       do for a long time but just not had the chance
    12.       so it's like what you want to get out of it>
    13.  MS   tak erm hm how to say it hm I want to people stand s-
    14.       be same as me change their future
    15.       <well erm hm how to say it hm I want to people stand s-
    16.       be same as me change their future>
    17.  JH   I want
    18.  MS   I don't know how to say it
    19.       ((Monika's partner laughs))
```

```
20.  MS   no I mean like my job gonna be change them (.)
21.       like they in that I was
22.       in that position where they are now yea ↑
23.  JH   yea
24.  MS   and I wanna show them they can change (.)
25.       they can be same like me working
26.       look after family and be strong (.)
27.       I mean this way I don't mean like me
28.       I'm not good role model (.) some ways (sighs)
29.  JH   ((typing, muttering)) community and
30.  MS   you know what I mean
31.  JH   ((typing)) manage to find my way to employment
32.       ((reading out what she's just written))
33.       I have been in in a similar situation like many people
34.       in the community and I managed to find my way to employment
35.  MS   and look after (.) look after your kids
36.  JH   and
37.  MS   stable family or how to say
38.  JH   and stable family life
39.  MS   yea without chaos
40.  JH   without any (.) erm (.) jo dobře (.)
41.       a co z toho chceš pro sebe tady třeba jako erm
42.       <without any (.) erm (.) **yea (.) all right (.)**
43.       **and what do you want for yourself out of it here like erm**>
44.  MS   pro sebe↑
45.       <**for myself**>
46.  JH   pro sebe co tim chceš dokázat sama sama jakoby víšco
47.       <**for yourself what you want to prove yourself yourself**
48.       **like you know what**>
49.  MS   že môžem pomáhať ľudom alebo já nevim že môžem
50.       zmenit životy ludiom
51.       <**that I can help people or I don't know I can**
52.       **change people's lives**>
53.  JH   ((JH composes and types an answer to this question))
54.       ((*reading*)) I like I like helping people people
55.       to make their lives better better and I also like this
56.       what they say here er something or something you have
57.       wanted to do for a long time but just not had the chance
58.       I think that applies to you as well no↑ (.)
59.       so I c- I would put something like (typing)
60.       I have worked with the community for a long time
61.       as a volunteer and also on paid position and now
62.       and through through funding (.) funding (.) funding hmmm (.)
63.       through funding jo počkej (.) že si s nima pracovala
64.       dlouhou dobu
65.       <*I have worked with the community for a long time*
66.       *as a volunteer and also on paid position and now*
67.       *and through through funding (.) funding (.) funding hmmm (.)*
68.       *through funding* **yea wait (.) that you have worked**
```

```
69.         with them for a long time>
70.  MS    ale němohla som im provide every any kind of service
71.         what they looking for
72.         <but I could not provide every any kind of service
73.         what they looking for>
74.  JH    jo to je přesně vono
75.         <yea that's exactly it>
76.  MS    because of lack of money or how to say
```

This extract contains one of the clearest and most comprehensive statements of Monika's life project in our data set. It arises from Jolana's question in line 6, after reading the notes accompanying this section: *So it's like what* you *want to get out of it*. Monika struggles at first to put this into words (13-18). Her partner laughs (19). Monika speaks of her ambition to show people that they can change, be like her, find work, take care of their family, be strong. Two recurrent themes from Monika's world view are evident here: the importance of family security, which is what she wants to pass on, and a reciprocal altruism (as opposed to free-market entrepreneurism), a deep-rooted disposition. She admits, sighing, that she is not a good role model but believes people can follow the same path (*I mean this way*). Jolana (33-34) translates this into the language of the business plan (*similar situation … many people in the community… managed to find my way to employment*). This is a type of translanguaging which we have referred to elsewhere (Baynham et al 2015) as *interdiscursive* translanguaging (cf. Jakobson (2012 [1959]) on interdiscursive translation). Here, Jolana engages in interdiscursive translanguaging as the discourse of the business plan is unfamiliar to Monika. The neo-liberal economies of Monika's new environment favour those with competence in a range of languages, discourses, and patterned forms or registers in which these discourses are regimented. These include the bureaucratic discourses around funding applications, knowledge of which is crucial for those who need to navigate the dominant regulatory regimes which are in play. Just as interlingual translanguaging involves moving between one language and another, so interdiscursive translanguaging can be understood as mediating or interpreting a discourse to someone who is outside it, as Jolana does for Monika here.

And then, coming to the heart of the matter, Monika adds (35, 37, 39) *look after your kids … stable family … without chaos*. Jolana again translates (40), then, apparently feeling that Monika has not answered the original question for this section of the form, repeats it, but in Czech: *And what do you want for yourself out of it here for example*. Why does Jolana use Czech here? Possibly at her second attempt at achieving the right sort of response from Monika, she feels she has to ask the question in the language which Monika is most familiar with, to ensure comprehension. Monika still seems bewildered however (45): *For myself?* Jolana can put it no more simply (47-48): *for yourself what you want to prove yourself yourself like you know what*. Monika's reprise of her earlier response (*that I can help people or I don't know I can change people's lives*) suggests a breakdown in understanding. The distance between the requirement of the business plan form and Monika's own subject position is at this point unbridgeable. Translanguaging, even interdiscursive translanguaging with an expert mediator, is not always successful. Here there appear to be differing conceptions of 'self' at play: self as individuated and independent (the 'self' of the business plan) and Monika's social self, interdependent with and sustained by interaction with others.

However powerful a statement of Monika's life project this is, it is not yet a business plan. It begins to become one when Jolana, drawing on the template guidelines which she had earlier read out (4-5: *something you have wanted to do for a long time but just not had a chance*) to shape her own text (60-61) (*I have worked with the community for a long time as a volunteer*) introduces the notion of funding (62-63): *and now and through through funding (.) funding (.) funding hmmm (.) through funding*, as if aware of the importance of this point and not wanting to forget it. She is searching for the right way to continue, in written English appropriate for the form. Following Goffman (1959), she is within the form-filling frame; the legitimized and institutionalized discourse. Midway through the turn she moves outside that frame, slipping into an interpersonal interaction with Monika. In so doing, she again uses Czech, but perhaps not (this time) for increased comprehension: *yea wait (.) that you have worked with them for a long time*. At this point Monika comes in with the missing piece (70): *ale němohla som im (but I could not)* then moves back into the form-filling frame, and correspondingly to third-sector-speak-English, *provide every, any kind of service what they looking for*. Jolana, realizing how well this aligns with the guidelines (*but just not had a chance*), acknowledges the fact (74): *Yea that's exactly it*. And Monika finally comes on message (76) with *because of lack of money*. Here, finally, we hear the voices of Sheila and the others who are supporting her, as well as the authors of the form and the policy-makers and bigger discourses sitting behind them. She is finally thinking like a business person, finally recognising that her 'dream' must be something she can present as something attractive to funders.

Money, in the form of funding, is the thing which can empower Monika to realise her life project, and – emphasising our concern – to establish an initiative or enterprise that caters for the cultural heritage needs of Roma people in Harehills. Under other socio-economic regimes things might be different. But this is the one she finds herself in, and to which she must align.

5.6 Business plan: Conclusions
So what have we learned about the transformation of cultures, and indeed the transmission and transformation of heritage, by viewing Monika's business plan and its associated spaces as contact zones? First and foremost perhaps we have been able to observe the coming together of two world pictures, each with its own exempt-from-doubt, foundational, inherited beliefs. On Monika's side, these beliefs are attributed (by her) principally to her time in the care home, which, in spite of the good things she experienced there (the security and freedom from want, the egalitarianism, the stimulating activities, the being made to feel special, privileged), took place against a backdrop of family break-up. A period of dependence on others, with all that that entails, also, as Monika says, help explain *why I am how I am* (LeeHerInt_20151809_JH&JC_001). Part of that *how I am* is the project Monika now seeks to realise through her business plan, at the heart of which is the proposition: *Family is first* (see Section 4). Another foundational idea is that of passing on the valuable things learned through experience.

> (LeeHerInt_20150724_JC_003)
> *What I never had, I want to give them … I don't want this knowledge I will get now just lose … for everybody. It don't even have to be important for my kids … be important for someone else.*

And how is this passing on to be realised?

> (LeeHerIn_20150702_JC_001)
> ```
> My biggest dream to have something like castle, where I can have
> children who abandoned, and I can give them life, grow them like care
> home. Second part of my life is still support other people like I do
> now.
>
> …There is no like this book tell me 'you have to live this way.' I
> don't believe that… That's why I'm saying is not important how you
> write it down. It's important how you tell it and show it and how you
> guide.
> ```

Life progresses through projects, with causes – even if forgotten – in the past (Lefebvre 1991[1974]).

As for money, Monika says that, while she has learned she cannot do without it, it is not her primary concern. Sharon's question *Who's gonna pay for it?* – the question which resounds throughout the spaces of the business plan and the dominant free-market, entrepreneurial discourse which produces them – is inaudible in the care home. Much of the talk of money (aka funding) in Section 5 has been others' talk. And money is very much part of Monika's sister Margita's heritage, though interestingly the caring impulse is also there.

> (LeeHerFN_20150528_JH_014)
> *I don't know where I have my business mindset from. Maybe from my father – my adoptive father, as I grew up in an adoptive family. He was a businessman, and he had money, and I would sometimes take it to give it to people who were poor and I was sorry for them!*

In summary: the kind of social space Monika aspires to produce in her project (and in the business plan) is, we would argue, one dominated by the dimension of lived experience (*espace veçu*), i.e. by the experience of the 'whole person', whose impulse is to burst through the normative orders of the business plan (*it's so silly*) and to relate directly to the whole and irreducible 'other'. Such presuppositions of lived space, as Shields (following Lefebvre) observes 'often structure problem definitions and thus influence the sort of solutions that are thought of as being possible and achievable' (1999: 164).

This holism, however, is not how things work in the world of the business plan, which appears to be dominated by the dimension of conceived space (*espace conçu*): fragmenting (*one thing at a time*), homogenising, commodifying. Clearly, the meanings associated with these spaces are socially constructed by those with power (cf. Harvey 1996; Cresswell 2003), while those hoping to receive funding have little chance of resisting the established norms. The business plan thus becomes 'a tool in the creation, maintenance, and transformation of relations of domination' (Cresswell 2003: 46) with clients defined by its spatiality (competent or incompetent) and trapped in its grid (cf. Soja 1996: 110).

However, the perhaps unwitting agents of this domination, and presumably, the institutions they work for, show considerable appreciation for what we are calling Monika's mobile heritage (as outlined above and in Section 2): but only those aspects which are aligned to their own aims (see Wills 2012). By promoting, financing, subsidizing and regulating activity such as entrepreneurship through cultural tools like the business plan and the institutional representatives who support their production, the state, as we have seen in this section, reproduces state-like thinking, acting, perceiving and feeling in everyday life (cf. Lefebvre 1991 [1974]). In the co-authoring process with Jolana, we noted this function and identified some shifts in Monika's alignment to the business plan. Whether these represent superficial strategic compliance or fundamental transformation only time will tell. However the old world view and affective stance are still much in evidence: in Monika's commitment to her community, her frustration with bureaucratic constraints and the need to *garble*, the difficulty she has saying what she wants out of the business for herself, her insistence on the need for a community space, running counter to the dominant discourse of integration.

Nevertheless, fundamental transformation is clearly the goal, which is why, for example, Parmi encourages clients to sit on panels to assess one another's proposals: *That way they've got a better understanding of what it's like to be on the other side of the table. And it was a really good learning process.* And, as we have suggested, learning is merely socialisation or adaptation to new environments by another name (Atkinson et al. 2007).

We have no evidence, however, that Parmi and Sharon (whose sensitivity and commitment to their clients is clearly beyond question) carry out corresponding exercises to help themselves gain insight into their client's foundational assumptions. Nor do we have any evidence that they question their own. The environment is what it is and those wishing to prosper must adapt. *Start small and do one thing at a time* may sound like good advice. It does not, however, correspond to the lived experience of parents, for example, who must address children's' needs holistically (not food *or* clothing, health *or* education). Nor is the assertion that nothing can happen without money beyond challenge, as anthropologist David Graeber (2011) has shown, arguing that money (and debt, which appears on the scene at the same time) have subtly but fundamentally changed the basis of human relations by placing them on an economic (precisely measurable, arithmetic) rather than a moral footing. The development of Monika's business seems to provide an object lesson in this dialectic.

6 Commodifying music and food for a heritage business

6.1 Introduction

Food and music and emerge as relevant themes in our case study, in particular as they relate to Monika's brother, Ivan. Ivan aspires to set up a café in Harehills catering for the Roma population. Our fieldnotes report on a conversation between a third sector project manager and local politician (EC), and Ivan. This discussion exemplifies how food has become embedded in the institutional discourse around community-building. We see how the council is using food as one of its key areas of focus, not only to promote the city and region through its annual food festival, but also to draw in less represented people from around the city. We see the space emerging here for Ivan to develop his idea further and link in to the wider city agenda.

> (LeeHerFn_20150617_JB_001)
> *EC talks about how years ago the council has decided to put an emphasis on food as cultural heritage and a 'space' for interaction and community building / reconciliation in Leeds and how interesting it is to hear about projects and ideas relating to food from communities that are less represented. He tells Ivan that the aim for the food festival is to make it more relevant and representative of the changing Leeds communities. He thinks that a Czech/Slovak/ Roma food stall would be a great idea and well received. He jots down his details and a couple of other email addresses and contacts, one being for the food festival*

This links to themes arising in Section 5, around how ideas associated with cultural heritage are shaped to fit institutional and policy discourses (see also Section 2.2, on the heritage sector). The food and music of a particular community are typically viewed as part of their intangible heritage. We recall the UNESCO definition of intangible cultural heritage as being 'submitted from generation to generation', of being 'constantly recreated by communities and groups' and of providing people with 'a sense of identity and continuity' (UNESCO, n.d.). In this section we aim to understand more generally how music and food come into the definition of intangible heritage both within the entrepreneurial project and in the home. More specifically, we ask:

- how different types of music and food are commodified (Heller, 2003), as repertoires of transcultural resources, some of which may be linked to Ivan's Slovak and Roma cultural heritage practices, are turned into business initiatives aimed at the Roma community;
- how culinary and musical practices in our participants' domestic lives relate to this construction of culinary and musical repertoires as being 'sellable' or otherwise in business ventures that are oriented towards the Roma in Leeds.

We begin in 6.2 with a discussion of the role of food and music in the domestic lives of our participants, with social media and audio data from a family birthday celebration allowing us to reconstruct what we understand as fluid, transcultural and translingual musical and culinary practices. Following that (6.3), we briefly provide an overview of Ivan's business idea, before turning to explore how different types of music and food are constructed in different data sources as appropriate for his Roma-oriented business initiatives.

6.2 Diverse and fluid culinary and musical repertoires

These photos, posted on Monika's Facebook page, were taken at Monika's sister Margita's birthday party, mainly including family members (see Section 4.5 for a discussion of Monika's family life). The food (e.g. a birthday cake reading "Happy 28 Birthday Margita", Czech/Slovak open sandwiches known as 'obložené chlebíčky'), drink (e.g. Polish and German beer), cigarettes (e.g. Russian and American brands) and the ways of presenting and consuming them are sometimes recognisably British, sometimes arguably international, sometimes more identifiable as Roma, Slovak or Czech heritage practices, and often all of these things together.

As with food, the choice of music in the home data is diverse, driven by spontaneous selection, personal preferences and type of occasion. Thus, at Margita's birthday party, the music played in the background (likely from YouTube, as there are occasions when Margita comments on it during observations) is indexical of the musical preferences of various people present in the room (e.g. sometimes specific musical requests are made), as well as of their diverse cultural and linguistic heritage and repertoires. During the audio recording made at Margita's party, the following songs listed in the table below were heard in the background while people went about the celebration. The songs have been identified using the mobile phone application *Shazam* and are listed in the order in which they were played. Information about the genre, language and background of the artists was gleaned from *Wikipedia*.

Artist	Song	Other information
Bódi Guszti	3 or 4 songs are played	Lively music sung by a Hungarian Roma artist, in
50 cent	Candy Shop	Commercial US rap
50 cent	In Da Club	Commercial US rap
Eminem	The Real Slim Shady	Commercial US rap
Unidentified pop/electro	-	-
Eminem	My Name Is	Commercial US rap

Kabat	-	Czech rock music
50 cent	Candy Shop	Commercial US rap
Pussycat Dolls	Buttons	American pop
Hip hop in an unidentifiable language	-	-
Unidentified Gypsy music (?)	-	-
Igor Kmeťo ft. Anita Soul & Rytmus	Ona Má Štýl	Slovakian R&B
AK26	A Gengszter	Hungarian rap
AK26	Rettenthetetlen	Hungarian rap
Metallica	Nothing Else Matters	US heavy metal
Metallica	The Unforgiven	US heavy metal
Metallica	Fade to Black	US heavy metal
Unidentified rock music	-	-

In the playlist we find artists from different cultural backgrounds, singing in various languages. Neither of the artists of Roma heritage sings in a Romani language in the tracks that were heard in our audio recordings. Anita Soul is a singer of Roma heritage; however, her music is influenced by pop and R&B. The track heard on the audio recording is in Slovak. Bódi Guszti is a Roma singer singing in Hungarian and his music is influenced by traditional Roma music. The Hungarian language is also represented in the playlist by the rapper AK26, while 50 Cent, Eminem, Pussycat Dolls and Metallica perform in varieties of English. When we look at the playlist from the perspective of styles, we find Hungarian modern Roma music, US rap/Hip-Hop, Hungarian rap/Hip-Hop, Slovakian pop/R&B, US pop, US rock/heavy metal and Czech rock.

As is the case with food, this musical repertoire in the home exists as a whole; that is, the musical soundscape is a reflection of transcultural and translinguistic spaces and of the fluid linguistic and cultural identities of our research participants, to which Roma, Slovak, Czech or Hungarian heritage practices contribute in part, and which we might describe, as suggested in Section 2.1, as mobile heritage or heritage as repertoire. We can note too that the diverse musical repertoire is facilitated by technical affordances which make it feasible to assemble an eclectic playlist.

6.3 Ivan's development of a heritage-related business plan
Noting the central role of food and music in family life, we can now develop an analysis of how different types of food and music, as aspects of heritage, are commodified in the development of a business plan. Like his sister Monika, Ivan intends to initiate a heritage-related enterprise and is therefore looking for funding. His primary business

idea involves establishing a Roma café based in Harehills serving coffee and light snacks, as well as more substantial dishes and desserts. The second focus of Ivan's business would be music; he would like to give local musicians the possibility of a space where they could rehearse; he also wants to host breakdancing classes. He is further interested in the idea of organising musical events in the area in the future. Unlike Monika, Ivan never talks explicitly about the important social function of food and music for Roma people; nonetheless both food and music are clearly central elements for him in imagining his Roma-oriented business ventures. In Section 2.2 above we introduced the notion that aspects of heritage can be commodified, can provide a living. In this section we begin with an analysis of how certain dishes in Ivan's repertoire are commodified for his heritage business idea. We follow with a similar discussion about music.

The commodification of a culinary repertoire

Otheguy, García and Reid (2015) draw parallels between cooking and translanguaging. To align with translanguaging as an approach to language description is to accept that different named languages do not exist separately in the mind: rather, access to an ever-developing repertoire (or what Otheguy et al. refer to as an idiolect) of semiotic resources that is partly shared with others, and that is partly linked to our heritage as one aspect of our lived experience. Aspects of this repertoire are associated with societally-recognised names such as 'Czech' or 'Catalan' and are expected to be mobilised conforming to the social and linguistic norms in any situated interaction.

According to Otheguy et al., something similar occurs with food: they claim that a named (often national) language is analogous to a named (often national) cuisine. Often we just *transcook* (our term) or fuse together ingredients and recipes that people like and that are feasible to prepare in a given situation from our repertoire of transcultural culinary experiences. Our participants are seen to do this at Margita's birthday party, above. Sometimes, however, we also have to define what we are serving in terms of societally-named and recognised culinary traditions, such as 'Ethiopian', 'Basque' or 'Italian', and to stick to certain recognisable norms in the preparation of dishes. Like languages, the boundaries and overlaps between one recognised culinary tradition and another are not always clear and may depend as much on how the cook names their national or ethnic heritage as it does on the ingredients and preparation of the recipe (Otheguy et al. 2015: 285). We might ask: What are the traditional Romani dishes? What are traditional Slovakian dishes? Some dishes that might be considered Romani (Český Rozhlas 1997) are often eaten by the majority society and not perceived by all Czech and Slovak people as exclusively part of Roma heritage. This resonates clearly with the idea of heritage as repertoire, elaborated in Section 2.1.

In the interactions around food in relation to Ivan's business venture, the metaphor introduced by Otheguy et al. (2015) involving translanguaging and cooking is appealing for describing the tensions emerging in terms of what food is constructed as business-worthy. In Ivan's process of deciding what dishes to include in his plan, the criteria of financial profitability and easy preparation need to be met first and foremost. That is, what is primarily at stake for Ivan is not whether certain dishes in his transcultural culinary repertoire may be identified as being recognisably part of his Roma or Slovak heritage, but whether they are practical to make, attractive to his imagined (Roma) clientele and thus apt to make money.

However, certain foods that Ivan values or misses from his Roma and Slovakian heritage and memories of life in Slovakia also figure in his business plans. The fact that nobody, according to him, is offering Czech or Slovak or Roma food in Harehills at the moment is discussed as a potential market niche and a business opportunity. Some references are made to food that *my people* eat, to what is *ours*; that is, to parts of Ivan's culinary repertoire that he constructs as being part of a collective Roma or Slovakian identity.

In the following extract, both of these considerations – about what is attractive and profitable and what is *ours* and missed – emerge. Ivan is discussing, with Monika, Margita and Ivan's partner Frank, the food to be prepared in the context of the musical events to be organised, in which bands will be brought from Slovakia. Data from different sources reveal that roast sausages, goulash, schnitzels, roast bacon, corn hobs, gypsy roast and candyfloss are all considered for such events; that is, both food that is more closely identifiable as being part of Roma/Czech/Slovak heritage and is sometimes constructed as such through the use of possessive pronouns (e.g. *our gypsy roast*), and food from his transcultural repertoire that simply sells well (e.g. *candyfloss, corn hobs*). Turns are numbered; the original conversation appears in the left-hand column, a translation to the right of that, and researcher comments in the far-right column.

(LeeHerAud_20150603_JH_031)

1.	Ivan:	alebo normálne že sa spraví naprieklad nevim, že by sa spravili, neviem ňáké jedlo a podávalo tam. Nevim. A na to jedlo, jediné čo by se bolo oplatilo eště tie klobásy pečené, víš takéto volačo, hotdgy, to oné čo hovorim, kukuricu	or you could have for example I don't know, that there would be I don't know some food and it would be served there. I don't know. And about the food, the only thing that would be profitable might be roast sausages, you know, things like this, hotdogs, like I am saying, the corn	Talking to Frank
2.	Monika:	zejtra mám soud. Ráno	tomorrow I have the court. In the morning	Monika and Margita are speaking in the background
3.	Margita:	niekúpily sme si ani farbu na vlasy	we haven't bought the hair colour	
4.	Monika:	[...]		
5.	Ivan:	takéto, našu cigánskú	these things, our gypsy [roast]	
6.	Monika:	[...]		
7.	Ivan:	našu cigánsku pečienku, vieš to čo myslim tu cigánskú do žemle	our gypsy roast, you know what I mean, gypsy [roast] in a bun	
8.	Monika:	to je také dohněda	that's more brownish	Talking about the hair colour
9.	Ivan:	tu cibulku [...]	the onion [...]	

		osmaženú dáš, ne, horčicu lebo čo, cigánsku, zavreš, máš. A na to potrebujem ten gril, taky, na tu cigánskú čo je. Nie taký mriežkový	fried you put in it, no, mustard or whatever, you close it, ready. And for that you need the grill, also, the one for the gypsy [roast]. Not the one with the lattice
10.	Frank:	hm, hm	
11.	Ivan:	toto chcem, také, cigánskú. To tu nikte není, naprieklad. Cukrová vata, keď by sem vedel sehnat cukrovú vatu, ten stroj, lacný, máš špajglu, dáš tam tu cukre, a tak a tššš a už to máš. A dáš za jednu libru takú, ty deti to budú jest. Lebo len kvoli deckám to zarobíš.	this I also want, the gypsy [roast]. That can't be found here, for example. Candy floss, if I knew how to get the candy floss, that machine cheap, you have a stick, you put in the sugar and so on and tssssh and it's done. And you sell it for one pound and the kids will be eating it. Because only for the kids you'll be doing it.

In turn 1 Ivan suggests several food items, explicitly mentioning the criteria of profitability (also turn 11) as important to his venture. In turns 2-4, 6 and 8, a parallel conversation is taking place between Monika and Margita about colouring hair. In turns 5 and 7 Ivan refers to *our Gypsy roast* as another possibility for his venture. In turns 7 and 9 he clarifies what he means exactly by *our Gypsy roast*, which is served in a bun with onion and mustard and cannot be found in the area (turn 11). It is interesting to note how the pronoun *our* used in turns 5 and 7 is dropped for the article *the* when talking about Gypsy roast in turns 9 and 11, following the definition contrasting *our* Gypsy roast to another possible category of Gypsy roast. This suggests that intersubjective understandings of what we are talking about as *ours* needs to be established rather than being a given; that is, this short interaction shows how the cataloguing of what is shared as intangible heritage is at least in part an interactional accomplishment.

The commodification of a musical repertoire
Music is also discussed as part of the activities that Ivan (as well as Monika) wants to organise. The music discussed by them for their business ventures is exclusively Roma music or music performed by Roma-heritage artists. This contrasts with how food is commodified, and with how music is experienced in the home.

This preference for Roma music (i.e. Roma-style and/or in Romani) or music performed by Roma-heritage artists results from the demand of the Roma community from the area as understood and imagined by Ivan and Monika, rather than being directly indexical of their own personal tastes. Berger (2003) speaks of the importance of

language choice in balancing potential outreach and local tastes in the globalised music industry:

> For many throughout the world, questions of language choice are a crucial part of musical experience. Musicians, listeners, and cultural workers must constantly ask themselves questions such as: Which languages or dialects will best express my ideas? Which will get me a record contract or a bigger audience? What does it mean to sing or listen in a colonial language? A foreign language? A 'native' language?
>
> (Berger 2003: x)

Ivan is planning to use music for business in two ways. Firstly, as a part of the activities he would like to offer in his Roma café to young people; he wants to offer breakdance classes and a space for young musicians to rehearse. Ivan is also thinking of organising concerts. While they should include Roma music or Roma heritage artists (Ivan mentions Anička Oláhová, Chorus Maťo and Martina Balogova, among others), the concerts should also be profitable, or at least sustainable. He has seen that similar events are already successfully happening in the region (e.g. a concert by the Slovak rapper Rytmus in Bradford, concerts organised by the Harehills-based rapper Ekoo, both of whom are prominent on Monika's Facebook pages). The price the artist would set for their performance cannot be too high, which means that Ivan plans to invite local artists and emerging artists rather than big stars. TV talent shows such as Superstar or X-Factor are often mentioned in conversation; this is how many Roma singers have become known and famous, entered the mainstream music industry and media, and are collectively seen as success stories. In the extract below, a conversation between Ivan and Jolana, many of these aspects become relevant. It starts with Ivan speaking about a singer he knows from Slovakia through personal contacts, who could potentially be invited to perform and who would do it for free just to be able to have the opportunity to sing in England.

(LeeHerAud_20150616_JH_023)

1.	Ivan:	Ale zase ona by mi prišla, ona vetšinou anglicky spievá	but then she would come, she sings mostly in English
2.	Jolana:	ahá	aha
3.	I:	a ona jako že má pár piesniček čo má naspievané	and she has a few songs rehearsed
4.	J:	nó	yea
5.	I:	a že kvoli mně by sa naučila i ňáké dve tri romské, akože by to [...]	and that because of me she would learn also two or three in Romani, like it [...]
6.	J:	no, no, no	yea yea yea
7.	I:	ale vetšinou anglické, akože celkom dobre. Neni perfekt ale zase je dobrá v tom. A zadarmo, vieš, to je to	but mostly in English, like quite good. She's not perfect but she's good at it. And for free, you know, that's it
8.	J:	jasně	sure
9.	I:	a o-, ohlásil som už pár spievačok, lenže oni už sú že taká postúpila do superstar alebo X Factor vyhrála v Rakúsku jedna,	and con-, I've contacted a few singers but they are like one of them qualified in Superstar or one of them won the X Factor in

		dobrá spievačka, cigánka, lenže ona chce už, sama keby prišla, lietenku a šest sto libier. To už je moc	Austria, a good singer, a gypsy, but she wants, if she came by herself, air ticket and 600 pounds. That is too much.
10.	J:	za vystoupení?	for performing?
11.	I:	hej, lebo ona už je akože hviezda bo vyhrála, X Factor vyhrála. Takže, v Rakúsku	yes, because she's like a star, she has won, she has won the X Factor. So, in Austria
12.	J:	no tak to musíš mít místo aby se ti tam vešlo tolik lidí	well you will need a space for so many people to fit in
13.	I:	to by som musel	I would need to
14.	J:	aby se ti to vrátilo	so that you get the money back
15.	I:	já bysom musel aj vstupné. Teraz mám jednu, som ohlásil, ona je v Čechách žije, na facebooku má plné takých ak spievá. Se mi zaľúbila, ohlásil som [...] to. Včera mi písala že dobre, že [...] by prišla akože s jednim eště, že oni sú duet, že lietenku a tiež šest sto libier. A já hovorim ok že já sa ozvem neskor lebo že to mám len informačně, že eště neotváram. A tak informačně dopredu že aké sumy	I would also need to charge the entry fee. I have one, I have contacted her, she lives in the Czech Republic, on her facebook there is a lot of how she sings. I liked her, I contacted [...] it. Yesterday she wrote me that fine, that [...] would come like with another one, that they are a duo, and flight ticket and again 600 pounds. And I said ok I will get back in touch soon and that I had it just for my information, that I'm not opening yet. But for my information, how much the sums are
16.	J:	jo to je dobrý vědět	yea that's good to know
17.	I:	[...] a to radši to zaplatím štyry sto a mám celú kapelu, vieš že cigáni na to chodia	[...] and I'd rather pay 400 and I have a whole band, you know that the gypsies like it
18.	J:	to jo	right
19.	I:	dám desať liber vstupné a mám	I'll ask for 10 pounds to get in and that's it

As mentioned previously, music is a cultural practice in which global and local dynamics of language are particularly relevant, and a good example of heritage as repertoire (we talk about the repertoire of a band or a performer after all). This fluidity is evident from the outset in this extract. In turn 1, Ivan mentions that his Roma contact from Slovakia sings *mostly in English*, probably because of global linguistic flows privileging that language in mainstream popular music that she sings (Alim, Ibrahim & Pennycook 2009), and maybe in seeking outreach of her talent beyond Slovakia. She presumably also sings in Slovak. However, in turn 5, Ivan claims that she would be willing to learn a few songs in Romani as well, to orient her performance to what he understands to be the tastes of the local Roma public in the UK. It is interesting that not all Roma speak a Romani language fluently: indeed Ivan himself does not. However, Ivan indicates that there is a demand for music in Romani amongst the supposed clientele for his venture.

Whether a singer is both Roma and *good* (turn 7) are crucial issues, but not the only ones; they also need to be sufficiently well-known that people would be willing to pay, so as to at least cover costs. In turns 9-11, the idea of bringing emerging Roma 'success stories', such as artists who have performed on Superstar in Slovakia or X-Factor abroad, comes up. Elsewhere, Ivan mentions having music competitions designed after this model in his café. However, given the costs of bringing in emerging stars, Ivan needs to balance considerations of space (more expensive means a bigger audience to cover costs or higher ticket prices, turns 12-16) and stylistic preferences in terms of value for money (Roma people, according to him, would rather see a less popular band at a reasonable price, than a famous singer, turns 17-19).

6.4 Food and music: Conclusions

In this section we have aimed to understand how music and food exist as intangible heritage for Monika and especially for Ivan, both within the home and as part of the entrepreneurial project. More specifically, we asked how different types of music and food are commodified and how culinary and musical practices in our research participants' domestic lives relate to this construction of culinary and musical repertoires as being 'saleable' or otherwise in Roma-oriented business ventures. In the case of food, what is primarily at stake in deciding whether a dish is Roma-oriented business-worthy is not whether it may be socially recognisable as being part of Roma/Czech/ Slovak traditional heritage, while in the case of music there is a distinct preference for Roma artists in Ivan's business plan, if not in the home environment. Furthermore, the identification of what counts as shared heritage is at least in part an interactional achievement, rather than always *a priori* fact. Such findings remind us of the need for complex understandings of heritage practices in contexts of superdiversity as part of as a diverse and fluid repertoire of transcultural and translingual resources, which may be differentially and strategically commodified – either for the heritage business industry or for the basic necessity of making a living.

7 Conclusion

In the Heritage phase of the TLang project in Leeds, our focus has been on our KP, Monika. As we suggested at the outset, we had to work hard to understand what heritage meant for Monika, and consequently for us. Here we summarise the findings and discuss the implications of this case study.

Long-established understandings of cultural and tangible heritage mean little to Monika; rather, she values – and holds close in the new environment – her experiences in childhood and her family. In our background discussion in Section 2 we suggested that heritage for Monika might also entail dynamic identifications with different heritage traditions. This led to an understanding of heritage, for Monika, as having no fixed abode. Rather, in relation to *repertoire*, we considered it to comprise a range of heritage resources she might draw upon. This contrasted with more traditional understandings of heritage as something we might find housed in a museum or gallery. We also drew attention to how heritage might become commodified, and might be deployed for income generation. Importantly for us we developed the idea of heritage as space, and of heritage spaces that are produced discursively, in talk and interaction, informed by competing positions and ideologies. Re-imagining heritage spaces in this way focuses attention on how – in contexts of superdiversity – heritage becomes unstuck from established chains of transmission.

Monika's personal history and life in Leeds, the focus of Section 4, are unusual, but in this time of mass mobility and spatial upheaval, surely not unique. She grew up in a children's home, not with a Roma-speaking family, locating her in an in-between space even as a child. As an adult in Leeds she again occupies a liminal position, as a broker between other Roma in Leeds and the people in the city's institutions whose roles and desire it is to support her. We discussed the plans and dreams that she has to do *something* for the Roma (though she is not entirely clear what that might be), and to find a place to do it. These plans and dreams, i.e. the wish to make something happen somewhere, became our heritage focus. We recognised that Monika herself is bringing along her history, her experiences and her sense of being neither here nor there to the heritage enterprise. Conditions of contemporary mobility surely suggest that large numbers of people experience a similar sense of in-between-ness as they attempt to create a heritage for the future.

Monika's ideas about heritage, relating to her desire to see something she values passed on, have come up against the exigencies of modern life as a migrant in Leeds, and the need to make a living. Section 5 documented a transformation of cultural capital, in the form of the ideas she begins with (under-developed though they might be) into economic capital. With twin aims in mind – to do something for the Roma in Leeds and to earn a living – she worked on the business plan that was her main occupation during our time with her. We saw how the plan was shaped and constrained in certain ways, and in interaction with others; following Lefebvre, we observed how the social production of thought, action and experience pulled her away from her original ideas and towards plans that were far more down to earth, involving the provision of advocacy. Her plans changed as her search for space become a search for funding, suggesting a mismatch between her own sense of what might be passed down and that of those who could help her.

Section 6 brought us to food and music, familiar heritage territory. Here again we found Monika and her family adopting an approach to heritage in social life as repertoire to draw upon: individuals have repertoires of food and music, as they do of language, some aspects of which conform closely to societally-recognised varieties ('Roma food', 'Roma music') and some less so. However, when they become 'heritage commodified' – as we saw with Ivan's business ideas – their value is as something more essentially Roma, but with Roma-ness defined – at least in part – interactionally.

Heritage is repertoire, heritage is social practice, and heritage spaces are co-produced by and in practice. Language and discourse are also heritage resources, as heritage becomes commodified. In Section 2 we quoted Monica Heller, noting struggles over language resources which were once markers of identity now become commodities. This can be seen through struggles over legitimacy, over 'who has the right to produce and distribute the resources of language and identity' (2003: 474). In the efforts of Monika and also of her brother Ivan to turn heritage-related activities into the income that they need, we see similar struggles. Which cultural heritage practices are valued by Monika and Ivan, and which are valued (perhaps differently) by those around them, as heritage becomes commodified and transformed?

References

Alim, H.S., Ibrahim, A. and Pennycook, A. (eds.) (2009). *Global Linguistic Flows: Hip Hop Cultures, Youth Identities, and the Politics of Language*. New York: Routledge.

Arts Council England (2015). *Equality, Diversity and the Creative Case*. http://issuu.com/artscouncilengland/docs/equality_diversity_and_the_creative_e3a9970066b8d9/1?e=9197550/31814905

Arts Council England (n.d.). *Our Priorities*. http://www.artscouncil.org.uk/what-we-do/our-priorities-2011-15/

Atkinson, D., Churchill, E., Nishino, T., and Okada, H. (2007). Alignment and interaction in a sociocognitive approach to second language acquisition. *The Modern Language Journal, 91*(ii), 169-188.

Austin, J. L. (1962). *How to do Things with Words*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Bachelard, G. (1994). *The Poetics of Space*. 2nd edition. Boston: Beacon Press.

Bakhtin, M.M. (1981). *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays*. M. Holquist (ed.). C. Emerson and M. Holquist (trans.). Austin and London: University of Texas Press.

Bateson, G. (1972). *Steps to an Ecology of Mind: Collected Essays in Anthropology, Psychiatry, Evolution, and Epistemology.* Aylesbury: Intertext.

Bauman, Z. (2000). *Liquid Modernity*. Cambridge: Polity.

Baynham, M., Bradley, J., Callaghan, J., Hanusova, J. and Simpson, J. (2015). Language, Business and Superdiversity in Leeds. *Working Papers in Translanguaging and Translation* (WP. 4). (http://www.birmingham.ac.uk/generic/tlang/index.aspx)

Baynham, M., Bradley, J., Callaghan, J., Hanusova, J., Moore de Luca, E., and Simpson, J. (forthcoming). Leeds Sport Phase Case Study. *Working Papers in Translanguaging and Translation*. (http://www.birmingham.ac.uk/generic/tlang/index.aspx)

Berger, H.M. (2003). Introduction: The politics and aesthetics of language choice and dialect in popular music. In H. M. Berger and M. T. Carroll (eds.), *Global Pop, Local Language* (pp. ix-xxvi). Mississippi: The University Press of Mississippi.

Blommaert, J. (2005). *Discourse: A Critical Introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Blommaert, J. (2007). Applied ethnopoetics. *Narrative Inquiry, 16*(1), 181-190.

Borkovcova, M. (2007). *Romsky Etnolekt Čestiny* [Czech Romani Ethnolect]. Prague: Signeta.

Bourdieu, P. (1984). *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste*. Massachussetts; Harvard University Press.

British Art Show 8 (2015). http://britishartshow8.com

Callaghan, J. (2015). Changing landscapes: Gipton and Harehills (Leeds): A superdiverse inner-city ward. *Working Papers in Translanguaging and Translation* (WP. 7)*. (http://www.birmingham.ac.uk/generic/tlang/index.aspx)

Český Rozhlas [Czech Radio] (1997). *Tradiční Romská Jídla*. (http://romove.radio.cz/cz/clanek/18180. Accessed January 8 2016.)

Chandler, D. (2007). *Semiotics: The Basics* (2nd ed.). London: Routledge.

Clark, A. (2011). Supersizing the Mind: Embodiment, Action, and Cognitive Extension. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Clark, A. and Chalmers, D. (1998). The extended mind. *Analysis, 58*(1), 7-19.

Clawson, L. (2005). 'Everybody knows him': Social networks in the life of a small contractor in Alabama. *Ethnography, 6*(2), 237-264.

Cowley, S. J. (2011). Distributed language. In S. J. Cowley (ed.), *Distributed Language* (pp. 1-14). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Cresswell, T. (1996). *In Place/Out of Place: Geography, Ideology and Transgression*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Cresswell, J. W. (2003). *Research Design: Quantitative, Qualitative and Mixed Methods Approaches* (2 ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Cresswell, T. (2015). *Place: An Introduction* (second edition). Oxford: Wiley Blackwell.

Davies, B., and Harré, R. (1990). Positioning: the discursive construction of selves. *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour, 20*(1), 43-63.

Deumert, A. (forthcoming) The Multivocality of heritage: Moments, encounters and mobilities. In A. Blackledge and A. Creese (eds.) *The Routledge Handbook of Language and Superdiversity*.

Duranti, A. (2009). The relevance of Husserl's theory to language socialization. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology, 19*(2), 205-226.

Duranti, A. (2010). Husserl, intersubjectivity and anthropology. *Anthropological Theory, 10*(1-2), 16-35.

Fetterman, D. (1989). *Ethnography step-by-step*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Freeman, D. (1999). *The Fateful Hoaxing of Margaret Mead: A Historical Analysis of Her Samoan Research*. Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press.

Garfinkel, H. (1967). *Studies in Ethnomethodology*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.

Gibson-Graham, J. K. (2008). Diverse economies: performative practices for other worlds. *Progress in Human Geography, 32*(5), 613-632.

Glenn, P. (2003). *Laughter in Interaction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Goffman, E. (1981). *Forms of Talk*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Goodwin, C. (1996). Professional vision. *American Anthropologist, 96*(3), 603-633.

Goodwin, C. (2008). Embodied organisation of language, cognition and action. Paper presented at the First International Conference on Multimodality. Multimodality and Learning: New Perspectives on Knowledge, Representation and Communication. Centre for Multimodal Research, Institute of Education, University of London, June 2008.

Graeber, D. (2011). *Debt: The First 5,000 Years*. Brooklyn and London: Melville House.

Graham, H.C. (2013). Museums and How to Know about Access. *New Formations: A Journal of Culture/Theory/Politics, 79*(4), 64-82.

Graham, H. et al. (2015). How Should Heritage Decisions Be Made? Website and presentations. (http://heritagedecisions.leeds.ac.uk/publications/).

Halliday, M. A. K. (1973). *Explorations in the Function of Language*. London: Edward Arnold.

Harvey, D. (1996). *Justice, Nature and the Geography of Difference*. Cambridge, Mass: Blackwell Publishers.

Heller, M. (2003). Globalization, the new economy and commodification of language and identity. *Journal of Sociolinguistics, 7* (4), 473-492.

Hutchins, E. (1995). *Cognition in the Wild*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: The MIT Press.

Hymes, D. (2003). *Now I Know Only So Far: Essays in Ethnopoetics*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

Jancovich, L. (2015). The participation myth. *International Journal of Cultural Policy, 2015*, 1-15.

Kelly-Holmes, H. (2013). Translation in progress: Centralizing and Peripheralizing Tensions in the Practices of Commercial Actors in Minority Language Tourist Sites. In S. Pietikäinen and H. Kelly-Holmes (eds.) *Multilingualism and the Periphery*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Latour, B. (2005). *Reassembling the Social: An Introduction to Actor-Network-Theory*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Lefebvre, H. (1991). *The Production of Space* (D. Nicholson-Smith, trans.). Oxford: Blackwell. Originally published (1974) as *La production de l'espace*, Paris: Anthropos.

Li Wei (2011). Moment Analysis and translanguaging space: Discursive construction of identities by multilingual Chinese youth in Britain. *Journal of Pragmatics, 43*(5), 1222-1235.

Liebscher, G. and Dailey-O'Cain, J. (2013). *Language, Space and Identity in Migration*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Malafouris, L. (2013). *How Things Shape the Mind: A Theory of Material Engagement*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: The MIT Press.

Maybin, J. and Tusting, K. (2011). Linguistic Ethnography. In J. Simpson (ed.) *The Routledge Handbook of Applied Linguistics*. London: Routledge.

National Trust for Historic Preservation (n.d.). *Heritage Tourism*. http://www.preservationnation.org/information-center/economics-of-revitalization/heritage-tourism/#.VqoDdtKLTIV

Otheguy, R., García, O. and Wallis, R. (2015). Clarifying translanguaging and deconstructing named languages: A perspective from linguistics. *Applied Linguistics Review, 6* (3), 281–307.

Payne, M. (forthcoming). Investigating minority languages in multilingual spaces: The hidden Roma language of Sheffield. In K. Horner and J. Dailey-O'Cain (eds.) *Multilingualism and (Im)mobilities: Language, Power, Agency*.

Pietikäinen, S. (2013). Heteroglossic authenticity in Sámi heritage tourism. In S. Pietikäinen and H. Kelly-Holmes (eds.) *Multilingualism and the Periphery*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Pink, S. (2007). Walking with video. *Visual Studies, 22*(3), 240-252.

Pratt, M. L. (1992). *Imperial Eyes: Travel Writing and Transculturation*. London: Routledge.

Reyes, A. (2004). Asian American stereotypes as a circulating resource. *Pragmatics* 14/2 and 3, 173-192.

Rogers, T. (2002). Henri Lefebvre, space and folklore. *Ethnologies, 24*(1), 21-44.

Roma in the Czech Republic (2000). *The Romani Family*. (http://romove.radio.cz/en/clanek/18241)

Schmid, C. (2008). Henri Lefebvre's theory of the production of space: towards a three-dimensional dialectic. In K. Goonewardena, S. Kipfer, R. Milgrom and C. Schmid (eds.), *Space, Difference, Everyday Life* (pp. 27-45). New York and London: Routledge.

Schutz, A. (1971). The stranger. In *Collected Papers: Studies in Social Theory* (pp. 91-105). The Hague: M Nijhoff.

Scollon, R. (1998). *Mediated Discourse as Social Interaction: A Study of News Discourse*. London: Longman.

Scollon, R. (2001). *Mediated Discourse: The Nexus of Practice*. London: Routledge.

Scollon, R. and Scollon, S. W. (2004). *Nexus Analysis: Discourse and the Emerging Internet*. London, New York: Routledge.

Shields, R. (1999). *Lefebvre, Love and Struggle: Spatial Dialectics*. London and New York: Routledge.

Soja, E. W. (1985). The socio-spatial dialectic. In D. Gregory and J. Urry (eds.), *Social Relations and Social Structures* (pp. 90-127). London: Macmillan.

Soja, E. W. (1996). *Thirdspace: Journeys to Los Angeles and Other Real-and-Imagined Places*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Steffensen, S. V. (2011). Beyond mind: An extended ecology of language. In S. J. Cowley (ed.), *Distributed Language* (pp. 185-210). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Tannen, D. (2007). *Talking Voices: Repetition, Dialogue, and Imagery in Conversational Discourse* (2nd edition). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Thomson, P. and Gunter, H. (2011). Inside, outside, upside down: The fluidity of academic researcher 'identity' in working with/in school. *International Journal of Research & Method in Education, 34*(1), 17-30.

UNESCO (n.d.). *Definition of Intangible Heritage*. http://www.unesco.org/services/documentation/archives/multimedia/?id_page=13

UNESCO Cairo (n.d.). *Tangible Cultural Heritage*. http://www.unesco.org/new/en/cairo/culture/tangible-cultural-heritage

Williams, R. (1961). *The Long Revolution*. 2011 edition. Cardigan: Parthian.

Wills, J. (2012). The geography of community and political organisation in London today. *Political Geography, 31* (2012), 114-126.

Wittgenstein, L. (1969). *On Certainty*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Appendices

Appendix 1 Monika's business plan form

My Business Plan

Name.	
Business Name.	
Private Address.	
Postcode.	
Tel. No.	
Mobile.	
E-mail.	

My Business Idea.

Before starting any business it's important to have a clear understanding of what exactly your business will do. Many people have an idea for a new product or service but when it comes down to it, it just isn't viable. You must differentiate your idea from all the others out there. Will it fill a genuine gap in the market, building on its Unique Selling Point (USP)? This is where you let people know just what your business activities will be. *Don't be too restrictive in your idea.*

My Business Aims & Objectives.

Most people, when asked why they go into business, will reply, "*To make money of course.*" But you must have some other Aims & Objectives. "*To take control of my life,*" or, "*to achieve something I have always wanted".*

My Personal Aims & Objectives.

You should give a little background on you and what you wish to achieve by starting your own business, i.e. to prove your capabilities, provide security for your family, or something you have wanted to do for a long time but just not had a chance. People like to see that you have enthusiasm and commitment.

Key Personnel.

Who will be involved with the business and why, what will be their roles? It is a good idea to look to the future also if you are considering employing anyone. *Don't forget to include these in your Cash Flow Projection.*

My Personal/Business Strengths Weaknesses Opportunities Threats

Don't confuse this with your Personal Aims & Objectives. This section covers just what it says on the tin. So just focus on your own S. W. O. Ts that you will bring to your business or what you may need help with to make your business successful. *It might help if you invite someone to help you with this, someone who will be honest with you.*

The Businesses Products & Services.

This should be clear and concise. Are you providing a service or buying and selling products?
Price lists, Menus, Brochures will be a great help to people you are looking for help from.

My Pricing Structure.

This is a tough one. You must consider your pricing carefully if you want to get into the market. You will need to know your costs before you can arrive at the correct sales price. Your prices need to be keen but don't fall into the trap of being too cheap. Do your homework and borrow a few prices from the competition and adjust to give you the edge. This will show whether or not you can deliver at a price that is suitable for all concerned.   *(DON'T SELL FOR MEDALS)*

My Market Research.

No-one should consider starting a business unless they have done their Market Research relating to their product or service.

This should cover: the market size, the competition, the area you will cover, the customers you will be dealing with and how you will deal with them. Remember Richard Branson did not invent Airlines, he just made them better. Don't forget there are lots of people out there offering the same as you, so how will yours will be better?

My Marketing.

| |
| |

How will you get your business known? I.e. Mail Shots, Internet, Posters, Yellow Pages even just word of mouth. Is the market place ready for your product or service? It's no good thinking about this after you have started. By that time it's too late. A good business will have an action plan based over several months rather than a scatter gun approach.

Your Competitors Strengths & Weaknesses

| Strengths | Weaknesses |
| | |

If you have done your market research correctly you will know this and will have decided how to deal with it. *Don't look upon the competition as enemies, you may have to use or work with them one day.*

The Business Premises.

| |
| |

Decide where you are going to work from. If it's the back bedroom remember your heating and lighting bills will increase. You can run a business from home but you need permission to do so. Commercial premises can be expensive and involve other costs such as rates and services charges so check and *remember to put this in your cash flow projections.*

Funding Required For

| |
| |

List all the equipment you need to start with and any that you will need as the business expands over say 12 months *with realistic costs and don't forget VAT, where applicable. All estimates should be included.*

(See Excel workbook to aid with the below, using the tabs along the bottom)

Personal Expenditure

Very few businesses make much money in the first year. Use the attached form to work out how much you and your family need to survive over the first twelve months. These are the funds you need to keep you and your family going whilst your business gets off the ground or worse still if it stalls. So be practical. You will still need to keep a roof over your head, *i.e. holidays, birthdays, the odd drink. You will be surprised when you add them all up.*

Sales Forecast

On the back of the market research you have undertaken you should now be in a position to estimate your level of sales and hence the amount of income you will generate. The attached table will help you think about the number of units you think you will sell on a monthly basis across your product range at your chosen price.

Cash Flow Forecast (2 years)

Understanding how cash will move in your business is very important. Using your Sales Forecast for the income side you now need to estimate the costs that you will incur on a monthly basis when running the business. If you have costs which are directly related to each sale (e.g. purchase of stock) these should have been included within the Sales Forecast and you should bring the figure forward from there.

Personal Profile

Please take the time to tell us about yourself and what makes you tick and how this will benefit your business. This will help us in our assessment of your Business Plan. Remember the more information you can give the better for us all. If you need help just ask.