This is a repository copy of *Collective autonomy and multilingual spaces in super-diverse urban contexts: Interdisciplinary perspectives*.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:
http://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/121614/

Version: Accepted Version

Book Section:
Lamb, T.E. and Vodicka, G. orcid.org/0000-0002-7730-3507 (2017) Collective autonomy and multilingual spaces in super-diverse urban contexts: Interdisciplinary perspectives. In: Murray, G. and Lamb, T.E., (eds.) Space, Place and Autonomy in Language Learning. Routledge . ISBN 9781138656727

This is an Accepted Manuscript of a book chapter published by Routledge in Space, Place and Autonomy in Language Learning on 03/11/2017, available online: http://www.routledge.com/9781138656727

Chapter 2

Collective autonomy and multilingual spaces in super-diverse urban contexts:

Interdisciplinary perspectives

Terry Lamb orcid.org/0000-0002-6715-0965

Goran Vodicka orcid.org/0000-0002-7730-3507

Introduction

> Unlike in the past, the reality of living in close proximity with
>
> strangers seems to be here to stay, and so it demands that skills in
>
> daily coexistence with ways of life other than our own must be
>
> worked out or acquired; a coexistence, what is more, which will prove
>
> not only bearable but mutually beneficial – not just despite, but
>
> because of the differences dividing us. (Bauman 2011: 37)

In this chapter we aim to explore the themes of autonomy, space and place within linguistically super-diverse urban contexts. We will argue that, in some parts of the world, there is not only an ambivalence towards the value of linguistic diversity and the capacity to use a range of languages, but also a tendency to position certain languages and the communities who speak them as pathological 'problems', in particular when these languages are spoken by communities of minority ethnic migrant background. This can entail an exclusion of such languages not only from formal educational spaces (the classroom, the school, the curriculum etc.) but also from other public spaces, which means that particular linguistic groups may be

excluded from learning or even using their languages beyond the spaces of the home or linguistic community. It also means that negative dispositions towards multilingualism are perpetuated across the population, as the value of other languages and, hence, the contribution of the diverse linguistic communities, to the common good remains unarticulated and invisible.

Our position in this chapter is that the invisibility of these languages and, by implication, the identities of those who speak them (Beacco 2005), reflects and reinforces an entrenched linguistic hegemony, sustained by a 'monolingual habitus' (Gogolin 1994, 2002), which nurtures an assimilation to the (mono)linguistic norm. We see this as an onslaught on the identities of such language communities and a reinforcement of the marginalisation and exclusion to which they are frequently subjected (Blackledge 2006). We reject such exclusionary practices and argue instead for inclusion, which, at least with regard to language, implies positioning the use of other languages not as a deficit but as a benefit for all (whilst at the same time acknowledging that exclusion will not be fully addressed without deep-seated structural shifts to address issues such as poverty and institutional racism). Drawing on the construct of habitus (Bourdieu 1985), an internalised set of cultural norms that shape individual thinking, identities, choices and behaviours, we understand that it is constructed by power relations; however, we also acknowledge that it is not determined by structures but emerges from dynamic webs of dispositions that have been shaped by past and present experiences and practices (Bourdieu 1985: 170). Changing such dispositions is therefore a challenge, but the multilingual city offers possibilities for such change (Lamb 2015). We argue that this implies changes in the education and everyday experiences of everyone, both formally in educational spaces

and informally in public spaces, which must valorise, make visible and normalise the presence of the languages of our communities and develop a 'plurilingual habitus' through the production of interlingual shared spaces (for an exploration of the concept of 'interlinguality' see Lamb 2015).

Drawing on theories of autonomy, space and place from a range of disciplines and as they relate to contexts of resistance and struggle, the chapter highlights the potential of groups and communities autonomously to 'find the spaces for manoeuvre' (Lamb 2000), in order to ensure that their languages continue to be learnt, and to celebrate multilingualism, challenging the monolingual habitus within formal and informal urban spaces. This involves shedding fresh light on the definition and nature of autonomy as a political, collectivist construct, interwoven with space/place and with communities and networks rather than individuals as the basic unit, thus extending critical versions of autonomy in language learning (Lamb 2000; Jiménez Raya et al. 2007; Vieira 2009). We maintain that the complexities of superdiversity (Vertovec 2007) in urban contexts do not lend themselves to unitary, centrally driven, top-down policy approaches to inclusion of the languages of our linguistic communities. Whilst it is still necessary to acknowledge and attempt to erode the modernist conceptualisations of structural power, the social injustices being experienced demand action in the here-and-now. It is not tenable to wait for mass struggles to bring about social transformation. Instead we need to enlist critical postmodernist understandings of the possibility of localised skirmishes and grassroots initiatives that can transform everyday experiences and 'celebrate multilingualism, challenge assumptions and stimulate inclusive policy and practice' (Lamb 2015: 2).

In this chapter, therefore, we illuminate the relationships between the constructs of autonomy, place and space before referring to several studies and interventions in multilingual cities in the UK that illustrate ways in which communities themselves produce spaces in which they can ensure that their languages continue to be learnt and used. This includes firstly reference to community-led complementary schools where a range of languages are learnt and used within the community. This is followed by an intervention, which involved local communities, as part of an autonomous network of organisations and individuals, in a multilingual festival in public spaces in the city centre, with the aim of not only challenging prevailing assumptions amongst passers-by, but also offering an opportunity to minority linguistic groups, often invisible in the city centre, to showcase their languages in formal public spaces. The limitations of this intervention, however, lead us to examine the potential of building on the emerging linguistically hybrid practices in local informal urban spaces. We propose that the engagement of communities in participatory and activist research may enable them to further develop their collective autonomy in ways that are critical and that involve them in designing local and translocal, informal and formal, everyday urban spaces that are intercultural and interlingual and reach beyond their local communities (Lamb 2015).

The multilingual city: A critical perspective

The multilingual city is intrinsically entangled in the complex phenomenon of globalisation and the global migratory movements generally perceived to be one of its characteristics. Migration is, of course, not a new phenomenon in Europe. In the introduction to this chapter, Bauman describes the exigencies of life in what he calls

the 'third phase of modern migration', the 'age of diasporas' (Bauman, 2011: 35); following the first (colonial migration outwards from Europe) and second (migration to Europe of previously colonised populations), the third is described as 'an infinite archipelago of ethnic, religious and linguistic settlements, heedless of the pathways marked out and paved by the imperial/colonial episode, and steered instead by the logic of the global redistribution of living resources and the chances of survival peculiar to the current stage of globalisation'. Furthermore, though neo-Marxists argue that key drivers of globalisation are capitalism and the associated neo-liberal ideologies (Harvey 2005), others, such as Giddens (1990), criticise the preoccupation with economic factors, focusing on processes of 'transformation in the spatial organization of social relations and transactions' (Held et al. 1999: 16). Such transformation, 'the gradual emergence of the flimsy, indistinct, fragile and ultimately fictitious nature of system boundaries' (Bauman 2011: 33) has provoked widespread academic argument about whether globalisation is a late development of modernity and its related hegemonic, colonialist power structures or a new, postmodern phenomenon (Andreotti 2010; Jacquemet 2005) characterised by liquidity, flux and the loss of credibility of the 'grand narrative' (Bauman 2011; Lyotard 1984).

Migration is also marked by a shift from rural to urban contexts; indeed the world's urban population surpassed the rural population for the first time in 2009 (Cru 2014: 4). What is emerging in these urban settings through Bauman's 'third phase of migration', then, is a kaleidoscopic and constantly shifting pattern of diverse social, ethnic, linguistic and cultural groups. These groups may be small or large, newly arrived or resident for generations, transnational and/or translocal, and are characteristic of Vertovec's (2007) 'super-diversity', a 'diversification of diversity'

(Rampton et al. 2015). One aspect of this relates to what could be called linguistic

super-diversity (Lamb 2015), which, though not a new phenomenon in many parts of

the world, has led to the transformation of many urban contexts in Europe and

elsewhere. The UK, for example, is becoming increasingly multilingual, and not only

in cities. The specifically super-diverse nature of cities, however, makes it difficult to

know the extent of multilingualism (Salverda 2006), though an indication of the

linguistic super-diversity of London can be seen in the number of home languages

spoken to varying extents by children in schools - over three hundred already in 2000,

according to Baker & Eversley (2000). Numbers of languages and size of linguistic

communities also continue to increase. In Sheffield, for example, 125 home languages

were identified in 2012; however, the increasing proportion of children bringing other

languages to school can be seen in the fact that, although almost 17% of the overall

school population spoke a language other than English at home, this rose to over 30%

amongst those entering primary education (Languages Sheffield 2012). When

compared with the 1994 figures (48 languages with 8.1% of the primary school

population speaking them at home), the increase can be seen even more sharply

(SUMES 1994). In addition, many of these children are not bilingual but plurilingual,

a term used by the Council of Europe and in this chapter, which is defined as 'the

capacity of individuals to use more than one language in social communication

whatever their command of those languages' (Beacco 2005: 19). This is rendered

even more complex, however, by manifestations of the new 'multilingualism of

entanglement' (Williams & Stroud 2013), in which multiple languages are used for

communication, sometimes simultaneously, by individuals and groups; this is

evidenced by studies into forms of linguistic hybridity such as translanguaging

(Creese & Blackledge 2010) and metrolingualism (Pennycook & Otsuji 2015) in

'post-multilingual cities' (Lamb 2015: 3).

Nevertheless, in the midst of such linguistic super-diversity, England and, indeed, most other Anglophone and European countries, is still penetrated by the Herderian ideology of 'one state, one people, one language' (Lamb 2015: 3). There is considerable evidence of the 'monolingual ideology' (Blackledge 2001) in England's schools, for example, where English is often the only language to be valued and any other languages that are brought into school are perceived as a threat to the children's development of English rather than a resource to support it. The situation is, sadly, particularly evident for children who bring a language spoken by more recent migrant populations from parts of South Asia or Africa (such as Punjabi or Somali), rather than one of perceived high status, such as French or German. The focus on these children's perceived deficit in English means that their languages are more likely to be seen as a barrier to learning in school, indeed a barrier to a successful life, rather than as a rich and valuable form of symbolic capital. Writing in the UK, Li Wei (2011: 371) reports that,

> public perception of minority ethnic children, especially those who speak languages other than English at home, is that of problems. Their multilinguality often seems to be a contributing factor; that is, the children's apparent underachievement or the socioeconomic disadvantage they are experiencing has been attributed to the fact that they do not speak English only or all the time.

The problematisation of multilingualism and plurilingualism is not only apparent in schools. The Nuffield Foundation's (2000: 36) enquiry into the state of languages in the UK claimed that 'the multilingual talents of UK citizens are under-recognised, under-used and all too often viewed with suspicion'. Nor is such problematisation only experienced in the UK. Phillipson (2003) has written about the hegemony of English across Europe as a result of globalisation, leading to a decreasing interest in studying other languages and to structural barriers to bringing children's home languages (where they are not the language of instruction) on to the curriculum. Baetens-Beardsmore (2003) has asked the question 'Who is afraid of bilingualism?' and describes how fear even exists amongst parents of bilingual children. This concern is echoed in Souto-Manning's (2003) research with bilingual families in the USA and in figures showing the reduction in use of some well established home languages by Australian families (Clyne & Kipp 1997). It would appear that the problematisation of multilingualism and plurilingualism can affect everyone, including some of the linguistic communities themselves; combined with the hegemony of English in the context of globalization, this serves to reduce the range of languages learnt outside the home.

Within the modernist paradigm, to overturn a linguistic hegemony would require a revolution, a re-structuring of society. With the onset of late-modernity (Giddens 1993), however, and the increasing complexities of a globalized world, we suggest that pushing for effective and long-term, top-down change is inadequate, even if a national government is willing. For example, the British Labour government expressed commitment to supporting multilingualism in its development of a national languages strategy in 2002:

> For too long in this country there has been as assumption that because English is spoken in many parts of the world, there is no need for English speakers to learn other languages […] We need to […] recognise the contribution of languages – not just European languages, but all our community languages as well – to the cultural and linguistic richness of our society, to personal fulfilment, commercial success, international trade and mutual understanding. (DfES 2002: 1)

This shift in language education policy was marked by numerous multilingual projects, interventions and curriculum developments (including provision of qualifications in a wide range of languages), but all of them were discontinued following the government's defeat in the 2010 elections. The failure of such policy cannot, however, mean the end of attempts to address the situation. Instead, we authors of this chapter see the potential of contestation and resistance by groups and communities themselves, developing local initiatives to explore linguistic 'futures in the present' (Cleaver 1979) at grass-roots level. Such groups and communities may inhabit physical urban spaces or virtual spaces in a global world, but collectively they will be living an autonomy that is in the present, shaping 'the vision of the world', developing their symbolic power themselves, and imposing recognition of the value of multilingualism and plurilingualism in a process of shifting the monolingual habitus (Bourdieu 1994: 137-138).

Understanding autonomy as a collectivist construct

Autonomy is often demonised as an individualistic and threatening force that is incompatible with the idea of communities:

> [we] need to celebrate collective solidarity, connection, responsibility for dependent others, duty to respect the customs of one's community – instead of western capitalist culture's valuing of autonomy and liberal freedom. (Žižek 2008: 123)

We contend that autonomy as applied in the field of language learning and teaching to date has predominantly and ultimately focused on the individual's personal autonomy, though this is not necessarily at odds with the idea of social living. We are not claiming that it has been restricted to the Kantian rationalist interpretation (an individual able to govern him/herself according to reason and independently of any emotions or preferences), though early definitions of learner autonomy in the language learning field tended to have a rationalist orientation, with '[t]he autonomous learner […] himself capable of making all these decisions concerning the learning with which he is or wishes to be involved' (Holec 1981: 3). Indeed, we see the construct of personal autonomy as also encompassing the relational, where it is socially embedded; according to Christman (2004: 148, in Baumann, 2008) 'requirements concerning the interpersonal or social environment of the agent' are one of the defining conditions of autonomy, and for Baumann (2008: 448) '[t]he 'social' is written directly into the definition of autonomy'. For many years the social dimension of learner autonomy in language learning has indeed been recognised (Little 2000; Murray 2014); nevertheless, much of this work still focuses either on the ways in which individuals achieve their learning goals not in isolation but through

collaboration with others, or on the ways in which the social space affords individual learning.

The construct of personal autonomy has been criticised from critical and postmodern perspectives, which deny the possibility of divorcing the individual from the dynamic socio-political context and the power it exerts over him/her (Zembilas & Lamb 2008). Reflecting this, scholarship on the social dimensions of learner autonomy in language learning has taken what could be described as a late modernist turn, resonating with the position of this chapter in relation to globalisation and urbanism. Murray (2014), for example, explores the autonomy of learners and teachers in an increasingly interconnected world, where it is entangled within complex webs of social and contextual processes, power flows, interrelationships, motivations and constantly shifting social identities. Here we see a deeper understanding of the ways in which, for example, in-school and out-of-school learning are entwined and how learners' diverse and ever-changing identities (including their plurilingual identities) are brought into play (or not) when learning another language. Ushioda (2011: 21-22) also argues that motivations and identities 'develop and emerge as dynamically co-constructed processes' through social participation, pointing out that '[w]hen students are enabled to voice opinions, preferences and values, align themselves with those of others, engage in discussion, struggle, resist, negotiate, compromise or adapt, their motivational dispositions and identities evolve and are given expression'.

To some extent, then, such developments mark a shift from a focus on the individual. To what extent it relates to the collectivist autonomy of groups or communities, however, is not articulated, although Vieira's work is influenced by a Freirian

'politics of hope' when she describes her network of teachers, teacher educators and academics as 'a collective commitment to a collective struggle' (Vieira 2009: 10). This offers a more collectivist proposal than the earlier critical definition of both teacher autonomy and learner autonomy that emerged from the EuroPAL project:

> The competence to develop as a self-determined, socially responsible
> and critically aware participant in (and beyond) educational
> environments, within a vision of education as (inter)personal
> empowerment and social transformation. (Jiménez Raya et al. 2007)

Such developments in the construct of autonomy in language learning reveal a commitment to creating the conditions for social transformation both individually and collectively. It is, however, to other disciplines that we must turn to find interpretations of autonomy, which lend themselves to an exploration of groups, networks or communities autonomously and collectively creating the conditions in which particular languages can be learnt and used and where multilingualism and plurilingualism can be understood and lived as resources rather than problems. In the field of Law, for example, Alexander has written about 'group autonomy' as 'a mode of social organization in which nomic clusters, replacing the individual as the basic unit, are free to pursue their conceptions of the good, just as classical liberalism promotes the autonomy of the individual' (Alexander 1989: 3). A more radical interpretation comes from Cornelius Castoriadis (1975), a French philosopher of Greek origin, for whom a collectively autonomous society reconciles individual and collective conceptions of autonomy when both society and its members are reflexive, able to interrogate themselves and their laws, and engage in acts of the 'radical

imagination', through which they can imagine a different way of being and take action to try to make this work. Such collective or group versions of autonomy challenge Žižek's (2008: 123) juxtaposition of 'autonomy' and 'group', seen above, reminding us that 'autonomy' had its origins as a political construct (the emergence of the self-governing city state), before Plato developed it into a more personal one (Marshall 1996) and that this re-emerged in the 1960s in the form of Italian Autonomism, rejecting hegemony and calling for the creation of autonomous space for the working classes.

This chapter is concerned with language communities autonomously finding spaces where they can challenge the monolingual habitus, collectively creating the conditions in which multilingualism can be normalised and interlingual encounters nurtured. We therefore now turn to a cross-disciplinary consideration of the three constructs of collective autonomy, space, and place as informed by critical orientations. This will enable us to gain an understanding of existing strategies for sustaining multilingualism in urban spaces, illuminating possibilities for further struggles. Firstly, we turn to the ways in which the concepts of 'space' and 'place' are used in a range of disciplines.

Considering space and place

The space-place dualism was introduced in the field of human geography in the 1970s. For the phenomenologist Tuan (1977), space is 'a realm without meaning' and for Agnew (1987) a place is 'a meaningful location'. For Cresswell (2015), '[s]paces have areas and volumes' whereas 'places have space between them'. Such binaries

are, however, not uncontested, as demonstrated effectively by Casey (2013), a philosopher of place, in his comprehensive exploration of the concepts. Even if we consider the classical Greek philosophical concepts of chora and topos, often considered to be the origin of the distinction between space (chora) and place (topos), it is clear that not only do they overlap but that they have been used inconsistently and sometimes interchangeably, particularly in relation to the concept of 'extent' (Algra 1994). There is in fact as great a lack of consensus in relation to these concepts as there is to the concepts of space and place. Rämö (1999), for example, depicts them as abstract space (chora) and concrete space (topos), though the Greeks used a third term (kenon) to depict an abstract space or a void, as chora tended to contain something or be occupied. Rämö's binary depiction is possibly influenced by the Aristotelian understanding of 'topos' as fundamental to existence and by Heidegger, for whom existence was necessarily Dasein (the German word for 'existence', literally 'being there'), both subjective concepts of 'place' as opposed to the more objective conception of 'chora' (space as a vessel in which places may 'become') (Casey 2013). The contested nature of space and place can be seen across academic discourse (Dovey 2010: 3). For Malpas, another philosopher of place, places also carry spaces within them (Cresswell 2015: 48). Lefebvre (1974) refers to 'social space', or 'socially produced space', which has much in common with understandings of place referred to above. For De Certeau (1984), place is empty and space is created by practice, a 'tactical art that plays with the structures of place that are provided' (Cresswell 2015: 70). Soja (1999) rejects binaries altogether, identifying the significance of Thirdspace, which is 'practiced and lived rather than simply being material (conceived) or mental (perceived)' (Cresswell 2010: 69-70).

In this chapter we understand space not as abstract or empty, 'an invisible medium, a contentless container, an exterior stage' (Friedland 1992: 11) that made it so attractive to enlightenment and modernist thinkers, privileging as they did 'an objective and abstract conception of space as a framework for the particularities of place' (Dovey 2010: 4). Instead we understand that space has the potential to afford the social construction of places, in which meanings are made. Furthermore, we are particularly interested in the 'particularities of place, a celebration of the possibilities of making new histories' (Friedland 1992: 11) that modernity was so averse to. Our overall late modern conception of the world, however, also leads us to an avoidance of the risk of essentialism (Dovey 2010; Harvey 1996), which could arise from a tight relationship between place, attached meaning and belonging and which could render a place unwelcoming towards other meanings and therefore exclusionary. In order to achieve this, we draw on the geographer Massey (1994) and the urbanist Dovey (2010). In Massey's 'progressive sense of place', place is open and outward looking rather than enclosed and inward looking; it is characterised by a 'throwntogetherness' of interactions, collections of stories, histories of journeys and connections. This can be seen in this example of her research in a local high street in London:

> while Kilburn may have a character of its own, it is absolutely not a seamless,
> coherent identity, a single sense of place which everyone shares . . . If it is
> now recognized that people have multiple identities, then the same point can
> be made in relation to places. Moreover, such multiple identities can be either,
> or both, a source of richness or a source of conflict. (Massey 1994: 153)

For Dovey (2010: 6), 'place is an inextricably intertwined knot of spatiality and sociality' and therefore requires 'approaches that cut across the spatiality and sociality divide'. In order to find appropriate approaches he then turns to Deleuze and Bourdieu:

> I suggest we replace the Heideggerian ontology of being-in-the-world with a more Deleuzian notion of becoming-in-the-world. This implies a break with static, fixed, closed and dangerously essentialist notions of place, but preserves a provisional ontology of place-as-becoming […]. I also suggest we replace the division of subjectivity–objectivity or people-environment with Bourdieu's concept of the habitus as an embodied world. (Dovey 2010: 6)

This returns us to issues of power, which, for us, underpins the structures of society and therefore of the spaces and places within it. We understand that such structural power always needs to be borne in mind, whilst reminding ourselves that action in the here-and-now is needed and that places have the potential to be sites for struggle, where communities can find 'spaces for manoeuvre' (Lamb 2000) in order to produce a degree of autonomy. In our interdisciplinary exploration of the interrelationships between space, place and critical, collective autonomy, we hope to gain insights into ways of creating more inclusive, urban, multilingual spaces.

Space, place and autonomy

The struggle for autonomy in urban spatial contexts drives the philosophy and writing of the Marxist sociologist, Henri Lefebvre, and the Marxist geographer, David

Harvey. For Lefebvre (1974), influenced by Gramscian thought, urban space is socially produced by hegemonic forces in order to maintain their dominance, and this is integral to social reproduction. His theories also foreground everyday life, defined as the intersection of 'illusion and truth, power and helplessness; the intersection of the sector man controls and the sector he does not control' (Lefebvre 1947). He argues that everyday life and movement through urban spaces are colonised by capital, which dominates their pace and rhythms as well as turning them into places of consumption. Nevertheless, he acknowledges the potential for revolution through raised awareness, opening the intersections of everyday life to new possibilities. Lefebvre was a great influence on Harvey's (1996) radical critique of cities and the ways in which the spatial nature of global capital leads to domination and oppression, mobility of production and capital, and postcolonial migrations. 'We have been made and re-made without knowing exactly why, how, wherefore and to what end', he claims (Harvey 2003: 939), exposing the fate of particular groups (in this case, groups without access to 'endless capital accumulation'). Nevertheless, he does not position such groups as passive pawns:

> We are, all of us, architects, of a sort. We individually and collectively make the city through our daily actions and our political, intellectual and economic engagements. But, in return, the city makes us. (Harvey 2003: 939)

Through such actions, Harvey reveals the possibility of change by invoking Lefebvre's (1968) concept of 'le droit à la ville' ('the right to the city'), 'not merely a right of access to what already exists, but a right to change it after our heart's desire' (Harvey 2003: 939). Seizing the right to the city is a collective enterprise, which

brings a 'more inclusive, even if continuously fractious city' (Harvey 2003: 941):

> The right to the city is far more than the individual liberty to access urban resources: it is a right to change ourselves by changing the city. It is, moreover, a common rather than an individual right since this transformation inevitably depends upon the exercise of a collective power to reshape the processes of urbanization. (Harvey 2008: 23)

This includes 'the right to be different [...] but it also implies the right for different group or collective explorations of such differences and, as a consequence, the right to pursue development on some territorial and collective basis that departs from established norms' (Harvey 2000: 251). For Harvey, this is a real possibility, for '[i]f our urban world has been imagined and made then it can be re-imagined and re-made' (2003: 941). There is also, however, a danger that communities will degenerate into 'regressive exclusions and fragmentations' (2000: 240), so the struggle for power in such spaces requires the 'construction of collective identities, of communities of action, of rules of belonging', in order to translate the personal and the political onto a broader terrain of human action (2000: 241). In such local and collective action, Harvey (2000) sees 'spaces of hope' for communities to achieve for themselves a greater inclusion of their own identities.

Through this lens, we see the possibility for linguistic communities to create their own 'spaces of hope', not through retreat into themselves, but through engaging with others to create dynamic places in which multilingualism and plurilingualism are seen as an ever-changing but always present norm. For the human geographers Pred (1984)

and Massey (1993) and the urbanist Soja (1999) place is a process and is 'never finished', always 'becoming' (Pred 1984: 279); it is always changing through the repetition of practices, like Soja's (1996) Thirdspace, which is practised and lived rather than conceived (material) or perceived (mental), 'an-Other way of understanding and acting to change the spatiality of human life, a distinct mode of critical spatial awareness' (Soja 1996: 57). Here we see the interaction between structure and agency, also reflected in the philosopher de Certeau's (1984) distinction between strategy and tactics, where strategy relates to the structures of power and tactics to the movements and actions of people that do not conform to the strategies. De Certeau's Practice of Everyday Life (1984) offers insights that enable us to see linguistic communities making their own mark on everyday spaces and creating new linguistic landscapes (not only visible but audible) that have the potential to shift perceptions and challenge the monolingual habitus.

The constructs of place, space and autonomy explicitly intersect in the fields of political studies and autonomous geographies. Pratchett's (2004) work on local autonomy explores powers transferred to local communities in the context of devolution from central to local government. Pratchett argues that local autonomy differs from local democracy in that the latter is about influencing decisions and the former about being able to make choices. Local autonomy is used synonymously with sovereignty, which is recognised as being constrained by central government. Pratchett (2004: 366-367) proposes three approaches to understanding local autonomy: *'freedom from'* (the extent to which the centre devolves to the local); *'freedom to'*, the extent to which local government can develop localised policies; and *'reflection of local identity'*, which portrays local autonomy as bottom-

up and flexible, not free from constraints but with 'the capacity to define and express local identity through political activity'. Pratchett thus emphasises the activities of local communities, which define their own local autonomy, 'the discretion to practise politics in preferred ways and the freedom to express and develop local identity through political processes'. As in the field of learner autonomy in language learning, autonomy is intimately related to identity, but in this case to a sense of fluid and flexible collective identity, which, in the context of the multilingual city, may enable the community to experience and develop a sense of the value of their languages as they engage across communities within and beyond the localities, a kind of experiential autonomy. As DeFilippis (1999: 976), working in the same field, argues: 'autonomy is not a discrete commodity that is possessed or not possessed by individuals or localities. Instead autonomy is a set of power relations'.

In his work on political activism and social movements, the radical geographer Chatterton defines autonomy as 'a desire for freedom, self-organization and mutual aid' (2004: 545). In his article with Pickerill (Pickerill & Chatterton 2006: 731), the 'usage, meanings and widespread practices [of autonomy] in activists' everyday activities' are explored in the context of localized autonomous spaces, such as social centres, eco-villages, housing cooperatives and self-education. For Pickerill & Chatterton (2006: 730-733), autonomous geographies are 'spaces where people desire to constitute non-capitalist, egalitarian and solidaristic forms of political, social, and economic organization through a combination of resistance and creation'. Autonomy is a desire, a vision that is 'simultaneously a documentation of where we are, and a projection of where we could be', contextual and situated, made and re-made, a collective project capable of multiple trajectories, 'fulfilled only through reciprocal

and mutually agreed relations with others'. Pickerill & Chatterton (2006: 735-736) go on to argue that it is not only a socio-spatial strategy but also a temporal one, preserving collective memories of former struggles and 'projecting autonomous visions into the present and future', but never complete. Autonomy does not, however, privilege the local; it also involves connecting with other groups, as '[a]utonomous practices are not discrete localities, but networked and connected spaces, part of broader transnational networks, where extra-local connections are vital social building blocks'. Furthermore, they add that autonomy and resistance are constituted and practised in interstitial everyday places and identities, 'an explosive combination of making protest part of everyday life, but also making life into workable alternatives for a wider social good' (2006: 737). Finally, rather than autonomous geographies representing a universal notion of social transformation and revolution, they explore the potential of local autonomous spaces to change 'the nature and boundaries of what is taken as common sense and creating workable solutions to erode the workings of market-based economies in a host of, as yet, unknown ways' (2006: 738).

These considerations of the ways in which other disciplines discuss the relationships between space, place and autonomy, especially where there is a focus on struggle, resistance and challenge to the status quo, offer insights into the ways in which linguistic communities may be developing their own practices, their own tactics, not only amongst themselves, but reaching beyond and thereby eroding the monolingual habitus. Whether rooted in a Marxist economy-focused critique of neo-liberalism or in relation to broader hegemonic forces, they help us to understand the socio-spatial dimension of autonomy in relation to urban spaces and communities and how more

inclusive, interlingual spaces might emerge in the here-and-now through action and interaction, creation and re-creation, and education and re-education. In the final section of this chapter, we will briefly reflect on the potential of collective and autonomous spatial actions in English cities to create the conditions for a plurilingual habitus to emerge.

Collective autonomy in urban spaces: challenging the monolingual habitus

We have argued in this chapter that there is a need to challenge the social injustices brought about by the problematisation and marginalization of plurilingualism and multilingualism, palpable in the invisibility of particular languages not only in the school curriculum, but in the everyday life of citizens. This monolingual habitus both shapes and is shaped by the emergent dispositions and everyday experiences not only of monolingual but also plurilingual communities, encouraging even plurilingual families to have concerns.

In urban spaces, however, we see the emergence of local communities that are resisting this, creating autonomous places in which their languages can be learnt, used and sustained. In the UK, for example, there is a long history of 'complementary schools', organised by local ethnic communities in response to the 'fear of loss of language and culture and the consequent urge to protect and nurture these heritages' (Creese 2009: 270). Such voluntary schools usually meet in the evenings or at weekends in rented premises (sometimes local mainstream schools), with volunteer members of the community teaching the classes. Such schools fulfill a desire of the communities to have places where they may learn and maintain not only their

'community' languages (as they are known in the UK), but also their religious and cultural values. In Lamb's (2001) research in Nottingham, UK, it was felt by some of the school coordinators that they could also support learners with other mainstream examination subjects by discussing them in their home languages. As such, it has been argued that complementary schools 'have presented and will continue to present a challenge to the ideologies of mainstream education and society' (Li Wei 2006: 82), offering 'safe spaces […] where teachers and students engage in fluid linguistic practices that allow them to draw on a wide range of available resources in creating meaning' (Creese 2009: 268). Creese's research demonstrates that their experiences in these schools challenges the plurilingual learners' and their teachers' beliefs since, despite the espoused wishes of teachers to privilege the home languages in the school, they all in fact engage in translanguaging practices, 'associated with multicultural, transnational subject positioning' and with the construct of 'flexible bilingualism'. The complementary schools thus become places, which not only protect the languages and cultures of the communities, but also challenge the ideology that languages should remain as separate and discrete entities. This is similarly argued by Hornberger (2007: 189) in the context of the 'heritage language initiative' in the USA, which 'takes an ecological, resource view of indigenous, immigrant, ethnic, and foreign languages as living and evolving in relation to each other and to their environment and as requiring support lest any of them become further endangered'.

Complementary schools enable us to understand the ways in which spaces can afford particular linguistic practices, even when they are not permanent spaces, but ones that serve other purposes at other times. For the periods in which they are being used as complementary schools, however, they are effectively closed spaces, separate from

the rest of society not only in space but also in time and exclusive to particular communities, autonomously preserving their own linguistic and cultural values. As we have argued earlier, this may offer resistance to a totally monolingual hegemony, but it will not necessarily challenge the monolingual habitus of society as a whole; for that to occur, there is a need for everyone to be re-educated to value plurilingualism. Unfortunately, these complementary schools have little impact on this, with even the teachers in the mainstream schools attended by the plurilingual learners unaware of the work carried out in them (Creese 2009: 272). This is not to say that such schools have no role in empowering the communities; a Gramscian view 'would argue that these languages can only maintain their place in society from a position of strength built up outside the state system, since otherwise they will be at the whim of the majority power' (Lamb 2001: 10). However, as we have argued, for the monolingual habitus to be addressed, change is needed to re-educate everyone, not just the linguistically disenfranchised, and this requires visibility of the languages throughout the city; for Marten et al (2012: 1) '[b]eing visible may be as important for minority languages as being heard'.

The re-education of all has been the driving purpose of Languages Sheffield since its early days as the local government funded Multilingual City Project, launched in 1994. At that time it described a multilingual city as

> one where different languages become part of the organic development of the community as a whole. It is where these languages are spoken at home, in public and in education. Crucially, it is where they are on offer to be learnt and used by anyone interested or fired by them – as well as by those who are

historically and culturally bound by them. (SUMES 1994: 7)

Languages Sheffield is a charitable body that attempts through its networks to develop a city-wide understanding of the value of its multilingualism through projects, partnerships with community groups and complementary schools, and development of a local languages strategy. A feature of late modern urbanism is that it is characterised by networks, which Samarajiva & Shields (1997: 536) have conceptualised as spaces, which serve as 'sites of communicative action structured by a range of social relations'. Networks can be dynamic and creative spaces, offering the flexibility to enable individuals and groups collectively to take some control over issues of importance to them. One example was the large-scale weeklong celebration of multilingualism in central public spaces organised by the authors of this chapter at the University of Sheffield, together with Languages Sheffield and other local and community organisations in October 2014. For a week, Sheffield's multilingualism became visible to all in parts of the city centre, with multilingual performances of song, poetry and storytelling by children and adults, poster displays in public spaces, public talks on languages and the arts/business/culture, radio debates, and an interactive exhibition to which passers-by were encouraged to contribute their stories of language learning and use. The festival generated a great deal of interest and excitement as well as many conversations about languages and language learning. It was noticeable, however, that most of the language performances by children were offered in French, German and Spanish. Over twenty complementary schools were invited to participate, but only three replied (Chinese, Spanish and Oromo). The data from the interactive exhibition have not yet been fully analysed, but it is clear that, though many languages were represented in the exhibits, most of the contributions in

community languages were completed locally in advance of the festival, not in the city centre itself, and those completed in the central spaces were from university students and visitors rather than from established Sheffield communities. Further research is needed to understand the use of local community languages in formal city centre spaces, but the festival certainly suggested the possibility that 'multilingualism is structured and regimented by spaces and relations between spaces' (Blommaert et al. 2005: 205). It would appear that particular languages and their speakers may be excluded from some civic spaces, just as they frequently are from mainstream classrooms, reducing the likelihood of meaningful re-educative contact between plurilingual individuals and communities and the hegemonic linguistic population.

Before concluding this chapter then, let us return to the spaces, in which our interdisciplinary review of space/place and collective and critical autonomy suggested 'new histories' are continuously being made and re-made, the spaces which afford the ongoing social (re-)construction of places through collective and experienced autonomy. These are the local neighbourhood spaces outside the civic centres, such as Massey's Kilburn, where superdiversity is most visible and audible. Linguistic landscape studies have begun to shift from the commercial city centres, providing rich and vibrant portraits of superdiverse neighbourhoods, such as Brockton, Calgary (Burwell & Lenters 2015), Bogatto and Hélot's (2010) Quartier Gare in Strasbourg, or the London Borough of Hackney (Wessendorf 2015). In Sheffield it is our experience that in local, informal, public spaces such as streets and parks, the fluid and varied use of languages is an everyday part of life, resonating with Pennycook and Otsuji's (2015) record of metrolingualism in Sydney and Tokyo. To what extent such spaces are affording an 'ordinary cosmopolitanism' (Hall 2012), in which people

live amongst and recognise difference without converging to sameness, cannot, however, be known without further research. Such vibrant local urban spaces nevertheless reflect Massey's non-essentialist 'progressive sense of place', which views place as process, open and dynamic, always shifting and characterised by 'throwntogetherness', in this case of languages, cultures and identities. They suggest a linguistic Thirdspace, practised and lived, where linguistic tactics reveal the ways in which agency interacts with structure. Within these slippery spaces, we see practices emerging, in which a collective but pluralistic identity may be developing. This is not to deny that there may be tensions and struggle, but overall they offer the possibility of moving towards an increasingly visible, everyday multilingualism and becoming dynamic 'spaces of hope' for a more linguistically inclusive city, with people drawing on all of their linguistic resources to communicate with each other. The potential for local communities to shape the linguistic spaces that they inhabit offers a vision of wider self-empowerment, not just locally but also translocally and transnationally.

Of course, such practices could simply reflect an exciting but ultimately non-transformative late modernity, in which anything is possible in local spaces, but where access to other formal urban and educational spaces remains withheld. We have argued, however, that though we need local activism in the here-and-now, we must not lose sight of the structural injustices experienced by many linguistic minority groups. The monolingual hegemony may be countered in local spaces and the potential for interlinguality may be enhanced there; the challenge, however, is to address the monolingual habitus on a wider level in order to raise awareness of the value of plurilingualism, including the validity of hybrid linguistic practices, beyond the communities themselves. If we return to the Gramscian idea of the 'war of

position' (Gramsci 1971), we see how such local self-empowerment by linguistic communities is an essential step towards confronting the monolingual hegemony and eroding the monolingual habitus. In order to gain insights into ways of further impacting on broader hegemonic practices, however, including at official institutional and educational levels, we might draw on Mouffe's (2005; 2007) concept of 'agonistic' (as opposed to antagonistic) urbanism, according to which it is to be understood that 'public spaces are always plural and the agonistic confrontation takes place in a multiplicity of discursive surfaces' (Mouffe 2005: 3). Whilst challenging the consensus of local hegemonic spaces, then, the construction of agonistic spaces through activist practices nevertheless respects and negotiates with dominant perspectives, engaging with them at different levels, not only locally but also at broader political levels, defusing hostility, yet nevertheless providing 'affordances for new uses, symbols, and meanings to emerge as an outcome of public process' (Rios 2008: 218). Through such engagement, the struggle can continue to create more inclusive, socially just places, in which plurilingualism can be valued beyond the local neighbourhood spaces.

Conclusions

This chapter has argued that linguistically super-diverse cities offer spaces, in which local language communities can and do challenge the monolingual hegemony through processes which can be understood as collectively autonomous, in the sense that the communities reflect critically on their situation within the broader monolingual context and adjust their local environment to suit their desires. In such spaces local citizens can produce not only plurilingual places, where it is perceived as normal for

many languages to be used, but interlingual places, where hybrid linguistic practices facilitate and reflect a willingness to see all languages as a resource for all (Lamb 2015). Through their everyday practices, as well as through the creation of complementary forms of education in language and culture, such communities are autonomously ensuring that their languages continue to be used, learnt and maintained. Nevertheless, there is also a need to investigate the extent to which these communities themselves are absorbing the monolingual habitus and restricting their own use of their languages to local spaces, such as the home, as identified earlier in this chapter. Where this is the case, there may be the need to build on fledgling work to support communities, and in particular young people, by involving them in co-produced and activist research and training, not only to educate them to continue to value their own plurilingualism, but also to facilitate the ongoing development of their collective and critical autonomy in designing everyday local and translocal, informal and formal, urban spaces that reach beyond their own communities and challenge the monolingual habitus (Vodicka 2015; Lamb & Vodicka 2015).

Taking this a step further, there is the need for communities to be involved in collaborations that develop localised practices into broader institutional policies that value plurilingualism. As we have seen, the monolingual hegemony is particularly tenacious in the English education system. Nevertheless, the acknowledgement of the need to value plurilingualism and multilingualism and the related developments in education policy and curriculum between 2002 and 2010 demonstrate that a more inclusive approach is possible. During that time, for example, the UK Government funded the World Languages Project as a two-year project, though it was curtailed in 2010 following the election of a new government. The aim was to conduct research

and develop a strategy to increase the range of languages available to be learnt in schools in England and to encourage monolingual English speakers to learn languages spoken in their communities. As yet unpublished research by the first author included case studies of schools, which were already managing to create places in the curriculum in which pupils could learn such languages, despite the shortage of curriculum time for languages and the lack of community language teachers. Interestingly, despite the research being conducted at a time when there was greater encouragement to diversify, none of the eight case study schools mentioned policy drivers as a rationale for offering a multilingual curriculum. Instead, they had made choices based on principles such as the value of language learning for future citizens of the world and the development of a positively diverse community, elements of an interlingual awareness. Most significantly, however, they had also been influenced by their location in multilingual urban areas and their history of engagement with local linguistic communities. Such engagement had in many cases stemmed from autonomous approaches from the communities to organise their complementary schools on the school premises, as well as offers to provide community teachers (albeit often untrained) in order to develop a more multilingual curriculum, evidence of a critical and collective autonomy that is struggling to bring about shifts beyond its own boundaries and to challenge the monolingual habitus.

The struggle to shift the monolingual habitus continues. Financial constraints and central curriculum control make it difficult to sustain such innovations in mainstream education. Language communities, supported by allies in schools, academia and business who see the importance of building on the valuable multilingual resources present in their midst, nevertheless continue to resist the pressures from the

monolingual hegemony and to channel their desire that their children learn and use their languages. Local neighbourhood spaces are also increasingly reflecting multilingualism through linguistically hybrid practices. Despite the challenges then, local and collective autonomous action still offers 'spaces of hope' (Harvey 2000) for communities to sustain their languages and to develop agonistic spaces of influence beyond their own local neighbourhoods, building alliances to challenge the monolingual habitus.

References

Agnew, JA 1987, Place and politics: The geographical mediation of state and society, Allen and Unwin, Boston.

Alexander, GS 1989, 'Dilemmas of Group Autonomy: Residential Associations and Community', Cornell Law Faculty Publications, no 466.

Algra, KA 1994, Concepts of space in Greek thought, Brill, Leiden.

Andreotti, V 2010, 'Global Education in the '21st Century': two different perspectives on the 'post-' of postmodernism', International Journal of Development Education and Global Learning, vol. 2, pp. 5-22.

Baetens-Beardsmore, H 2003, 'Who is afraid of bilingualism?', in JM Dewaele, A Housen & L Wei (eds.), Bilingualism: Beyond basic principles, Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, Bristol, UK.

Baker, P & Eversley, J 2000, Multilingual Capital. The languages of London's schoolchildren and their relevance to economic, social and educational policies, Corporation of London, London.

Bauman, Z 2011, Culture in a liquid modern world, Polity Press, Cambridge.

Baumann, H 2008, 'Reconsidering Relational Autonomy. Personal Autonomy for Socially Embedded and Temporally Extended Selves' Analyse und Kritik, vol. 30, pp. 445-468.

Beacco, J-C 2005, Languages and language repertoires: Plurilingualism as a way of life in Europe, Council of Europe, Strasbourg.

Blackledge, A 2001, 'Literacy, schooling and ideology in a multilingual state', The Curriculum Journal, vol. 12, pp. 291–312.

Blackledge, A 2006, 'The magical frontier between the dominant and the dominated: Sociolinguistics and social justice in a multilingual world', Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development, vol. 27, no. 1, pp. 22-41.

Blommaert, J., Collins, J. and Slembrouck, S. 2005, 'Spaces of multilingualism', Languages and Communication, vol. 25, pp. 197-216.

Boeckmann, K-B, Aalto, E, Abel, A, Atanasoska, T & Lamb, T 2011, Promoting Plurilingualism – Majority Language in Multilingual Settings, Council of Europe, Strasbourg.

Bogatto, F & Hélot, C 2010, 'Linguistic Landscape and Language Diversity in Strasbourg: The "*Quartier Gare*"' in E Shohamy, B-R Eliezer & M Barni (eds.), Linguistic Landscape In The City, Multilingual Matters, Bristol.

Bourdieu, P 1985, 'The social space and the genesis of groups', Theory and Society, vol. 14, no. 6, pp. 723-44.

Bourdieu, P 1994, In other words: Essays towards a reflexive sociology, Polity Press, Cambridge, original work published 1990.

Burwell, C & Lenters, K 2015, 'Word on the street: Investigating linguistic landscapes with urban Canadian youth', Pedagogies: An International Journal, vol. 10, no. 3.

Candelier, M, Daryai-Hansen, P & Schröder-Sura, A 2012, 'The framework of reference for pluralistic approaches to languages and cultures – A complement to the CEFR to develop plurilingual and intercultural competences', Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching, vol. 6, pp. 243–257.

Casey, ES 2013, The Fate of Place: A Philosophical History, University of California Press, Berkeley, CA.

Castoriadis, C 1975, L'institution imaginaire de la société, Éditions du Seuil, Paris, France.

Chatterton, P 2004, 'Making autonomous geographies: Argentina's popular uprising and the Movimiento de Trabajadores Desocupados (Unemployed Workers Movement), Geoforum, vol. 36, pp. 545- 561.

Cleaver H 1979, Reading capital politically, Harvester, Brighton.

Clyne, M & Kipp, S 1997, 'Trends and changes in home language use and shift in Australia, 1986–1996', Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development, vol. 18, pp. 451–473.

Creese, A 2009, 'Building on young people's linguistic and cultural continuity: Complementary schools in the United Kingdom', Theory Into Practice, vol. 48, pp. 267-273.

Creese, A & Blackledge, A 2010, 'Translanguaging in the bilingual classroom: A pedagogy for learning and teaching?', The Modern Language Journal, vol. 94, pp. 103–115.

Cresswell, T. 2015, Place: An introduction, 2nd edn, John Wiley, Chichester, UK.

Cru, J (ed.) 2014, The Management of Multilingualism in Urban Settings / La gestió del multilingüisme en context urbà, Linguapax International, Barcelona.

De Certeau, M 1984, The practice of everyday life, University of California Press, Berkeley, CA.

DeFilippis, J 1999, 'Alternatives to the "New Urban Politics": Finding Locality and Autonomy in Local Economic Development', Political Geography, vol. 18, pp. 973–90.

Department for Education and Skills 2002, Language learning. DfES, Nottingham.

Dovey, K 2010, Becoming places: Urbanism/Architecture/Identity/Power, Routledge, London.

Friedland, R 1992, 'Space, place, and modernity: The geographical moment', Contemporary Sociology, vol. 21, no. 1, pp. 11-15.

Giddens, A 1979, Central Problems in Social Theory, University of California Press, Berkeley, CA.

Giddens, A 1990, The Consequences of Modernity, Stanford University Press, Stanford.

Giddens, A 1993, 'Modernity, history, democracy', Theory and Society, vol. 22, no. 2, pp. 289-292.

Gogolin, I 1994, Der monolinguale Habitus der multilingualen Schule, Waxmann, Münster.

Gogolin, I. 2002, 'Linguistic and cultural diversity in Europe: A challenge for educational research and practice', European Educational Research Journal, vol. 1, pp. 123–138.

Gramsci, A 1971, Selection from prison notebooks. International Publishers, New York.

Hall, S 2009, 'Being at home: Space for belonging in a London caff', Open House International, vol. 34, pp. 81–87.

Harvey, D 1996, Justice, nature and the geography of difference, Blackwell, Cambridge, MA.

Harvey, D 2000, Spaces of hope, Edinburgh University Press, Edinburgh.

Harvey, D 2003, 'The right to the city', International Journal of Urban and Regional Research, vol. 27, no. 4, pp. 939-941.

Harvey, D 2005, A Brief History of Neoliberalism, Oxford University Press, New York, NY.

Harvey, D 2008, 'The Right to the City', New Left Review, vol. 53, pp. 23–40.

Harvey, D 2012, Rebel Cities: From the Right to the City to the Urban Revolution, Verso, London.

Held, D, McGrew, A, Goldblatt, D & Perraton, J 1999, Global Transformation: Politics, Economics and Culture, Stanford University Press, Standford.

Holec, H 1981, Autonomy and foreign language learning, Pergamon, Oxford.

Hornberger, N 2007, 'Multilingual language policies and the continua of biliteracy: An ecological approach' in O García & C Baker (eds.), Bilingual education. An introductory reader, Multilingual Matters, Clevedon, UK.

Jacquemet, M 2005, 'Transidiomatic practices: Language and power in the age of globalization', Language & Communication, vol. 25, no. 3, pp. 257-277.

Jiménez Raya, M, Lamb, TE & Vieira, F 2007, Pedagogy for autonomy in language education in Europe: A framework for learner and teacher development, Authentik, Dublin.

Lamb, TE 2000, 'Reconceptualising disaffection – issues of power, voice and learner autonomy', in G Walraven, C Parsons, D Van Veen & C Day (eds.), Combating Social Exclusion through Education, Garant, Louvain, Belgium and Apeldoorn, Netherlands.

Lamb, TE 2001, 'Language policy in multilingual UK', The Language Learning
Journal, vol. 23, no. 1, pp. 4-12.

Lamb, TE 2015, 'Towards a plurilingual habitus: engendering interlinguality in urban
spaces', International Journal of Pedagogies and Learning, vol. 10, no. 1, pp.
151-165.

Lamb, TE & Vodicka, G 2015, 'Transculturality and multilingualism in formal
and informal urban spaces', paper presented at Transcultural Urban Spaces:
Where Geography meets Language conference, University of Bern,
Switzerland, 16-17 October.

Languages Sheffield 2012, Sheffield Languages Strategy. Languages Sheffield,
Sheffield.

Lefebvre, H 1947, The Critique of Everyday Life, Verso, London.

Lefebvre, H 1968, Le Droit à la ville, 2nd edn, Anthropos, Paris.

Lefevbre, H 1974, La production de l'espace, Anthropos, Paris.

Little, D 2000, 'Learner autonomy and human interdependence: some theoretical and
practical consequences of a social-interactive view of cognition, learning and
language', in B Sinclair, I McGrath & TE Lamb (eds.) Learner autonomy,
teacher autonomy: future directions. Addison Wesley Longman, Harlow.

Lyotard, LF 1984, The postmodern condition: A report on knowledge. University of
Minneapolis Press, Minneapolis.

Marshall, JD 1996, Michel Foucault: Personal autonomy and education, Kluwer
Academic Publishers, Dordrecht.

Marten, HF, Van Mensel, L & Gorter, D 2012, 'Studying minority languages in the
linguistic landscape', in D Gorter, HF Marten & L Van Mensel (eds.)

Minority languages in the linguistic landscape, Palgrave MacMillan, Basingstoke.

Massey, D 1994, Space, place and gender. Polity Press, Cambridge.

Mouffe, C 2005, The Return of the Political, Verso, London.

Mouffe, C 2007, 'Artistic activism and agonistic spaces', in ART&RESEARCH: a journal of ideas, contexts and methods, vol. 1. no.2, pp 1-5, viewed 16 May 2017, http://www.artandresearch.org.uk/v1n2/mouffe.html

Murray, G 2014, Social dimensions of autonomy in language learning, Palgrave Macmillan, Basingstoke.

Nuffield Foundation 2000, Languages: The next generation. The Nuffield Foundation, London.

Pennycook, A & Otsuji, E 2015, Metrolingualism: Language in the city. Routledge, Abingdon.

Phillipson, R 2003, English-only Europe: Challenging language policy. Routledge, London.

Pickerill, J & Chatterton, P 2006, 'Notes towards autonomous geographies: creation, resistance and self-management as survival tactics', Progress in Human Geography, vol. 30, no. 6, pp. 730-746.

Pratchett, L 2004, 'Local autonomy, local democracy and the "new localism''', Political Studies, vol. 52, pp. 358-375.

Pred, AR 1984, 'Place as historically contingent process: Structuration and the time-geography of becoming places', Annals of the American Association of American Geographers, vol. 74, pp. 279-297.

Rämö, H 1999, 'An Aristotelian Human Time-Space Manifold: from chronochora to kairotopo', Time & Society, vol. 8, pp. 309-328.

Rampton, B 2009, 'Interaction ritual and not just artful performance in crossing and stylization', Language in Society, vol. 38, no 2, pp. 149-176.

Rampton, B, Blommaert, J, Arnaut, K & Spotti, M 2015, Superdiversity and sociolinguistics: Working Papers in urban Language and Literacies, paper 152, King's College, London.

Rios, M 2008, 'Envisioning Citizenship: Toward a Polity Approach in Urban Design', Journal of Urban Design, vol. 13, no. 2, pp. 213-229.

Salverda, R 2006, 'Multilingual London and its literatures', Opticon1826, vol. 1, pp. 1-15.

Sheffield Unified Multicultural Education Service 1994, Sheffield Multilingual City Conference Report, Education Department, SUMES, Sheffield.

Soja, EW 1996, Thirdspace, Blackwell, Malden, MA.

Souto-Manning, M 2006, 'Families learn together: reconceptualizing linguistic diversity as a resource', Early Childhood Education Journal, vol. 33, pp. 443–446.

Therborn, G 2000, 'Globalizations: Dimensions, Historical Waves, Regional Effects, Normative Governance', International Sociology, vol. 15, no. 2, pp. 151-179.

Tuan, Y-F 1977, Space and place: The perspective of experience, University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis.

Ushioda, E 2011, 'Motivating learners to speak as themselves', in G Murray, X Gao & TE Lamb (eds.), Identity, motivation and autonomy in language learning, Multilingual Matters, Bristol.

Vertovec, S 2007, 'Super-diversity and its implications', Ethnic and Racial Studies, vol. 30, no. 6, pp. 1024-1054.

Vieira, F 2009, Struggling for autonomy in language education: Reflecting, acting and being, Peter Lang, Frankfurt-am-Main.

Vodicka, G 2015, 'Exploring the lived experience in Page Hall: Creative participatory methodologies and critical pedagogy', paper presented at Migration Graduate Conference, University of Sussex Centre for Migration Research, Brighton, UK, 9-10 March.

Wei, L 2006, 'Complementary schools: Past, present and future', Language and Education, vol. 20, pp. 76–83.

Wei, L 2011, 'Moment analysis and translanguaging space: Discursive construction of identities by multilingual Chinese youth in Britain', Journal of Pragmatics, vol. 43, pp. 1222–1235.

Wenden, AL 1999, 'An introduction to Metacognitive Knowledge and Beliefs in Language Learning: beyond the basics', System, vol. 27, no. 4, pp. 435-442.

Wessendorf, S 2015 ''All the people speak bad English': Coping with language differences in a super-diverse context', IRiS Working Paper Series, no. 9, Institute for Research into Superdiversity, Birmingham.

Williams, Q & Stroud, C 2013 'Multilingualism in transformative spaces: Contact and conviviality', Language Policy, vol. 12, pp. 289–311.

Zembylas, M & Lamb, TE 2008, 'Interrogating the notion of autonomy in education: tensions and possibilities' in M Jiménez Raya & TE Lamb (eds.), Pedagogy for autonomy in modern languages education: Theory, practice, and teacher education, Authentik, Dublin.

Žižek S 2008, Violence. Profile, London.