

English language learning for adult migrants in superdiverse Britain

James Simpson

Introduction: A history of inward migration

Over the past few decades English language learning for adult migrants in Britain has changed rather radically. Change has come in response to the variety that characterises contemporary societies: English language learners are a far more diverse group than hitherto. Change has also arisen as a result of government policies related both to how language learning opportunities for migrants are provided and funded, and more broadly to immigration itself. This chapter discusses these policies, and the ideologies, discourses and social realities that have contributed to their development.

Since the late nineteenth century Britain has experienced successive waves of migration: Jewish refugees fleeing persecution in Eastern Europe in the 1880s; escapees from German-occupied Belgium in 1915; opponents of fascism in Spain and Germany in the 1930s; and large numbers of people from across Europe in the aftermath of the Second World War (Rosenberg 2007). The mid-twentieth century saw the arrival of migrants from the former colonies who had a right to settle in Britain – particularly the Indian sub-continent and the Caribbean – in response to the post-war demand for labour. Migration today differs in range and scale from these earlier waves, at least in part due to processes of globalisation associated with late modernity (Appadurai 1996, Giddens 1999). These include increased mobility, and movement of people towards the developed West. Hence Britain in recent years has seen inward migration from places such as Ethiopia and Eritrea, Somalia, Congo, Iraq, and Afghanistan, where the political and economic situation has forced people to uproot. Migration is never straightforward, however, and nor is policy. The policy response to migration has on the one hand concentrated on how to accommodate ethnic minorities through ‘integration’ of various kinds, and on the other on ways to control and limit it. Britain’s asylum laws and curbs on non-European immigration mean that people from war-torn regions on the global periphery find it ever more difficult to enter the country. At the same time migration from Eastern European countries such as the Czech Republic, Slovakia and Poland has risen, a shift associated with an enlarged European Union.

Britain’s superdiverse urban centres now host multilingual and multicultural populations from potentially anywhere in the world. Likewise, any particular group of adult migrants learning English will be equally diverse. Baynham and colleagues (2007), writing before the most recent expansion of the European Union, describe an intermediate-level class of English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL) in North London with students from Spain, Brazil, Somalia, France, Turkey, Columbia, Albania, Chad, Congo, Cyprus and India. In 2013 an equivalent class at the same college again has students from Brazil, Somalia and Turkey, but also from Yemen, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Angola and China. The profile of these classes reflects the fast-changing patterns of migration. That there are no students from the European Union also points to the various constraints faced by potential students as they attempt to find a place in an English language class. The picture also varies from city to city, town to town, neighbourhood to neighbourhood. An intermediate ESOL class elsewhere in London, or in a large regional city such as Leeds, or in a rural county like Norfolk, would most likely exhibit a very different profile.

Moreover, diversity extends beyond countries of origin and first languages claimed. In a survey of over 500 ESOL students in the same study, Baynham et al (2007) found 58 countries of birth and 50 different first languages represented in the sample. In addition:

- 63% were women; 37% men
- Just under 80% were below the age of 40
- 14% said they were unable to read in their ‘first’ language
- 19% had university level education
- 28% were currently in employment
- 20% had been in the UK for 6+ years

This chapter concerns policy response to *linguistic* diversity, as it relates to the provision of opportunities for learning English. Below I consider how language and migration are talked of in the political and public spheres, noting how certain ideologies inform public discourse. I then turn to the trajectory of provision of ESOL classes in England, Scotland and Wales in the second half of the 20th century. The following section examines the *Skills for Life* policy, a major government initiative within which ESOL in England and Wales was located for a decade at the beginning of the 21st century, and its legacy for both learners and teachers. The final section takes stock of how the field of ESOL is addressing the diversity of the student population in policy and practice post-*Skills for Life*, and how ESOL as a distinct sector of adult education provision is facing a threat to its very existence.

‘A separateness that may be unhealthy’: Language and migration in political debate

The linguistic diversity of the UK is a fact of life. Though sometimes celebrated, in much popular opinion and in political rhetoric the country’s multilingualism can be a source of tension, is even presented as a threat to national unity, and is usually regarded as a problem that needs to be managed – as indeed is migration itself. Moreover, the position of English in the construction of national identity, that is, the connection of the English language to the notion of ‘Britishness’, informs the calls in some quarters that migrants be compelled to learn English. Although Britain is very obviously multilingual, its representation as a monolingual state, or one that at best tolerates a degree of regional bilingualism in Wales and Scotland, allies with the powerful ideology of ‘one nation one language’ (Kroskrity 2001; Spotti 2011). The association of the national community with English is underpinned by a belief that in order for British society to be strong and stable, its population must share a common language. This ideology is evident not just in Britain of course: monolingualist discourse is a key feature of the modernist project of building nation states everywhere. And in Britain as elsewhere, this ideology stands in sharp contrast to the multilingual reality ‘on the ground’.

In the 21st century the use of English has been associated with social cohesion in Britain, and conversely the non-use of English with social disorder. Events in the early years of the century both in the UK (street disturbances involving Asian and White youths and the police) and on the world stage (‘9/11’), were followed by sustained rhetoric insisting that migrants have an obligation, rather than a right, to learn English. Politicians and commentators have frequently connected the use of languages other than English, and of non-standard vernaculars, with a breakdown of social cohesion and the threat of extremism. For example, the position of the Prime Minister David Cameron in 2011 was that immigrants who don’t speak English cause ‘discomfort and disjointedness’ in their own neighbourhoods. This echoes a comment by an earlier Prime Minister, Tony Blair, who in the aftermath of terrorist bombings in London in 2005 said: ‘There are people who are isolated in their own communities who have been here for 20 years and still do not speak English. That worries me because there is a separateness that may be unhealthy’. In this and other such pronouncements, it is notable that people’s competence in English is talked about as a feature

of difference in terms that could not usually be used to discuss issues such as race or ethnicity: language is sometimes used as a stand-in for other things.

In order to legitimise their discourses and to distance themselves from extreme right-wing ideologies, politicians who make the connection between multilingualism and social disorder usually couch their talk in ‘liberal’ terms. That is, English is necessary for everyone to access their rights, to be able to fully participate in British society and to avoid being economically and socially marginalised. This is well-illustrated by Eric Pickles, the British Government Communities Secretary, who in 2013 said, ‘If your kids don’t have English you’re condemning them to a limited life.’ An insistence that that migrants have an obligation, rather than a right, to learn English is presented as a means of promoting social cohesion, as demonstrated by Ed Milliband, the opposition leader, in 2012: ‘If we are going to build One Nation, we need to start with everyone in Britain knowing how to speak English. We should expect that of people that come here. We will work together as a nation far more effectively when we can always talk together.’ And increasingly the use of English is seen as part of the contract immigrants enter into when they come to Britain, or even explicitly as a tool for immigration control. Nick Clegg, the Deputy Prime Minister, said in 2010: ‘If they want to play by the rules, pay their taxes, speak English, that is a smart, fair effective way of dealing with immigration.’

Invoking competence in English in debates about Britishness strengthens a position that the nation is limited by finite boundaries, linked by a common culture and language. The reality of multilingualism in the daily lives of many, and the superdiversity and transnational movement associated with globalisation, challenges and perhaps threatens this notion. It is difficult to disagree that competence in English is important, and most people, migrants included, regard it as an advantageous resource. Its role as the language of equality and social cohesion is somewhat overstated though, and political rhetoric over-emphasises language in debates about migration and society, at the expense of a focus on the more tangible problems that beset poor minority communities.

The political stance that linguistic diversity and multilingualism (and by extension immigration) are problems to be managed is adopted in a range of debates, including those concerning the public funding of translation services, bi- and multilingual education in primary schools, and the provision of non-English language children’s books in public libraries. Nowhere however does the Britishness debate rage more fiercely, nor is the role of English more contentious, than in the discussion of language requirements for immigration and citizenship. Since 2002 these requirements have in different ways involved English language classes, language testing and a ‘citizenship’ test – the *Life in the UK* test.

When it was first introduced, this test was administered to those applying for citizenship or naturalization. Today individuals from outside the EU have to pass it if they want to gain leave to remain in the country; in other words, it has become an obligatory test for anyone wishing to settle in the UK, regardless of whether they ultimately apply for citizenship. Tracing the trajectory of the test reveals a progressive tightening of requirements:

- 2002: According to the 2002 *Nationality, Immigration and Asylum Act*, applicants for British citizenship must show ‘a sufficient knowledge of English, Welsh or Scottish Gaelic’ and have ‘sufficient knowledge about life in the United Kingdom’. The *Life in the UK* citizenship test is introduced: a multiple choice test taken on computer, with a pass

mark of 75%. Applicants who are not competent users of English have the option to follow an ‘ESOL and Citizenship’ course in lieu of the test.

- 2007: The same requirements are extended to Indefinite Leave to Remain (settlement).
- 2009: A ‘tiered’ system for immigration is introduced: points are awarded for English language proficiency.
- 2010: An English language requirement is introduced for the issuing of spouse or partner visas prior to entry into the UK.
- 2013: People applying for settlement are required to pass an English language examination at level B1 on the CEFR (i.e. intermediate level), in addition to the *Life in the UK* test.
- 2013: The entitlement to take ESOL and Citizenship classes in lieu of the *Life in the UK* test is scrapped.

As a result English language education for migrants has become closely intertwined with policy on immigration and citizenship, and migrants and potential migrants are subject to language testing as a mechanism of immigration control (see McNamara 2012; cf Kurvers and Spotti, this volume). It is important to note that none of these strictures apply to EU citizens, making it difficult to argue that the testing is being done in the name of community cohesion.

Without doubt the relevance of competence in English is appreciated by migrants themselves, as noted earlier, though English is far from ‘the only game in town’. Multilingualism, though, is generally viewed in British public discourse as a positive attribute only in a limited way. While competence in European languages and certain other languages (e.g. Japanese) is admired, the day-to-day use in the home or workplace of other languages as part of a multilingual repertoire is not valued, as the quotations from politicians above suggest. And in England if not in Scotland or Wales there is scant attention paid in policy to the UK’s other languages, be they historically well-established or more recent. Also held in low esteem are the varieties of English that are not Standard British English. People educated through the medium of English in former British colonies in Africa, the Indian sub-continent and the Caribbean seem to cause particular problems when institutions attempt to classify them, for example when deciding which area of educational provision they ‘belong’ to. They are also subject to erroneous ideas about their linguistic repertoires and the varieties of English they use, which are widely regarded as being deficient. Thus migration entails not simply a shift of location, but also a move to a place where one’s variety of language may be valued less highly than it was before. The inequalities faced by multilinguals and users of non-standard varieties of English become visible when monolingualist ideologies play out in practice. This happens, for example, when people are confronted with teaching and testing regimes which fail to recognise either their polylingual local environments or the diversity of their everyday language practices, and which judge them by their failure to write according to the norms of a small culturally specific (i.e. middle-class, academic, English) elite. Moreover, the preoccupation that politicians have with linguistic diversity obscures the more concrete sources of inequality in British society. In the second decade of the 21st century the country is far more divided by housing, wealth and income than it is segregated according to ethnicity, or indeed its proxy, linguistic repertoire (see Dorling, 2012).

‘Anomalies, inconsistencies, unhelpful restrictions’: Post-war ESOL in the UK

Despite the rhetoric from politicians supporting the learning of English by migrants, opportunities to attend English classes have never been freely available to all new-arrival adults who want or need them. There exists a contradiction: on the one hand the strident

insistence in public and political discourse that ‘migrants must speak English’ contrasts with the denial of possibilities to do so. Behind this apparent paradox lie the issues both of the types of migrant privileged in UK migration policy, and how migrants who are English language learners are positioned within such policy. To illustrate this, we can note that free English lessons for migrants in the UK tend to come with strings attached, in that entitlement to such lessons is limited to certain categories of migrant, and that the content of those lessons is often restricted, for example to job skills-related topics. In this section I examine how the shifting understandings of the position of migrants in society in the post-war years, together with the actions of governments and policy activists, have helped to shape the nature of English language provision for new arrivals.

The 1950s and 1960s was characterised by the implicit, then explicit, racialisation of immigration policy. Post-World War Two the vast majority of migrants to the UK hailed from the former British colonies in the Indian sub-continent and the West Indies, recruited from the home country to work in industry and the public sector, and allowed to enter the UK under the 1948 *British Nationality Act*. Migrants from the mid-1950s experienced racially-motivated tension on Britain’s streets. A policy discourse developed through the 1950s positioning the new arrivals – ‘coloured people’ – as somehow incompatible with the British way of life and linking them to unemployment, housing shortages and crime (Carter et al 1987). Racialised immigration control was enshrined in law in the early 1960s. 1962 saw the first large-scale immigration control in the UK, the *Commonwealth Immigrants Act*, introduced by the Conservative government of the time. The 1968 Act of the same name also contained an explicitly racial dimension, distinguishing between British citizens descended from British-born parents and those who were citizens because of a connection with a former or existing British colony. As Don Flynn, the Director of Migrants’ Rights Network, says (2012): ‘By the late 1960s these ideas of distinction and difference were embedded across the political spectrum. Whether from the mainstream of the left or the right, ethnicity was thought of as a key component of citizenship.’

By the mid-1960s immigration policy included an articulation of the need for new arrivals to learn English. In 1965 the government’s *Education of Immigrants* pamphlet advised: ‘The Secretary of State considers that, even though adult immigrants may not intend to settle permanently in this country, they should have an induction course in English ways of living and learn to speak intelligibly’ (DES 1965 quoted in Rosenberg 2007: 89). Soon after, central government funding for ESOL was introduced for the first time in England and Wales under Section 11 of the 1966 Local Government Act. This provision, according to Sheila Rosenberg (2007: 92), contained ‘anomalies, inconsistencies and unhelpful restrictions’. For example, despite the changing nature of the ESOL population, it was only extended beyond New Commonwealth citizens in 1993, by which time its funding had been cut substantially.

The 1970s saw an increase in the number and diversity of migrants arriving in the UK, for instance Ugandan Asians in 1972, and Vietnamese boat people in 1975. That decade witnessed not only an expansion of ESOL teaching, but also a nascent critical and activist approach among some ESOL practitioners. In 1978 NATESLA, the National Association for Teaching English as a Second Language to Adults, was founded, affording coordinated lobbying for ESOL provision on a national scale. The London Literacy Unit, established in 1980, also played a key activist role until its disbandment in 2010. Nonetheless, despite the rise of policy activism and a growing demand for English language lessons, provision remained *ad hoc* and fragmented through the 1970s and 1980s. Some areas were better-

organised than others, notably London, where the Inner London Education Authority (ILEA) supported much ESOL practice until its abolition in 1989.

During this period ESOL practice and materials began to better reflect the realities of the daily lives of ethnic minority migrants, as materials developers – often practitioners themselves – attempted to counter the discrimination faced by many. Noteworthy initiatives included BBC TV programmes aimed at adult migrants and their teachers: *Parosi* (1977), for Asian women, and the series *Speak for Yourself* (1981). The BBC also broadcast *Crosstalk* (1979), produced by the National Centre for Industrial Language Training. ILT was initially funded under Section 11, and in the fifteen years from 1974 offered ESOL training and training in multicultural awareness in workplaces, as well as hitherto under-explored understandings of language as a dimension of racial discrimination (Roberts et al 1992; Roberts 2005; Agar 1998). Although influential at the time, the work of ILT is little known by today's policy makers and practitioners.

In policy the Bullock report *A Language for Life* (1975) developed the concept of language across the curriculum; it also stressed the importance of the maintenance of the mother tongue. But funding and coordination of ESOL was still largely ignored on a national level. Dwindling and partial Section 11 funding together with piecemeal funding from the Manpower Services Commission was augmented in 1984 when the field of ESOL came under the remit of the Adult Literacy and Basic Skills Unit (ALBSU), in effect positioning of ESOL as a 'basic skill', and linking it with adult Literacy and Numeracy. ALBSU, though limited in its effectiveness, did manage to get ESOL included in the list of courses that attracted statutory funding from the Further Education Funding Council in the 1990s by labelling it as 'vocational' (Hamilton and Hillier 2009). Its linkage in policy with adult literacy, though, contributed to the trajectory of ESOL as separate from other branches of English Language Teaching.

The identity of ESOL as a distinct field is strengthened by its position vis-à-vis immigration. That is, ESOL is viewed in public and policy discourse as 'a compensatory education programme to aid the assimilation of immigrant communities into what is perceived as a traditionally monocultural, monolingual heritage' (Hamilton and Hillier 2009: 8). This distinctiveness is problematic: ESOL is treated differently in policy, and differs culturally, from 'international EFL'. In later years this distinction was regarded as being unhelpful (Williams and Williams 2007) or at least to an extent redundant (Baynham et al 2007), a perspective informed by the reality of the ESOL student population in the 21st century. In many cases ESOL classes began to resemble international EFL classes, populated as they were by relatively well-heeled and mobile European migrants as well as by people from poorer parts of the world. Yet the policy understanding of ESOL as 'different' was crystallised when the sector, after intense lobbying from practitioners, was included under the *Skills for Life* umbrella in 2001.

'Buying control of ESOL': *Skills for Life* and its legacy

Early in the first New Labour government, a review of basic skills (DfEE 1999) had recommended implementing a national strategy to reduce the number of adults with low levels of basic skills, literacy and numeracy, *Skills for Life*, which was funded until 2009. ESOL was not originally included as a 'skill for life' but activists viewed its inclusion as a chance for proper funding, as well as an opportunity for professionalisation. This goes some way towards accounting for the compliance of ESOL practitioners in aligning with the policy over the subsequent decade. Yet it is argued that the marginalisation of ESOL in terms of

policy and funding that continues to the present day results in part from its positioning as a ‘skill’ (Cooke and Simpson 2008, 2009; cf. Auerbach 1991), one which aims to prepare students for menial employment and a service role in socioeconomic structure. Employability is tightly connected to the skills agenda: if English is a ‘skill’, and ‘skills’ are deemed necessary to become employable, ESOL students will be viewed primarily in terms of how they can become more economically productive.

Establishing it as a ‘skill for life’ also strengthened centralised government influence on ESOL, as well as widening its separation from international EFL. *Skills for Life* brought with it the creation of a national curriculum for ESOL, classroom materials to support that curriculum, new teacher-training and inspection regimes, and qualifications mapped against national standards. A statutory curriculum dictates the nature of the English language education that migrants can gain access to, and the way they are positioned in formal education. As Cooke and Simpson maintain (2009: 22), ‘by bringing ESOL under the *Skills for Life* umbrella, the Government effectively bought control of ESOL.’ The *Adult ESOL Core Curriculum* (AECC; DfES 2001) was statutory under *Skills for Life*, and to the present provides a framework for syllabus planning for ESOL practitioners in England.

The AECC applied only to England and Wales. Elsewhere in the UK, ESOL in policy followed a somewhat different trajectory in the early 21st century. In Scotland, where there have long been settled ethnic minority communities, the demand for ESOL classes has experienced something of a boom in recent years. Glasgow in particular became host to a sizeable number of refugees seeking asylum who were removed from London and the south east of England under a programme of dispersal after 2000. The other major rise in numbers came after the extension of the European Union in 2004 when workers started to come to Scotland from the new accession states. In addition, the strictures of the *Life in the UK* test apply equally to residents in Scotland, leading to an increase in demand for ESOL classes for ‘New Scots’. In response the Scottish Qualification Authority (SQA) has ratified a suite of qualifications which come under the same framework as mainstream Scottish education, with levels entitled Access, Intermediate and Higher. Moreover, the ESOL Higher qualification is accepted as a university entrance level language qualification, which is particularly helpful for school-age ESOL students.

In 2007 *The Adult ESOL Strategy for Scotland* was introduced; its main work was to prepare a national curriculum (www.esolscotland.com). With its tradition of a ‘social practices’ approach to adult literacy, Scotland’s curriculum is different in conception and principle to that in England and Wales, and avoids some of the problems that have attracted criticism there, namely that it is prescriptive and too skills-based. The Scottish Adult ESOL Curriculum Framework is flexible, and is oriented towards guidance rather than prescription. More recently the Welsh Government distanced itself from ESOL policy in England with the release of an ESOL Policy for Wales (Welsh Government 2014).

From ‘cohesion’ to ‘austerity’: Current concerns, future directions

In 2009 the then New Labour Government signalled the end of the position of ESOL as a central component of *Skills for Life*. The ‘New Approach to ESOL’ required ESOL to be coordinated locally, at the level of local authorities and councils. Under the Conservative-dominated coalition government, from 2010 attention to ESOL in policy shifted from ‘community cohesion’ to ‘austerity measures’. This coincided with cuts to local government funding, which severely compromised local authorities’ ability to fulfil their obligations to coordinate English language provision for adult migrants. Responsibility increasingly became

shouldered by the voluntary sector, where teachers are often inexperienced and untrained, centres are poorly resourced, and provision lacks cohesion (Simpson 2012).

The response to recent policy moves from practitioners and students has been vocal and at least partly effective. The *Action for ESOL* movement, formed in 2010 in response to that year's funding cuts, involves practitioners and students themselves. The movement lobbies for access to funded ESOL classes for a broad swath of students upon their arrival in the UK, not just those who have been in the UK for a certain amount of time, or those in receipt of certain types of unemployment benefit. Its *Manifesto* (www.actionforesol.org) is a statement of core principles which provides a reference point for activist practitioners. A related group is *ESOL-Research* (www.jiscmail.ac.uk/ESOL-Research), a vibrant online discussion forum connecting ESOL practitioners over the internet. NATESLA has become NATECLA – 'English and Community Languages' – and retains a role in providing a platform for practitioner and student resistance to the excesses of policy. And NIACE, the National Institute for Adult and Continuing Education, is a somewhat critical voice speaking to policy. The practitioner response to multilingualism remains paradoxical: when they respond critically to government policy, practitioners understandably invoke the benefits of English language education in an English-dominant society. But the debates are Janus-faced: a policy privileging English language education for migrants might also preclude attention to students' expert languages. For example, while beginner literacy remains a special challenge for many new arrivals, there is still a lack of focus in policy and in practice on potentially transformative first language literacy programmes for non-literate migrants.

The renewed prominence of community-based classes, often taught by volunteers, has had one possibly unintended consequence, as teachers find themselves freed from the strictures of curriculum and the bureaucratisation that plagued ESOL during the *Skills for Life* years. This has afforded the nascent and very welcome emergence of new Freirean-inspired critical and participatory pedagogies for ESOL (see Hamilton et al 2012, Mallows 2012, Cooke and Winstanley, this volume). These may in turn lead to the development of multilingual approaches to adult migrant language education that are appropriate for students in superdiverse contemporary Britain.

More broadly, current migration policy aligns with the dominant concern in the developed West of keeping poor migrants out. At policy level, the UK is a reluctant host state; immigrants are needed but not welcomed, and its political leaders present any fall in the numbers of inward migrants as a victory for 'tough' policies. In place, however, is a system which encourages freedom of movement for goods and capital while denying it to human beings (Harding 2012), which is inequitable from any perspective. Anti-immigrant rhetoric remains shrill, and from outside Europe in particular only certain types of migrant are favoured. Finally, when it comes to entitlement for a free state-provided ESOL class, despite the best efforts of activist practitioners and students, only limited categories of people have access.

Conclusion: A more pressing material plane

This chapter maintains that since the 1950s, ESOL students have been positioned as deficient in relation to an Anglo-dominant norm; this orientation is underpinned by a modernist ideology of monolingualism which is out of kilter with the daily language experience of many. At the same time, the demand to learn English has always been greater than state provision of opportunities to do so, even during the early years of the *Skills for Life* policy. In fact ESOL as a field has typically existed on the margins of mainstream adult education. In

response, the ESOL profession has since the 1970s included a strong seam of activism, which has recently involved students themselves. I have also noted that in recent years, English language education and testing have become progressively intertwined with immigration policy: English language professionals have – usually unwillingly – found themselves involved in questionable and problematic testing practices, ones in which test scores are employed for immigration control.

Finally I have suggested that the diversity associated with globalisation presents challenges to the identity of ‘ESOL’ as a field. I do not propose that the sustainability of English as the dominant language of the UK is in doubt. It is clear however that the debates about the tension between a monolingualist ideology and a multilingual reality will continue to rage. Recent (and not so recent) work in Sociolinguistics and Applied Linguistics has raised critical questions relating to these tensions. For instance:

- To what extent does English fulfil the role of ‘language of equality and opportunity’ that is so often claimed (Pennycook 2007)?
- Do the varieties of English used in the English-speaking West (e.g. Standard British English) continue to be ascendant (Kirkpatrick 2010; Canagarajah 1999)?
- In the superdiverse globalised world is it more appropriate to consider language in use in terms of individuals’ *communicative repertoires*, rather than *languages* understood as discrete entities (Gumperz 1982; Blommaert and Backus 2011)?

Meanwhile, however, contemporary Britain is witnessing a shift to a more pressing material plane, invoking work and housing, and the inequalities inherent in these domains. Such concerns, rather than deliberations about language, tend to be at the forefront of migrants’ minds.

References

Agar, D. E. (1998) *Language Policy in Britain and France*. London: Continuum.

Appadurai, A. (1996) *Modernity At Large: Cultural Dimensions of Globalization*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Auerbach, E. (1991) Politics, pedagogy, and professionalism: Challenging marginalization in ESL. *College ESL* 1/1: 1-9.

Baynham, M., Roberts, C., Cooke, M., Simpson, J. and Ananiadou, K. (2007) *Effective Teaching and Learning ESOL*. London: NRDC.

Blommaert, J. and Backus, A. (2011) Repertoires revisited: Knowing language in superdiversity. *Working Papers in Urban Language and Literacies*. King's College London, Paper 67.

Canagarajah, S. (1999) *Resisting Linguistic Imperialism in English Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Carter, B., Harris, C. and Joshi, S. (1987) The 1951-1955 Conservative Government and the racialisation of black immigration. *Policy Papers in Ethnic Relations* 11. University of

Warwick Centre for Research in Ethnic Relations. Available online at http://www2.warwick.ac.uk/fac/soc/crer/research/publications/policy/policyp_no.11.pdf

Cooke, M. (2010) Research digest 5: Language and migration. *Language Issues* 21/2, 66-72.

Cooke, M. and Simpson, J. (2012) Discourses about linguistic diversity. In M. Martin-Jones, A. Blackledge and A. Creese (eds.) *Routledge Handbook of Multilingualism*. London: Routledge.

Cooke, M. and Simpson, J. (2009) Challenging agendas in ESOL: Skills, employability and social cohesion. *Language Issues* 20/1, 19-30.

Cooke, M. and Simpson, J. (2008) *ESOL: A Critical Guide*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Department for Education and Employment (1999) *A Fresh Start - Improving Literacy and Numeracy* (The Moser report). London: Basic Skills Agency.

Department for Education and Skills (2001) *Adult ESOL Core Curriculum*. London: Basic Skills Agency/DfES. Available online at http://www.dfes.gov.uk/curriculum_esol/

Dorling, D. (2012) Editorial – Inequality and injustice: Some news from Britain. *Urban Geography*, 33/5, 621-629.

Flynn, D. (2012) Marking 50 years of Commonwealth immigration controls. Available online at <http://www.migrantsrights.org.uk/blog/2012/01/marking-50-years-commonwealth-immigration-controls>

Giddens, A. (1999) *Runaway World: How Globalization is Reshaping Our Lives*. London: Profile.

Gumperz, J. (1982) *Discourse Strategies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hamilton, M., Tett, L and Crowther, J. (eds.) (2012) *More Powerful Literacies*. Leicester: NIACE.

Hamilton, M. and Hillier, Y. (2009) ESOL policy and change. *Language Issues* 20/1, 4-18.

Harding, J. (2012) *Border Vigils*. London and New York: Verso.

Home Office (2012) *Statement of Intent: Family Migration*. June 2012. Available online at <http://www.ukba.homeoffice.gov.uk/sitecontent/documents/news/soi-fam-mig.pdf>

Kirkpatrick, A. (ed.) (2010) *The Routledge Handbook of World Englishes*. London: Routledge.

Kroskrity, P. (2001) Language Ideologies. In J. Verschueren, J-O Österman, J. Blommaert and C. Bulcaen (eds.) *Handbook of Pragmatics*, Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Mallows, D. (ed.) (2012) *Innovations in English Language Teaching for Migrants and Refugees*. London: British Council.

Martin-Jones, M. and Gardner, S. (2012) Introduction: Multilingualism, discourse and ethnography. In S. Gardner and M. Martin-Jones (eds.) (2012) *Multilingualism, Discourse and Ethnography*. London: Routledge. pp. 1-15.

McNamara, T. (2012) Poststructuralism and its challenges for applied linguistics. *Applied Linguistics* 33/5, 564-581.

Pennycook, A. (2007) The myth of English as and International Language. In S. Makoni and A. Pennycook (eds.) *Disinventing and Reconstituting Languages*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters. pp. 90-115.

Roberts, C. (2005) Teaching English to speakers of other languages (ESOL) in the workplace. In E. Hinkel (ed.) *Handbook of Research in Second Language Teaching and Learning*. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates. pp. 117-136.

Roberts, C., Davies, E and Jupp, T. (1992) *Language and Discrimination*. Harlow: Longman.

Rosenberg, S. (2007) A Critical History of ESOL in the UK, 1870-2006. Leicester: NIACE.

Simpson, J. (2012) "Bits here and there" – Fragmented ESOL provision in Leeds. *Language Issues* 23/2, 32-45.

Simpson, J. and Cooke, M. (2010) Movement and Loss: Progression in tertiary education for migrant students. *Language and Education* 24/1, 57-73.

Simpson, J. and Cooke, M. (2011) English Language classrooms: A battleground for migration policy? *Red Pepper*. Available online at <http://www.redpepper.org.uk/mind-your-language/>

Spotti, M. (2011) Modernist language ideologies, indexicalities and identities: Looking at the multilingual classroom through a post-Fishmanian lens. In Li Wei (ed.) *Applied Linguistics Review* 2011, 29-50.

Vertovec, S. (2006) The emergence of super-diversity in Britain. *Working paper no. 25*. Oxford: Centre on Migration, Policy and Society (COMPAS), University of Oxford.

Welsh Government (2014) *English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL) Policy for Wales*. <http://wales.gov.uk/docs/dcells/publications/140619-esol-policy-en.pdf>

Williams, E. and Williams A. (2007) *ESOL and EFL: An Unhelpful Distinction*. Reading: CfBT Education Trust.