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Manchester is quickly becoming one of the most culturally diverse cities in the UK, with a continually increasing population and rate of immigration the linguistic state of Manchester is constantly changing and developing. This report aims to give an in depth analysis of how certain external factors could be influencing the linguistic state of the area of Greater Manchester, focusing primarily on the distribution of first languages.

This project will analyse numerous data sets from an array of Manchester institutions ranging from the 2011 Census, School Census data and interpretation requests from the Interpreting and Translation Services (ITS) at the Manchester Royal Infirmary. Our analysis will feature internal comparisons of the data sets and then cross-comparisons between them all the investigate numerical dominance of languages across the area of Greater Manchester, comparing this with the distribution of languages, noting whether or not the age of a speaker can affect first language or language choice. We will investigate any variations or interesting findings to suggest potential external social reasons behind our results.

## 2 Analysis of census data

Our linguistic analysis uses the Census Data from 2011 as the starting point of our research, as we expected it to return linguistically rich results. Manchester's rapid growth has seen linguistic diversity become an 'inherent element' of contemporary human society and is a major component of modern social structure (Aronin, Larissa, \& Singleton, 2008:2). According to the Multilingual Manchester Digest (2013) Manchester boasts the highest growth rate of any city outside London, claiming that over the past decade Manchester's population has grown by 19\% (Gopal et al 2013). Therefore we expected that we would find a great deal of linguistic diversity based on the census data in 2011. Nine of the ten boroughs we examined in Greater Manchester returned a majority of over $90 \%$. In comparison, particularly to Wigan's $98 \%$, the metropolitan borough of Manchester has a notably lower majority of just $83 \%$. With 400,886 of its 480,738 inhabitants using English primarily, we can calculate just under a fifth of people use a competing language. This entails the affluence of foreign cultures in Manchester, with around 80,000 people declaring their main language as one other than English.

## 2i. Which Areas in Greater Manchester are the Most Linguistically Diverse?

Our first analysis concerned which languages were most commonly spoken in which areas of Greater Manchester. We first by compiled a table including the languages represented in the 2011 census and the areas across Greater Manchester, including percentages and exact numbers of speakers in each borough for each individual language.

Because Greater Manchester is such a linguistically diverse area there were a significant number of languages to include in our analysis therefore we had to create 7 tables to represent the data. These can be found in full in the appendix but below is a summary of our most significant findings.

Table 1: Total number and percentage of speakers of each language by each area in Greater Manchester

| Location | Population | English | Urdu | Polish | French | Chinese | Bengali | Punjabi | Arabic |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Bolton | 265,412 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 91.5 \% \\ & 242898 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.2 \% \\ & 3068 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{0 . 6 \%} \\ & 1596 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.1 \% \\ 274 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.2 \% \\ 433 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.1 \% \\ 250 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.6 \% \\ & 1600 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \mathbf{0 . 2 \%} \\ 576 \end{gathered}$ |
| Bury | 177,700 | $\begin{gathered} 95.7 \% \\ 1669065 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.9 \% \\ & 1575 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.8 \% \\ & 1464 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.1 \% \\ 165 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.1 \% \\ 243 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.1 \% \\ 143 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.7 \% \\ & 1204 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.2 \% \\ 291 \end{gathered}$ |
| Manchester | 480,738 | $\begin{gathered} 83.4 \% \\ 400886 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2.7 \% \\ & 1309 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.3 \% \\ & 6447 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.5 \% \\ & 2351 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.2 \% \\ & 5878 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.6 \% \\ & 3114 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \% \\ 4719 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.5 \% \\ & 7037 \end{aligned}$ |
| Oldham | 215,212 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 89.5 \% \\ & 192530 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \mathbf{2 \%} \\ 4338 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.4 \% \\ 873 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \mathbf{0 . 1 \%} \\ 180 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.1 \% \\ 210 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4 \% \\ 8501 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.8 \% \\ & 3910 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.1 \% \\ 138 \end{gathered}$ |
| Rochdale | 202,809 | $\begin{gathered} \hline 917 \% \\ 185933 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2.3 \% \\ & 4662 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 0.9 \% \\ & 1905 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.1 \% \\ 229 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.1 \% \\ 256 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \% \\ 2006 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.2 \% \\ & 2407 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.1 \% \\ 216 \end{gathered}$ |
| Salford | 272,921 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 92.8 \% \\ & 207827 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.2 \% \\ 524 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.6 \% \\ & 3526 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.4 \% \\ 841 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \mathbf{0 . 4 \%} \\ 990 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.1 \% \\ 291 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.1 \% \\ 207 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.5 \% \\ & 1047 \end{aligned}$ |
| Stockport | 210,429 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 96.9 \% \\ & 264449 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.5 \% \\ & 1314 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \mathbf{0 . 3 \%} \\ 909 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.1 \% \\ 146 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.1 \% \\ 383 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \mathbf{0 . 1 \%} \\ 273 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.2 \% \\ 497 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.2 \% \\ 444 \end{gathered}$ |
| Tameside | 210,429 | $\begin{gathered} 95.3 \% \\ 200636 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 0.6 \% \\ & 1323 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \mathbf{0 . 8 \%} \\ & 1617 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.1 \% \\ 146 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.1 \% \\ 295 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \% \\ 2116 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.3 \% \\ 695 \end{gathered}$ |  |
| Trafford | 217,713 | $\begin{gathered} 94.5 \% \\ 205649 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.7 \% \\ & 1601 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.8 \% \\ & 1685 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \mathbf{0 . 2 \%} \\ 146 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.3 \% \\ 588 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.1 \% \\ 200 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.4 \% \\ 871 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.3 \% \\ 753 \end{gathered}$ |
| Wigan | 305,975 | $\begin{gathered} \hline 98.1 \% \\ 300221 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.1 \% \\ 212 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 0.4 \% \\ & 1209 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.1 \% \\ 202 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.1 \% \\ 250 \end{gathered}$ |  |  |  |

Source: ONS, 2001 Census Table QS204EW

The above table depicts the main languages spoken across the Greater Manchester area. However, the data we collected from the 2011 census was much larger than the table above.

The languages we have analysed (as depicted in the appendix) are as follows:

- Slovak
- Gujarati
- Malayalam
- Czech
- Cantonese
- Somali
- Lithuanian
- Tagalog
- Spanish
- Kurdish
- Sign language
- Italian
- Farsi
- Hungarian
- Pashto
- Turkish
- German
- Urdu
- Hindi
- Romanian
- Bulgarian
- Vietnamese
- Latvian
- Greek
- Thai
- Shona
- Dutch
- Malay
- Nigerian
- Russian
- Tigrinya
- Pakistani
- Tamil
- Akan
- Mandarin
- Yoruba
- Korean
- Swahili

The above table gives an indication towards the number of speakers of each of the most commonly spoken languages for each area across Greater Manchester. A language was included in the tables (found in full in the appendix) if it was considered in the 2011 census data for Manchester. This required $0.1 \%$ or more of the population speaking the language. Our first research question was based on which areas in Greater Manchester are the most linguistically diverse. It is well known that English is the governing language of world communication and it is without dispute that we expect it to be the principal language in the data. When we discount English, European languages (EU) account for just $2 \%$ of all main languages found in Greater Manchester. If we narrow analysis specifically to the city of Manchester, this statistic doubles to $4.3 \%$. With 10,000 inhabitants using Polish in Manchester and Salford alone, Greater Manchester boasts the UK's second most populous urban area (2012 ONS est). There are over 150 different spoken languages in Manchester, ranging from the more typical European languages to relatively unheard of African languages such as Luganda with just 45 speakers. When focusing on non-European languages, the results are equally captivating. The plurality of West/Central and South Asian languages is unquestioned; contributing a staggering 6.5\% with over 21,000 speakers of Arabic and Urdu. Our findings suggest that Manchester is the most linguistically diverse area of Greater Manchester. It has the lowest percentage of English with only $83.4 \%$ of the population claiming English is their main language. This is significantly lower than the majority of the areas for example 96.9\% of residents of Stockport spoke English in 2011. This is what we expected based on our prior knowledge of the area. Manchester is a city centre therefore it most likely to be the most commonly known of Greater Manchester and it is renowned for its rich multicultural population it is an inviting location for migrants from many countries

Figure 1: Graph depicting the percentage of English speakers in each area of Greater Manchester.


The above graph shows Manchester as the area with the least speakers of English with $83.4 \%$ of people living in Manchester speaking English, thus being the most linguistically diverse and Wigan as the area with the highest percentage of speakers of English with $98.1 \%$ therefore the least linguistically diverse. The second largest population in the Census Data is 305,976 in the town of Wigan. As mentioned previously $98 \%$ of its population regard English as their main language. We would tend to expect greater linguistic and cultural variation in a speech environment of this size. Languages outside of Europe constitute just $1 \%$ to the linguistic set-up of Wigan. Looking at Manchester comparatively, its seemingly low percentage of primary English speakers is a reflection of the cities' linguistic assortment. Manchester appears unique to its neighbours Wigan, Bolton, Salford, Oldham etc. The affluence and plurality of foreign cultures suggests there is intensified migration to Manchester. It holds home to several languages that do not appear in any of the other nine boroughs, e.g. Vietnamese and Nigerian (around 480 speakers of each). What is distinctive about Manchester as a multilingual city is not the array of living languages, but the large number of speakers behind each of them. Salverda (2002) argues that whilst London boasts an impressive 300 different languages, the majority listed in the 'multilingual capital' have a very low number of speakers- often only 1 , and usually well below 100 (2002:19). The larger number of these speakers in Manchester creates language communities. Williams and Van der Merwe (1996) argue that ethno-linguistic neighbourhoods facilitate the mapping of language distribution. Figures from the Census Data confirm the vitality of foreign languages and increase the likelihood of geo-linguistic patterning and ethnolinguistic groupings, which we will later analyse through school catchment areas.

Another way to assess which area is the most linguistically diverse is by analysing the number of languages spoken. We found the following results:

Figure 2: Graph depicting the number of languages spoken in each borough of Greater Manchester

## Number of Languages Spoke in Each Area in Greater Manchester



The results from the investigation of the number of languages spoken in each borough showed a similar patterning to our analysis the percentage of English speakers in each area. Manchester was once again shown to be the most linguistically diverse with a total of 44 languages being spoken in the city. Wigan was again shown to be the least linguistically diverse area with only 3 languages being spoken by $0.1 \%$ or more of the population.

Table 2: Summary of the Percentage of English Speakers and the Number of Languages Spoken in Each Area of Greater Manchester

| Location | Percentage of English Speakers | Number of Languages spoken |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Wigan | $98.1 \%$ | 10 |
| Stockport | $96.9 \%$ | 16 |
| Tameside | $95.3 \%$ | 12 |
| Bury | $95.1 \%$ | 19 |
| Trafford | $94.5 \%$ | 27 |
| Salford | $92.8 \%$ | 34 |
| Rochdale | $91.7 \%$ | 13 |
| Bolton | $91.5 \%$ | 22 |
| Oldham | $89.5 \%$ | 18 |
| Manchester | $83.4 \%$ | 44 |

Source: Source: ONS, 2001 Census Table QS204EW

At face value, the above table appears to suggest a correlation between the percentage of speakers of English and the Number of Languages spoken as Wigan, with the highest percentage of English speakers, have the lowest number of languages spoken and Manchester, with the lowest percentage of English speakers, has the highest number of languages spoken. However, this correlation is not constant throughout the boroughs.

Figure 3: Graph comparing the percentage of English speakers by the number of languages spoken in each borough of Greater Manchester.


This shows the relationship between the two factors is not as strong as previously anticipated. As stated previously, the two most significantly different areas in terms of the percentage of English spoken remained as the two most significantly different areas in terms of the number of languages spoken in the area. However, the boroughs which fall in between these two extremity regions do not conform to the same patterning and though there is a general inclination to a general patterning there is no direct correlation between the percentage of English speakers and the number of languages spoken by more than $0.1 \%$ of the population of an area.

Based on this research we had a number of potential routes to take to assess which area of Manchester appears to be the most linguistically diverse. We were more inclined to base our judgements of the most linguistically diverse on the percentage of English speakers in an area rather
than the number of languages spoken. This is because often, communities build-up of speakers of the same languages, with the same culture from similar backgrounds, therefore it could be the case that there are a large numbers of speakers of one particular language rather than a lesser number of speakers of more languages. This also adds some explanation to why Manchester has the highest number of different languages and the lowest percentage of English speakers compared to other areas across Greater Manchester. Because Manchester is the city centre and is one of the UK's cultural centres it attracts migrants from different countries who do not have much knowledge of the UK or any existing ties to the area. It is often the case that once families have settled in the UK and have a greater knowledge of the surrounding areas they will move to areas outside of the city centre where there are communities of people from the same cultural background and speak the same language. This goes some way to explain why there are 44 different languages spoken in Manchester with $83.4 \%$ of the population speaking English but then in an area just outside Manchester, Oldham, the percentage of speakers of English only rising by $6.1 \%$ to $89.5 \%$ but the number of language spoken in the area is less than half the number of languages spoken in Manchester with only 18 different languages spoken in Oldham. This could be due to the point mentioned previously with regard to speakers of the same languages living in close proximity to each other. An example of this occurring in Greater Manchester seems to be the case of Hebrew and Yiddish in Salford. Our research shows that these two languages are only spoken in the area of Salford:

Table 3: Showing the spread of Hebrew and Yiddish across Greater Manchester

| Location | Population | Hebrew | Yiddish |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Salford | 223,912 | $0.1 \%$ | $0.2 \%$ |
|  |  | 127 | 464 |

Yiddish and Hebrew are the languages of Jewish people and there is a large community of Jewish people in the Salford area. According to the online publication 'Manchester Jews' (2003) Manchester is the second largest Jewish Community in the UK with 35,000 people and there are 16 synagogues and Jewish Organisations and Groups. This is evidence of the idea that communities arise of speakers of the same language, as groups of people from the same cultural background tend to live in the same areas in the UK as there is a high concentration of speakers of Hebrew and Yiddish in Salford and only Salford.

Another interesting point that arose when conducting our analysis was that the majority of the Eastern Asian languages were spoken only in Manchester itself. Chinese was the exception to this generalisation because it was spoken in all areas across Greater Manchester. However, Korean, Vietnamese and Malay are only spoken by more than $0.1 \%$ of the population in Manchester and Thai and Mandarin Chinese are spoken by more than $0.1 \%$ of the population in Manchester and Salford. This could relate back to the idea of communities of from the same culture living in close proximity. Manchester's China Town district is a popular hub for Chinese culture with restaurants, shops, bakeries and supermarkets.

This attracts a great deal of Chinese Speakers to live in the city centre itself because they are immersed in their own culture and surrounded by things which are familiar to them. Furthermore, the Easter Asian population of Manchester is increased because of the number of Easter Asian students who come to study at the University of Manchester because it is a very prestigious University, being ranked by QS World University Rankings (2013) as number 33 in the world. This increases the number of speakers of Eastern Asian languages such as Chinese and Vietnamese thus being another explanation as to why these languages are concentrated in their usage to Manchester.

However, we found some interesting results with reference to Eastern Asian Languages. The Multilingual Manchester Digest (2013) suggests that Mandarin is the language which is preferred by the younger speakers whereas older speakers showed a preference for Cantonese (Gopal et al 2013). However, this was not necessarily reflected in our findings. We did not find that younger speakers displayed a preference for Mandarin as, according to the Census data from 2011 less than $0.1 \%$ of school children spoke Mandarin in schools in Manchester in both 2010 and 2011, as was the case for Cantonese. Therefore, based on the information we have been provided with it is not possible to support the assertion that Mandarin Chinese is preferred by younger speakers.

The effect of Manchester being home to a prestigious University could be another potential reason for Manchester having such a high number of languages spoken compared to other areas of Greater Manchester. As well as this highly ranked University, Manchester is home to another two institutes for higher education thus the area attracts a great deal of international students. Often, after graduating, a proportion of those students will find jobs in Manchester and then will stay in Manchester thus increasing the number of languages spoken in the area. This could also go some way to explain the large difference in the number of languages spoken in Salford compared to Rochdale. $92.8 \%$ of the population of Salford speak English and this is not that much more than the $91.7 \%$ of the population who speak English in Rochdale, however, there are 34 different languages spoken in Salford which is significantly higher than the 13 spoken in Rochdale. This could be accounted for by the fact that the University of Salford is located in Salford, attracting international students to the area, whereas there is no University in Rochdale.

Based upon the our analysis of the above data we have come to the conclusion that Manchester is the most linguistically diverse area in Greater Manchester based on the fact is has both the lowest percentage of English speakers and the highest number of languages spoken out of all the areas across Greater Manchester based on information gathered from the 2011 census data. There are multiple reasons for this, including the fact it in the city centre and the high number of international students in the area. However, it would perhaps be interesting to research this further; to look into the any further explanations for why Manchester is so much more linguistically diverse than its neighbouring areas across Greater Manchester.

## 2ii. Which languages are most popular in Greater Manchester?

The second research question we proposed was "Which Languages are the Most Popular in Greater Manchester?". This is another way to assess the linguistic state of Greater Manchester by analysing which languages are most commonly spoken across the whole area. Similarly to our prior investigation of the most linguistically diverse area of Greater Manchester, there was too much data to fit in one table therefore we had to create numerous tables.

These final tables, based on our analysis of the Census data for 2011, can be found in the appendix but we have created a summary table (table 4)of the languages which are spoken in the highest number of areas, this table includes all languages with an average of more than $0.1 \%$ of speakers across Greater Manchester:

Table 4: Table Showing the Most Popular Languages in Greater Manchester Based on the Number of Regions it is spoken in and the Average Number of Speakers Across the Greater Manchester

| Language | Number of Areas Spoken in | Average Number of Speakers <br> in Greater Manchester |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| English | 10 | $92.8 \%$ |
| French | 10 | $0.2 \%$ |
| Polish | 10 | $0.8 \%$ |
| Urdu | 10 | $1.1 \%$ |
| Chinese | 10 | $0.3 \%$ |
| Portuguese | 8 | $0.2 \%$ |
| Arabic | 8 | $0.4 \%$ |
| Farsi | 8 | $0.2 \%$ |
| Pashto | 4 | $0.2 \%$ |
| Malay | 1 | $0.2 . \%$ |
| Pakistani | 2 | $0.4 \%$ |
| Yiddish | 1 | $0.2 \%$ |
| Sure\| |  |  |

Source: Source: ONS, 2001 Census Table QS204EW

Based on our analysis of the 2011 Census data, other than English, the most popular language is Urdu, in every area across Greater Manchester and has the highest average percentage of speakers across the whole area with an average of $1.1 \%$. Yiddish, Malay and Pakistani were the most interesting of our results because they were spoken in some of the lowest number of areas but had some of the highest percentage of speakers. For example, Malay and Yiddish were only spoken in one area each but had an average number of speakers of $0.2 \%$ which was highest than the $44 \%$ of the remaining languages which had an average of $0.1 \%$. Again, this could be due to the point we referred to previously of communities of speakers living in close proximity to one another. This results in a higher concentration of speakers of a language in one area.

## 3 Analysis of School Census Data

Our second analysis looked at the School Census Data provided by the Office of National Statistics (2011). Research into the work of Calvert et al (2011) highlighted the significance of the age of a speaker to the language they speak. Therefore, we used school census data to draw comparisons between the percentage difference of school children speaking each given language between 2010 and 2011 and also the percentage difference between the general population and school children in 2011 for each given language. We compiled a table of all these comparisons; however, we faced the same issue as we did previous regarding the amount of data that was in each table. The full and complete table can be found in the appendix but below is a summary of our findings;

Table 5: A Summary of the Languages which showed the largest percentage differences between its use by School Children in 2010 and 2011.

| Language | Total School Children in 2010 | Total School Children in 2011 | Percentage of School Children between 2010 and 2011 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| English | 66.8\% | 66.1\% | -0.7\% |
|  | 43003 | 43605 |  |
| Urdu | 8.8\% | 10\% | + 1.2\% |
|  | 5644 | 6496 |  |
| Arabic | 3\% | 3.7\% | + 0.7\% |
|  | 1927 | 2447 |  |
| Polish | 0.8\% | 1.3\% | + 0.5\% |
|  | 525 | 865 |  |
| Punjabi | 3.7\% | 3\% | -0.7\% |
|  | 2105 | 2000 |  |
| French | 0.8\% | 1.1\% | + 0.3\% |
|  | 563 | 706 |  |
| Vietnamese | 0.2\% | 0.1\% | -0.1\% |
|  | 105 | 96 |  |
| Gujarati | 0.2\% | 0.1\% | -0.1\% |
|  | 106 | 82 |  |

Source: ONS, 2001 Census

This table includes all languages which increased in their percentage of usage by school children by $0.3 \%$ or more and any languages which decreased in their percentage of usage.

The languages highlighted in green represent those which have shown an increase in their usage by school children in 2011 compared to 2010 and those in red show the languages which have decreased in their usage by school children from 2010 to 2011.

## 3i. Percentage difference between 2010 and 2011 in the languages spoken by School Children

The majority of languages increased in their percentage of usage amongst school children in Manchester between the years of 2010 and 2011 according to the 2011 Census data. Only four languages decreased in their percentage of usage, these included English, Punjabi, Guajarati and Vietnamese. The most notable of these is English which decreased by $0.7 \%$ while many languages other than English increased in their popularity. This decrease in the use of English is an expected result due to the increase in the usage other languages as immigration increases and other languages are used more commonly. According to the Migration Observatory (2013) the percentage of the foreign-born population in Greater Manchester increased by 1\% from the year 2009 when 11\% of the population in Greater Manchester was foreign-born, to 2012 when $12 \%$ of the population was foreign-born. Though this does not specifically highlight the two years we are looking at in our analysis and it looks at the population as a whole rather than focusing on school children it does signify the vast increase in migration over the past few years. This reflects why the percentage of school children speaking English in Greater Manchester is decreasing and the average percentage of speakers of a foreign language is increasing because the number of speakers of foreign languages on the whole is increasing.

Another language which decreased in its usage is Punjabi. There are a number of potential reasons for this. Our research into which languages are most popular in which areas around Greater Manchester suggested that one potential reason for this decrease in the use of Punjabi in Manchester. Though Punjabi is relatively common in Manchester it is more common in other areas across Greater Manchester, for example it is used by $1.8 \%$ of speakers in Oldham and $1.2 \%$ of speakers in Rochdale. It could perhaps be the case that Punjabi speakers are moving out of Manchester and into the surrounding areas to live in close proximity with people from the same cultural background, with the same beliefs and whom speak the same language. The other two languages which have decreased in their usage are Guajarati and Vietnamese however there decrease was less significant than the two discussed previously as they only decreased by $0.1 \%$.

We referred to the Migration Observatory (2013) website to discover which are the most popular sender countries of immigrates to the UK in 2012 to see if this correlates with our estimations on the most popular sender countries based on the increase in the percentage of speakers of each language. We also took note of the fact that we were working with data referring to school children whereas the information provided by the Migration Observatory was in reference to the general population. We understand that around $14 \%$ of the population of a given language will be school children therefore we expected some variation in our findings but we thought it would be interesting to see if any general patterns or correlations arise. We were also aware that the data from the Migration Observatory was concerning 2012 statistics whereas our data showed the differences between 2010 to 2011, however, we concluded that if any patterns did arise they would be interesting languages to watch to see whether this pattern continues and how it develops over time.

Based on our data collected from the 2011 census the countries we expected to be the most popular sender countries would be India, Pakistan, any of the countries of states which recognise Arabic as a national language and Poland. These countries appear to be the same as the ones we found to be the most popular sender countries based upon data provided by the Migration Observatory as they list India, Poland and Pakistan as the three most popular sender countries in 2012. Therefore, based on this we can suggest that this is a pattern which is continuing from 2010 to 2012 and it would be of interest to observe whether this pattern continues and India, Poland and Pakistan remain as the 3 most popular sender countries of immigrants to the UK. Because the information provided by the Migration Observatory looks at the UK as a whole we can assume that, due to the correlation with our results that Manchester is following the same immigration patterns as the UK as a whole.

## 3ii. Percentage difference between languages used by the greater population and school children in 2011:

Table 6: A summary of the languages which showed the largest percentage difference between the its use by the General Population and School Children in 2011.

| Language | Total Population in <br> Manchester in 2011 | Total School Children <br> in 2011 | Percentage <br> Difference between <br> the Use of a |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Language by School <br> Children compared to <br> the General |
|  |  |  |  |
| English |  |  | Population in 2011 |
| Urdu | 400886 |  |  |


| Farsi | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 0.6 \% \\ & 2660 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.3 \% \\ 208 \end{gathered}$ | -0.3\% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| French | $\begin{aligned} & 0.5 \% \\ & 2351 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.1 \\ 706 \end{gathered}$ | +0.6\% |
| Kurdish | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 0.4 \% \\ & 1886 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.3 \% \\ 209 \end{gathered}$ | -0.1\% |
| Spanish | $\begin{gathered} 0.4 \% \\ 1869 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.3 \% \\ 213 \end{gathered}$ | -0.1\% |
| Portuguese | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.3 \% \\ 1458 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.6 \% \\ 369 \end{gathered}$ | +0.3\% |
| Pashto | $\begin{aligned} & 0.2 \% \\ & 1147 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.3 \% \\ 214 \end{gathered}$ | +0.3\% |
| Turkish | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.1 \% \\ 560 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 1.1 \% \\ 126 \end{gathered}$ | +1\% |
| Hindi | $\begin{gathered} 0.1 \% \\ 601 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.2 \% \\ 126 \end{gathered}$ | +0.1\% |
| Yoruba | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.1 \% \\ 559 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.9 \% \\ 565 \end{gathered}$ | +0.8\% |

Source: ONS, 2001 Census

Again this table includes languages which have a percentage difference of $0.3 \%$ or higher or any language which has reduced in its percentage of usage by children compared to the general population. The languages in green represent those which are used by a higher percentage of school children than the general population and those in red show the languages which are used by a lower percentage of school children than the general population.

Again, on the whole, the majority of languages increased in their usage as, typically, the percentage of school children in Manchester who used a specific language was higher than the percentage in the general population of Manchester who spoke the language; for example $6.1 \%$ more children spoke Urdu than the general population. This was not what we expected to find based on our prior research into language maintenance. We expected that the percentage of children speaking a language other than English would decrease in comparison to the population as a whole. This is because as children are brought up in an English speaking country; attending English speaking schools they may demonstrate a preference for speaking English in school and in social environments. Therefore we entered into our research expected that the percentage of children speaking English would increase and the percentages of children speaking languages other than English would decrease compared to the population as a whole. However, our results did not reflect our expectations.

We found that percentage of children speaking English was $16.6 \%$ lower than the general percentage of speakers of English in Manchester. This could perhaps be being influenced by the differences in
the percentage of speakers of languages from 2010 and 2011. The percentage of school children speaking English, according to the 2011 school census data, decreased by $0.7 \%$ and out of the 31 languages we analysed, excluding English, 20 of those increased in the percentage of speakers, in school in Manchester, from 2010 to 2011. Upon discussion of this we proposed the idea that originally, children who speak languages other than English were in more of a minority group in the school environment and therefore were in smaller social groups. Because of this they were perhaps more likely to spend more time socialising with English speaking children and thus were more likely to speak English in more environments. However, as time progressed the percentage of people who speak a language other than English increased and the number of English speaking school children decreased. This results in children who speak a language other than English being less likely to be in minority groups and would have larger friendship groups consisting of children who speak the same language as themselves. Therefore there will be more opportunities for them to speak their family language and fewer situations in which they will speak English. This could be one potential explanation for the significant decrease in percentage of school children who speak English.

Figure 3: Comparison of the percentage differences between the general population in 2010 and 2011 and between school children and the general population in 2011


The above graph is a comparison between the most significantly increasing languages and their percentage differences, first how much they increased in their usage in the general population from 2010 to 2011 and then how much they increased in their usage by school from the general population. At first the trend appears to be that as the percentage of speakers of a language in the
general population increases from 2010 to 2011 the percentage of school children speaking the language increases in comparison to the general population in 2011. This is the case for Urdu, Arabic and French. However, Polish does not follow this pattern as there is no percentage difference between the numbers of school children who speak Polish compared to the number of speakers in the general population. This could be an interesting point to explore further; what social factors are affecting the number of school children who speak Polish?

## Summary

Our analysis of the census data showed that, in general, due to a number of external social factors, Manchester is the most linguistically diverse area of Greater Manchester with the lowest percentage of English speakers and the highest number of languages spoken in the area. We suggest that this is due to the fact it is the city centre so is the most commonly sought after location for migrants who do not have much knowledge of the area or any family ties to other areas outside Manchester itself. Also, the number of international students who come to study in Manchester and they stay here once they graduate has an effect on the linguistic diversity of the city.

## 4 Proficiency

An issue which arises from the particularly linguistically diverse state of Manchester is that there is often difficulty with communication when a large proportion of the community don't speak the national official language. As previously established, in Manchester, around 80,000 speakers declare their main language to be one other than English. This could potentially prove problematic for communication across the area. One way to assess the extent of this potential issue is to evaluate the proficiency in English of the speakers in an area. According to the Office of National Statistics (2011) $0.4 \%$ of the population of Greater Manchester cannot speak English at all, that's 8,213 living in the area who are unable to communicate in English. This could cause a significant problem for communication. The percentage of speakers of a language other than English who can speak English very well is significantly higher than the percentage of speakers of language other than English who cannot speak English at all;. However, in every borough in Greater Manchester there are a number of people who cannot speak English at all; in Bolton in 2011 there were 995 people who couldn't speak English. We expect that this number will have risen based on the rate of migration increasing over the past few years. This could present a serious problem in terms of communication, not just from inside the communities but also in communication of important information.

Table7: Proficiency of English of speakers in each Borough.

| Borough | Speakers whose <br> main language is <br> English who can <br> speak English <br> very well | Speakers whose <br> main language is <br> not English who <br> can speak <br> English well | Speakers whose <br> main language is <br> not English who <br> cannot speak <br> English well | Speakers whose <br> main language <br> in not English <br> who cannot <br> speak English at <br> all |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Bolton | $3.1 \%$ | $3.2 \%$ | $2.0 \%$ | $0.4 \%$ |
| Bury | 7865 | 8455 | 5199 | 995 |

We expected that this issue would be most significant in Manchester as our prior research suggests this is the most linguistically diverse area of Greater Manchester. Our prior expectations appear to be correct because, alongside Oldham, Manchester has the highest percentage of speakers whose main language is one other than English and whom cannot speak English; in 2011 there were a total of 2681 people living in Manchester who could not communicate in English.

Figure 4: Pie Chart showing the proficiency in English of speakers in Manchester.


Evidently the percentage of non-English speakers in Manchester who cannot speak English is significantly smaller than any other proficiency group, however, there are still a considerable number of speakers who cannot speak English and as long as this group remains an issue concerning communication in this multicultural society will remain.

## 5 Interpreter Requests

There are currently over 150 languages spoken in Manchester alone, with a considerable $20 \%$ of inhabitants claiming their main language as one other than English, overriding the national average of 8\%. Upon consulting the 2013 Multilingual Manchester Digest (MLMD) for some background information, it highlighted the linguistically diverse state of Manchester as a City and its significance as a multilingual hub. As a continuation of these stats and claims, we decided to examine the demands for interpreter requests across two Manchester establishments- MRI and NHS Trust - within the Interpretation and Translation Services (ITS).

The analysis of Interpreter requests combines the use of data from the 2012 MRI Stats and the 20122014 NHS Interpreter requests. These two data samples have allowed us to closely analyse what languages in specific are on the increase in Manchester over the past two years and which ones in particular require the most assistance in understanding.

Table 7: The table below features all of the collated data from the two Manchester based translation services

| LANGUAGE NAME | MRI 2012 RREQUESTS | NHS 2012-2014 REQUESTS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Urdu | 6272 | 6845 |
| Arabic | 3183 | 2989 |
| Cantonese | 2667 | 2336 |
| Bengali (Sylheti) | 2033 | 2303 |
| Polish | 1965 | 2176 |
| Punjabi | 1805 | 2066 |
| Somali | 1669 | 1636 |
| Mandarin | 1597 | 1576 |
| Farsi (Iran) | 1191 | 1180 |
| Romanian | 1272 | 894 |
| BSL Sign | 628 | 842 |
| Czech | 838 | 821 |
| Kurdish | 960 | 778 |
| Portuguese | 426 | 544 |
| French | 452 | 448 |
| Hungarian | 174 | 392 |
| Gujarati | 316 | 388 |
| Russian | 444 | 376 |
| Pushto | 296 | 305 |
| Vietnamese | 209 | 280 |
| Tigrini | 268 | 273 |
| Spanish | 267 | 191 |
| Slovak | 124 | 230 |
| Italian | 154 | 148 |
| Lithuanian | 121 | 147 |
| Turkish | 159 | 140 |
| Brava | 173 | 125 |
| Latvian | 242 | 118 |
| Swahili | 86 | 107 |
| Greek | 72 | 97 |
| Hakka | 103 | 93 |
| Albanian | 56 | 92 |
| Amharic | 149 | 86 |
| Oromo | 64 | 52 |
| Hindi | 102 | 76 |


| Nepali | 37 | 61 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lingala | 83 | 60 |
| Tamil | 53 | 58 |
| Korean | 48 | 57 |
| Thai | 42 | 56 |
| Bulgarian | 36 | 53 |
| Twi | 42 | 52 |
| Yoruba | 20 | 36 |
| Bosnian | 23 | 33 |
| Mongolian | 101 | 30 |
| Mirpuri | 44 | 27 |
| Sinhalese | 16 | 27 |
| Burmese | 14 | 23 |
| Malayalam | 4 | 23 |
| Creole | 6 | 21 |
| German | 8 | 20 |
| Dutch | 17 | 16 |
| Hebrew | 10 | 16 |
| Ukrainian | 17 | 15 |
| Japanese | 12 | 13 |
| Telugu | 3 | 11 |
| Serb-Croat | 7 | 8 |
| Fula | 11 | 7 |
| Malaysian | 10 | 6 |
| Eritrean | 25 | 5 |
| Slovene | 2 | 5 |
| Kosovan | 4 | 5 |
| Various Languages | 1 | 5 |
| Wolof | 7 | 4 |
| Madinka | 3 | 4 |
| Armenian | 13 | 3 |
| Ndebele | 15 | 3 |
| Maltese | 16 | 2 |
| Ibo | 9 | 2 |
| Tagalog | 6 | 2 |
| Uzbekistan | 6 | 2 |
| Indonesian | 2 | 2 |
| Kirundi | 1 | 2 |
| Tshiluba | 1 | 2 |


| Danish | 1 | 2 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Croatian | 3 | 1 |
| Edo | 2 | 1 |
| Kutchi | 7 | 1 |
| Filipino | 1 | 1 |

As illustrated by the table, Urdu features the highest number of interpreter requests with 6272 requests in 2012 and 6845 requests for the 2012-2014 range. This was then followed by Arabic, providing a clear indication of which languages are strongly incorporating themselves in to the Manchurian culture. It has become apparent that the languages that are most frequently requested are the same in both the MRI and NHS stats- a question we set out to address in our fieldwork plan and literature review. As stated in our fieldwork plan, we expected to see similarities between frequency of interpreter requests; however it is interesting to see how closely these numbers correlate to one another and provide a strong indication of the strongly emerging non-British cultures currently present in Manchester.

It is evident that different cultures are on the increase in Manchester hence obtaining a multi-cultural city status, the graph below illustrates a comparison between the top three languages that require interpreter requests from the two establishments - from this we are able to draw more solid conclusions.

Figure 5: The top 3 Language Interpretation Requests from the MRI in 2012 and the NHS from 20122014

what we predicted would be the case yet Arabic and Cantonese, although very close, fall short of the

MRI 2012 stats. As a general principle of the patterns of immigration and cultural diversity in the UK, we expected that the 2012-2014 NHS stats would demonstrate a higher value of interpreter requests than the MRI 2012 stats for Arabic and in particular Cantonese with Manchester's ever-growing Chinese population around the City Centre. This could be a reflection as to how Manchester goes through influxes of immigration and cultural diversity, significantly less cases were present during a specific time period within 2012-2014 or perchance that non-native speakers are slowly learning to adapt to British culture and absorb English as a second language.

In contrast, the graph below shows the bottom three languages on record with the MRI and NHS for interpreter requests and from this we can compare the differences between which cultures are not as developed in Manchester.

Figure 6: The bottom 3 Language Interpretation Requests from the MRI in 2012 and the NHS from 2012-2014


The bottom three languages, featured in the graph above, are Edo, Kutchi and Filipino. These three languages, based on our data sets could be three of the least developed or slowest growing cultures in Manchester- possessing a mere 1-7 request range.

From what has been stated above it is clear to see which languages currently require the most assistance with understanding in Manchester; however one factor we cannot measure due to insufficient detail in data is whether or not age effects the need for increased interpreter requests.

Calvert et al, (2011) offers some notable topics for analysis on the topic of age and multilingualism, suggesting that it is not only the age of a child that can influence first language choice but it can also influence a multilingual speaker when they have the opportunity to choose which language they wish to speak. We believe that this point could be a reason as to why some of the data inputs are slightly unexpected as we could not gain access to the person's age for each request or if they selected a specific language out of the ones they have learnt.

In summary of this section, it is evident that there could be multiple reasons that contribute to the number of interpreter requests present each year. From the two year sample we have analysed, we can already see shifts in numbers and believe that there are numerous reasons such as learning of English, rates of immigration and general numbers of incidents that could have created this variation.

## 6 Conclusion

We began our research with the intention of questioning whether Manchester is what Williams \& van der Merwe (1996) describe as a 'global city'. This involves the movement of people from widespread areas into densely populated areas, creating an affluence of varied dialect and languages. Our research suggests that it would be justified to claim Manchester is in fact a 'global city' as the population is continually rising and the percentage of the population of who speak a language other than English is significantly decreasing. The population of Manchester has increased by $19 \%$ over the past decade however the percentage of the population whom speak English appears to be decreasing. This is highlighted through our research into the use of English by school children. We found that the percentage of school children in greater Manchester who speak English decreased by $16.6 \%$ from 2010 to 2011. If these children continue to speak their native language and remain living in Manchester this suggests that the percentage of people in Manchester who speak English is going to significantly reduce in the future. Therefore the area of Manchester and its surrounding areas in Greater Manchester are becoming increasingly culturally and linguistically diverse.
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## 8 Appendices

Appendix 1: Tables depicting the distribution of languages across Greater Manchester

| LOCATION | POPULATION | English | French | Portuguese | Polish | Slovak | Czech | Lithuanian |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Bolton | 265,412 | $\begin{gathered} \hline 91.5 \% \\ 242898 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.1 \% \\ 274 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.1 \% \\ 234 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 0.6 \% \\ & 1596 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.1 \% \\ 178 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.1 \% \\ 193 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.1 \% \\ 263 \end{gathered}$ |
| Bury | 177,700 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 95.1 \% \\ & 169065 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.1 \% \\ 165 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 0.8 \% \\ & 1464 \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.1 \% \\ 93 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.1 \% \\ 68 \end{gathered}$ |
| Manchester | 480,738 | $\begin{gathered} \hline 83.4 \% \\ 400886 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.5 \% \\ & 2351 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 0.3 \% \\ & 1458 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.3 \% \\ & 6447 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.1 \% \\ 685 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.2 \% \\ 933 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.1 \% \\ 676 \end{gathered}$ |
| Oldham | 215,121 | $\begin{gathered} \hline 89.5 \% \\ 192530 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.1 \% \\ 180 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.1 \% \\ 210 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.4 \% \\ 873 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.1 \% \\ 144 \end{gathered}$ |  |
| Rochdale | 202,809 | $\begin{gathered} \hline 91.7 \% \\ 185933 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.1 \% \\ 229 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.2 \% \\ 386 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 0.9 \% \\ & 1905 \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.1 \% \\ 115 \end{gathered}$ |
| Salford | 223,912 | $\begin{gathered} \hline 92.8 \% \\ 207827 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.4 \% \\ 841 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.4 \% \\ 785 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.6 \% \\ & 3526 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.2 \% \\ 359 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.1 \% \\ 316 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.1 \% \\ 159 \end{gathered}$ |
| Stockport | 272,921 | $\begin{gathered} \hline 96.9 \% \\ 264449 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.1 \% \\ 198 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.1 \% \\ 131 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.3 \% \\ 909 \end{gathered}$ |  |  |  |
| Tameside | 210,429 | $\begin{gathered} \hline 95.3 \% \\ 200636 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.1 \% \\ 146 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.1 \% \\ 110 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 0.8 \% \\ & 1617 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |
| Trafford | 217,713 | $\begin{gathered} \hline 94.5 \% \\ 205649 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.2 \% \\ 338 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.1 \% \\ 142 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 0.8 \% \\ & 1685 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.1 \% \\ 170 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.1 \% \\ 126 \end{gathered}$ |  |
| Wigan | 305,975 | $\begin{gathered} \hline 98.1 \% \\ 300221 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.1 \% \\ 202 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 0.4 \% \\ & 1209 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.1 \% \\ 249 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.1 \% \\ 127 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.1 \% \\ 362 \end{gathered}$ |


| LOCATION | POPULATION | Arabic | Kurdish | Farsi | Pashto | Urdu | Panjabi | Bengali |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Bolton | 265,412 | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.2 \% \\ 576 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.2 \% \\ 634 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.2 \% \\ 620 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.1 \% \\ 282 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.2 \% \\ & 3068 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 0.6 \% \\ & 1600 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.1 \% \\ 250 \end{gathered}$ |
| Bury | 177,700 | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.2 \% \\ 291 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.1 \% \\ 99 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.2 \% \\ 410 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.2 \% \\ 295 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 0.9 \% \\ & 1575 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 0.7 \% \\ & 1204 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.1 \% \\ 143 \end{gathered}$ |
| Manchester | 480,738 | $\begin{aligned} & 1.5 \% \\ & 7037 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 0.4 \% \\ & 1886 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 0.6 \% \\ & 2660 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 0.2 \% \\ & 1147 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 2.7 \% \\ & 1309 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \% \\ 4719 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 0.6 \% \\ & 3114 \end{aligned}$ |
| Oldham | 215,121 | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.1 \% \\ 138 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.1 \% \\ 205 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.1 \% \\ 135 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.3 \% \\ 627 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 2 \% \\ 4338 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.8 \% \\ & 3910 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 4 \% \\ 8501 \end{gathered}$ |
| Rochdale | 202,809 | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.1 \% \\ 216 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.1 \% \\ 268 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.1 \% \\ 121 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.1 \% \\ 120 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 2.3 \% \\ & 4662 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.2 \% \\ & 2407 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \% \\ 2006 \end{gathered}$ |
| Salford | 223,912 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 0.5 \% \\ & 1047 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.1 \% \\ 130 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.2 \% \\ 380 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.2 \% \\ 524 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.1 \% \\ 207 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.1 \% \\ 291 \end{gathered}$ |
| Stockport | 272,921 | 0.2\%444 |  | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.3 \% \\ 694 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 0.5 \% \\ & 1314 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.2 \% \\ 497 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.1 \% \\ 273 \end{gathered}$ |
| Tameside | 210,429 |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 0.6 \% \\ & 1323 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.3 \% \\ 695 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 1 \% \\ 2116 \end{gathered}$ |
| Trafford | 217,713 | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.3 \% \\ 753 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.1 \% \\ 112 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.2 \% \\ 393 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 0.7 \% \\ & 1601 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.4 \% \\ 871 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.1 \% \\ 200 \end{gathered}$ |
| Wigan | 305,975 |  | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.1 \% \\ 183 \end{gathered}$ |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.1 \% \\ 212 \end{gathered}$ |  |  |


| LOCATION | POPULATION | Gujarati | Cantonese | Tagalog | Sign <br> Language | Hungarian | Turkish | Hindi |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Bolton | 265,412 | $\begin{gathered} 3 \% \\ 7937 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.1 \% \\ 161 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.1 \% \\ 328 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.1 \% \\ 208 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.1 \% \\ 147 \end{gathered}$ |
| Bury | 177,700 | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.1 \% \\ 153 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.1 \% \\ 155 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.1 \% \\ 113 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.1 \% \\ 99 \end{gathered}$ |  |  |  |
| Manchester | 480,738 | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.1 \% \\ 490 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.4 \% \\ 1739 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.1 \% \\ 389 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.1 \% \\ 353 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.1 \% \\ 560 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.1 \% \\ 601 \end{gathered}$ |
| Oldham | 215,121 | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.2 \% \\ 415 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.1 \% \\ 137 \end{gathered}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| Rochdale | 202,809 |  | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.1 \% \\ 138 \end{gathered}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| Salford | 223,912 |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.1 \% \\ 248 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.1 \% \\ 172 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.1 \% \\ 119 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.1 \% \\ 144 \end{gathered}$ |
| Stockport | 272,921 | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.1 \% \\ 295 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.1 \% \\ 302 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.1 \% \\ 212 \end{gathered}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Tameside | 210,429 | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.5 \% \\ 1136 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.1 \% \\ 166 \end{gathered}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| Trafford | 217,713 | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.4 \% \\ 903 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.1 \% \\ 271 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.1 \% \\ 117 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.1 \% \\ 129 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.1 \% \\ 130 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.1 \% \\ 184 \end{gathered}$ |
| Wigan | 305,975 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| LOCATION | POPULATION | Malayalam | Somali | Spanish | Italian | German | Romanian | Latvian |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Bolton | 265,412 | $\begin{gathered} 0.1 \% \\ 200 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.2 \% \\ 492 \end{gathered}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| Bury | 177,700 |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.1 \% \\ 120 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.1 \% \\ 174 \end{gathered}$ |  |  |  |
| Manchester | 480,738 | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.2 \% \\ 849 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 0.6 \% \\ & 2958 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.4 \% \\ 1869 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.2 \% \\ 753 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.2 \% \\ 936 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.1 \% \\ 720 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.1 \% \\ 315 \end{gathered}$ |
| Oldham | 215,121 |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} 0.1 \% \\ 134 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.1 \% \\ 109 \end{gathered}$ |  |  |
| Rochdale | 202,809 | $\begin{gathered} 0.1 \% \\ 110 \end{gathered}$ |  |  | $\begin{gathered} 0.1 \% \\ 154 \end{gathered}$ |  |  |  |
| Salford | 223,912 | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.1 \% \\ 185 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.1 \% \\ 328 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.1 \% \\ 274 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.1 \% \\ 224 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.1 \% \\ 174 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.1 \% \\ 120 \end{gathered}$ |
| Stockport | 272,921 |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.1 \% \\ 230 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.1 \% \\ 192 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.1 \% \\ 181 \end{gathered}$ |  |  |
| Tameside | 210,429 |  |  | $\begin{gathered} 0.1 \% \\ 110 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.1 \% \\ 240 \end{gathered}$ |  |  |  |
| Trafford | 217,713 | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.1 \% \\ 151 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.1 \% \\ 217 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.1 \% \\ 279 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.1 \% \\ 180 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.1 \% \\ 233 \end{gathered}$ |  |  |
| Wigan | 305,975 |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.1 \% \\ 172 \end{gathered}$ |


| LOCATION | POPULATION | Bulgarian | Greek | Dutch | Russian | Tamil | Mandarin | Korean |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Bolton | 265,412 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Bury | 177,700 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Manchester | 480,738 | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.1 \% \\ 381 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 0.3 \% \\ & 1588 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.1 \% \\ 439 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.2 \% \\ 844 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.1 \% \\ 409 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.2 \% \\ 851 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.1 \% \\ 481 \end{gathered}$ |
| Oldham | 215,121 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Rochdale | 202,809 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Salford | 223,912 | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.1 \% \\ 247 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.1 \% \\ 213 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.1 \% \\ 244 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.1 \% \\ 135 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.1 \% \\ 164 \end{gathered}$ |  |
| Stockport | 272,921 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Tameside | 210,429 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Trafford | 217,713 |  | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.1 \% \\ 142 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.1 \% \\ 135 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.1 \% \\ 218 \end{gathered}$ |  |  |  |
| Wigan | 305,975 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| LOCATION | POPULATION | Vietnamese | Thai | Malay | Tigrinya | Akan | Yoruba | Swahili |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Bolton | 265,412 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Bury | 177,700 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Manchester | 480,738 | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.1 \% \\ 481 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.1 \% \\ 367 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.2 \% \\ 739 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.1 \% \\ 417 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.1 \% \\ 481 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.1 \% \\ 559 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.1 \% \\ 674 \end{gathered}$ |
| Oldham | 215,121 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Rochdale | 202,809 |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.1 \% \\ 133 \end{gathered}$ |
| Salford | 223,912 |  | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.1 \% \\ 118 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.1 \% \\ 263 \end{gathered}$ |  |  |  |
| Stockport | 272,921 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Tameside | 210,429 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Trafford | 217,713 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Wigan | 305,975 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| LOCATION | POPULATION | Shona | Nigerian | Pakistani | Chinese | Yiddish | Hebrew |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Bolton | 265,412 |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.2 \% \\ 433 \end{gathered}$ |  |  |
| Bury | 177,700 |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.1 \% \\ 243 \end{gathered}$ |  |  |
| Manchester | 480,738 | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.1 \% \\ 477 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.1 \% \\ 481 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & 1.2 \% \\ & 5878 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |
| Oldham | 215,121 |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.1 \% \\ 252 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.1 \% \\ 210 \end{gathered}$ |  |  |
| Rochdale | 202,809 |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 0.7 \% \\ & 1405 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.1 \% \\ 256 \end{gathered}$ |  |  |
| Salford | 223,912 | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.1 \% \\ 134 \end{gathered}$ |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.4 \% \\ 990 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.2 \% \\ 464 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.1 \% \\ 127 \end{gathered}$ |
| Stockport | 272,921 |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.1 \% \\ 383 \end{gathered}$ |  |  |
| Tameside | 210,429 |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.1 \% \\ 295 \end{gathered}$ |  |  |
| Trafford | 217,713 |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.3 \% \\ 588 \end{gathered}$ |  |  |
| Wigan | 305,975 |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.1 \% \\ 250 \end{gathered}$ |  |  |

## Appendix 2: The number of areas each language is spoken in and the average numbers of speakers in Greater Manchester

| Language | Number of areas spoken in | Average number of speakers in Greater Manchester |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| English | 10 | $92.8 \%$ |
| French | 10 | $0.2 \%$ |
| Portuguese | 8 | $0.2 \%$ |
| Polish | 10 | $0.8 \%$ |
| Slovak | 5 | $0.1 \%$ |
| Czech | 7 | $0.1 \%$ |
| Lithuanian | 6 | $0.1 \%$ |
| Arabic | 8 | $0.4 \%$ |
| Kurdish | 8 | $0.1 \%$ |
| Farsi | 8 | $0.2 \%$ |
| Pashto | 4 | $0.2 \%$ |
| Urdu | 10 | $1.1 \%$ |
| Punjabi | 9 | $0.7 \%$ |
| Bengali | 9 | $0.8 \%$ |
| Gujarati | 7 | $0.6 \%$ |
| Cantonese | 7 | $0.1 \%$ |
| Tagalog | 6 | $0.1 \%$ |
| Sign Language | 1 | $0.1 \%$ |
| Hungarian | 4 | $0.1 \%$ |
| Turkish | 4 | $0.1 \%$ |
| Hindi | 4 | $0.1 \%$ |
| Malayalam | 5 | $0.1 \%$ |
| Somali | 3 | $0.3 \%$ |
| Spanish | 6 | $0.2 \%$ |
| Italian | 8 | $0.1 \%$ |
| German | 5 | $0.1 \%$ |
| Romanian | 2 | $0.1 \%$ |
| Latvian | 3 | $0.1 \%$ |
| Bulgarian | 2 | $0.1 \%$ |
| Greek | 3 | $0.2 \%$ |
| Dutch | 2 | $0.1 \%$ |
| Russian | 3 | $0.1 \%$ |
| Tamil | 2 | $0.1 \%$ |
| Mandarin | 2 | $0.2 \%$ |
| Korean | 1 | $0.1 \%$ |
| Vietnamese | 1 | $0.1 \%$ |
| Thai | 2 | $0.1 \%$ |
| Malay | 1 | $0.2 \%$ |
| Tigrinya | 2 | $0.1 \%$ |
| Akan | 1 | $0.1 \%$ |
| Yoruba | 1 | $0.1 \%$ |
| Shona | 2 | $0.4 \%$ |
| Nigerian | 1 | $0.3 \%$ |
| Pakistani | 2 | $0.2 \%$ |
| Chinese | 10 | $0.1 \%$ |
| Yiddish | 1 |  |
| Hebrew | 1 |  |
|  |  |  |

Appendix 3: Comparison between the percentage of speakers of each language in the General population in 2011 with the percentage of school children who speak each language in 2011 and a comparison between the percentage of school speakers who speak each language in 2010 and in 2011

| Language | Total <br> Population in <br> Manchester <br> 2011 | Total school <br> children in <br> $\mathbf{2 0 1 0}$ | Total <br> school <br> children in | Percentage <br> difference of <br> school <br> children <br> between 2010 <br> and 2011 | Percentage <br> difference <br> between the <br> general <br> population <br> and school <br> children in <br> 2011 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  |  |  |  | $-16.6 \%$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| English | $83.4 \%$ |  |  |  |  |
|  | 400886 | 2011 |  |  |  |


| Slovak | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.1 \% \\ 685 \end{gathered}$ |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lithuanian | $\begin{aligned} & 0.1 \% \\ & 676 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.1 \% \\ & 48 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.2 \% \\ & 99 \end{aligned}$ | + 0.1\% | +0.1 |
| Gujarati | $\begin{aligned} & 0.1 \% \\ & 490 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.2 \% \\ & 106 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 0.1 \% \\ & 82 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | - 0.1\% | $=$ |
| Tagalog | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 0.1 \% \\ & 389 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \% \\ & 10 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 0.1 \% \\ & 37 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | + 0.1\% | $=$ |
| Turkish | $\begin{aligned} & 0.1 \% \\ & 560 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1 \% \\ & 670 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.1 \% \\ & 730 \end{aligned}$ | +0.1\% | +1 |
| Hindi | $\begin{aligned} & 0.1 \% \\ & 601 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.2 \% \\ & 108 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.2 \% \\ & 126 \end{aligned}$ | = | + 0.1 |
| Bulgarian | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 0.1 \% \\ & 381 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Romanian | $\begin{aligned} & 0.1 \% \\ & 720 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 0.2 \% \\ & 113 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 0.3 \% \\ & 172 \end{aligned}$ | +0.1\% | + 0.2 |
| Latvian | $\begin{aligned} & 0.1 \% \\ & 315 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.1 \% \\ & 43 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.1 \% \\ & 84 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | = | $=$ |
| Tamil | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 0.1 \% \\ & 409 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 0.1 \% \\ & 65 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 0.1 \% \\ & 88 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | = | $=$ |
| Vietnamese | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 0.1 \% \\ & 481 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 0.2 \% \\ & 105 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 0.1 \% \\ & 96 \end{aligned}$ | - 0.1\% | $=$ |
| Thai | $\begin{aligned} & 0.1 \% \\ & 367 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Tigrinya | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 0.1 \% \\ & 417 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 0.1 \% \\ & 66 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 0.1 \% \\ & 91 \end{aligned}$ | = | $=$ |
| Akan | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 0.1 \% \\ & 481 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.1 \% \\ & 75 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 0.2 \% \\ & 109 \end{aligned}$ | = | 0.1 |
| Yoruba | $\begin{aligned} & 0.1 \% \\ & 559 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.7 \% \\ & 427 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.9 \% \\ & 565 \end{aligned}$ | + 0.2\% | + 0.8 |
| Swahili | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 0.1 \% \\ & 674 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.2 \% \\ & 105 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.2 \% \\ & 132 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | = | + 0.1 |
| Shona | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 0.1 \% \\ & 477 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 0.2 \% \\ & 126 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 0.3 \% \\ & 171 \end{aligned}$ | + 0.1\% | + 0.2 |
| Nigerian | $\begin{aligned} & 0.1 \% \\ & 481 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Total |  | 64339 | 65947 |  |  |
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