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Abstract

This thesis analyses whether attempts to reimagine the nation in plural terms can be successful in altering individuals’ conceptualisations of national identity and belonging. Drawing on theories of identity maintenance and ontological security (Giddens 1991), identity as performance (Butler, 1990; Goffman, 1959) and Mason’s (2013) concept of ‘cosmopolitan museology’, it questions the degree to which individuals are willing or able to accept plural representations of national identity increasingly seen in European museums such as the National Museum of Scotland. Such interpretative approaches attempt to deconstruct homogenous discourses of nationhood while encouraging individuals to develop a reflexive sense of self. This thesis argues that further research is needed into the way in which heritage is produced and negotiated in everyday social environments beyond the museum in order to understand what—if any—impact museums may have in producing ‘inclusive’ definitions of national identity.

These issues are examined in Scotland, a devolved nation in the UK. The thesis critically analyses how young people aged between 13-17 years old from 5 schools in Glasgow, Edinburgh, Barra and the Scottish Borders utilised and negotiated concepts of ‘heritage’, ‘place’, ‘national identity’ and ‘diversity’ in narratives of belonging and exclusion. 73 young people participated in the research, which was conducted using focus groups and semi-structured interviews. The analysis also draws upon insights gained from teachers and heritage professionals.

The research found that the majority of participants adopted positions that reinforced their existing sense of self, rather than alter their definitions of nationhood. While many participants were comfortable with the language of ‘diversity’, they frequently struggled to express themselves when applying these principles to everyday life. The findings indicate that museums could make a positive contribution to public debates by enabling individuals to articulate ideas of diversity while avoiding the essentialisation of difference.
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‘In my country’

walking by the waters
down where an honest river
shakes hands with the sea,
a woman passed round me
in a slow watchful circle,
as if I were a superstition;

or the worst dregs of her imagination,
so when she finally spoke
her words spliced into bars
of an old wheel. A segment of air.

Where do you come from?
‘Here,’ I said, ‘Here. These parts.’

Jackie Kay,

From Darling (2007)
Chapter 1. Introduction

Any attempt to define an ‘inclusive’ heritage, one that allows for a thousand flowers to bloom and celebrates difference, always operates through asserting identity, or sameness, at one level or another (Dicks 2000:96).

Since 2010 there have been significant critical debates amongst practitioners and theorists in the UK over the effectiveness of cultural diversity initiatives and the degree to which current approaches essentialise difference (Dewdney et al., 2013; Sandell and Nightingale, 2012). Although UK cultural policy is moving away from targeted initiatives in favour of equality legislation—in issue examined in Chapter 2—the question of how museums can facilitate an understanding of difference remains. Increasingly, examples can be found in European museums, such as the National Museum of Scotland, of interpretative approaches that deconstruct homogenous discourses of national heritage and thus reimagine the relationship between the ‘mainstream’ and the ‘margins’, while encouraging individuals to develop a reflexive awareness of their own identity. However, the degree to which individuals are willing or able to accept these plural definitions is questionable. This thesis examines these issues in Scotland, a devolved nation in the UK undergoing a period of constitutional change.

The research critically analyses the way in which young people’s definitions of Scottish identity are produced and consumed through a process of narration and the resources which these narratives draw upon in order to create and sustain notions of ‘self’ and ‘other’. The thesis examines how young people aged between 13-17 years old from 5 schools in Glasgow, Edinburgh, Barra and the Scottish Borders utilised and negotiated concepts of ‘heritage’, ‘place’, ‘national identity’ and ‘diversity’ in narratives of belonging and exclusion. In doing so, it utilises the work of Goffman (1959) on identity as a ‘performance’ and Giddens (1991) on the use of narrative as a reflexive strategy for constructing and maintaining a coherent sense of self. While there are considerable tensions between the work of Goffman and Giddens in relation to questions multiple
identities and ‘authenticity’, both theories provide useful frameworks for understanding the responses of the young people in this study. This thesis therefore attempts to reconcile these positions throughout the analysis. It also draws upon Mason’s (2013) concept of ‘cosmopolitan museology’, in order to examine whether attempts to reimagine the nation in plural terms through discussions of historical and contemporary differences can be successful in altering individuals’ conceptualisations of national identity and belonging. It argues that further research is needed into the way in which heritage is produced and negotiated in everyday social environments beyond the museum in order to understand what—if any—impact museums may have on challenging prejudice and producing inclusive definitions of national identity. The research was conducted using a combination of focus groups of 6-12 people and small group semi-structured interviews of 2-3 people. In total, 73 young people, predominantly from white ethnic backgrounds participated in the research, of whom 35 chose to be interviewed. The analysis also draws upon insights gained from teachers and heritage professionals.

The Scottish context of this research is highly significant. I argue that issues relating to ethnic diversity have been largely overlooked in the heritage studies literature in Scotland when compared with the wealth of studies found in England. However, the particular demographic profile and political context in Scotland requires a deeper understanding of how debates north of the Border both converge and diverge with wider UK issues regarding national identity and cultural diversity. This thesis therefore offers an original contribution to knowledge by foregrounding the specific issues and challenges relating to discussions of heritage, identity and belonging in the Scottish context. In order to represent the reflexive nature of the identity positions of the young people in this study as accurately as possible I refer to ‘narratives of inclusion and exclusion’ throughout the research. These narratives should not be seen as inherently ‘inclusive’ or ‘exclusive’, nor as fixed positions, but rather as contextual and shifting. Drawing on Rounds’ (2006) theory of ‘identity work’, I argue that the young people in this study frequently adopted narrative strategies in order to accommodate new information without necessarily changing their definitions of national identity or altering their self-image. The research identified six key themes that emerged in individuals’ narratives:

---

1 There was one exception to this which was the second Edinburgh State School group, the reasons for which are explained in Chapter 3.
1. The importance of a continuity and stability in young people’s sense of self
2. The role of place in establishing a coherent identity and the need to sustain the cultural distinctiveness of place
3. The importance of consensus in definitions of heritage and national identity
4. The role of heritage in establishing a positive sense of self and the need to maintain a strong ‘core’ understanding of Scottish identity
5. The lived and imagined experience of place and the negotiation between local and national identity
6. The identification with ‘inclusive’ definitions of national identity as a means of constructing and maintaining a positive sense of self.

The research found that when discussing issues of national identity and cultural diversity the young people in this study had a tendency to adopt positions that concurred with their existing sense of self, rather than dramatically alter their concepts of identity and belonging. Young people who placed a high priority on an ‘inclusive’ self-identity were more willing to accept plural definitions of national identity than those who expressed suspicion of ‘politically correct’ approaches. In both instances, the findings indicate that while many young people were able to reflect critically on their own identity and were comfortable with the language of ‘diversity’, they frequently struggled to express themselves when applying these principles to everyday life. The findings indicate that museums could make a positive contribution to public debates by focusing on helping individuals to articulate ideas of diversity whilst avoiding the essentialisation of difference.

The research also identified challenges regarding the potential for a new paradigm of ‘place’ as an alternative to essentialised approaches based on ‘ethnicity’ or religion. It found that young people frequently drew upon both real and imagined experiences of locality in order to mediate discussions of national identity and accept or reject pluralist definitions of heritage and identity. The degree to which individuals were likely to accept heterogeneous accounts of nationhood was therefore dependent on whether or not these concurred with their own experience of place. The research found that place was consequently a more significant factor in constructions of national identity than ethnicity, although the two concepts intersected in many young people’s narratives.

Distinctions between ‘heritage’ and ‘culture’ were also a key feature in young people’s narratives of inclusion and exclusion. The research found that many participants utilised
definitions of heritage as the ‘past/fixed’ and culture as ‘present/fluid’. The findings here support Littler and Naidoo’s (2004) concept of ‘white past/multicultural present’, which asserts that concepts of national identity in the UK tend to be based on the notion of a homogenous past that has been altered through multiculturalism. These findings bring into question the degree to which museums and other public institutions can challenge mainstream conceptualisations of ‘heritage’ and thus national identity through encouraging individuals to ‘revise their own self-conceptions’ and thus ‘re-write the margins into the centre, the outside into the inside’ (Hall, 2005: 31). This thesis supports Mason’s (2013) argument that such attempts to re-imagine the nation in plural terms may only be successful if individuals are already inclined to identify with plural conceptualisations of the nation.

1.1 Research Aims and Objectives

This thesis addresses the question: How do young people in Scotland construct and utilise concepts of ‘heritage’ and ‘place’ when negotiating national identity and cultural diversity?

The research has four main aims and objectives:

Aim 1: Critically analyse the importance of national identity to young people in Scotland’s sense of self

Objective 1.1 Analyse the role of place and the intersection of local and national identity in young people’s narratives of identity

Objective 1.2 Analyse the role of family, including ethnic background, in young people’s narratives of identity

Objective 1.3 Analyse how young people’s political identities influence their attitudes towards national identity

Aim 2: Evaluate the role of heritage in young people’s constructions of Scottish identity

Objective 2.2 Analyse how young people in Scotland define Scottish identity

Objective 2.3 Analyse how young people in Scotland define Scottish heritage

Objective 2.3 Critically assess the role of place in shaping definitions of national heritage and identity
Objective 2.4 Evaluate how young people’s self-identities influence their narratives of Scottish identity

Aim 3: Analyse how the concepts of ‘heritage’ and ‘place’ are utilised in young people’s narratives of belonging and exclusion

Objective 3.1 Analyse how young people negotiate individual and group definitions of heritage and national identity

Objective 3.2 Analyse how young people respond to attempts of migrants and ethnic minorities to ‘join the nation’ through engagement with heritage

Objective 3.3 Analyse how young people negotiate challenges to their definitions of Scottish heritage and identity through reflexive narratives

Objective 3.4 Analyse how young people utilise the lived and/or imagined experience of place to accept, mediate or reject plural definitions of heritage and national identity

Objective 3.5 Analyse how heritage is utilised in young people’s narratives in order to stabilise and sustain their existing definitions of Scottish identity

Aim 4: Evaluate how discussions of heritage and national identity on an individual level relate to institutional practice and political rhetoric

Objective 4.1 Critically assess existing approaches to issues of migration and national identity in museum practice

Objective 4.2 Critically assess young people’s perceptions of museums and the legitimacy of stories of migration to national identity

Objective 4.3 Critically analyse cultural policy relating to heritage, national identity and cultural diversity and evaluate the implications of the research findings in relation to current policy recommendations

1.2 Thesis Position

The thesis is written from three key positions: firstly that nationalism and national identities are social realities. It is important to state that to undertake research on national identity is neither an attempt to promote nor prevent a nationalist agenda.
Secondly, I take issue with the notion that national identity, may be categorised using the simplistic dichotomy of inclusive/exclusive. Whilst I argue throughout this thesis that the political construction of national identity in Scotland is largely ‘inclusive’ in nature, in practice, both individual and political narratives of Scottish identity move between these positions, depending upon the context of the debate. To say that a particular nationalism or a nationality is inherently inclusive or exclusive therefore misses the point and is symptomatic of what Cannadine terms the ‘Manchiean view of the world [that] fails to recognise or describe the messy, complex, contingent, multifaceted, interconnected, joined-up reality of human relations’ (2013: 260). This is an important issue which is all too often overlooked within heritage studies. Thirdly, and most importantly, this research is written from the position that migration and cultural diversity are both a historical and social reality and that those whose role it is to construct and represent ‘heritage’ in the public sphere—be they academics, teachers or heritage professionals—have a responsibility to engage with current debates on immigration and cultural diversity. However, I am wary of those who overstate the impact that museums may have in this debate.

The research points to significant challenges to the success of museum representations and heritage education programmes that aim to tackle prejudice particularly towards ethnic communities through discussions of historical immigration and attempt to deconstruct mainstream definitions of nationhood. In doing so, I concur with Macdonald’s assertion that

While exhibitions and museums addressing migration and cultural diversity are certainly capable of expanding the range of ‘voices’ included in the public sphere, and, in this way, of potentially unsettling existing identity formations, they do not necessarily do so, or not as extensively as they might (2013: 185).

This is not to say that this study challenges the value of museum work of this nature, or questions the need for museums to take moral standpoints, regardless of whether they reflect popular opinion—issues which are contemplated in the final chapter. However, it is important to distinguish between advocacy and evidence-based research when assessing the impact museums may have on these issues.

Having established the key arguments of the thesis and its contribution to wider research, the next section provides a contextual overview of the role that heritage plays
in the construction of Scotland as an ‘inclusive’ nation in political discourse and considers the implications of this ‘top down’ definition when seeking to understand how the young people in this study responded to plural definitions of the nation. These issues will be introduced through the examination of the experience of a so-called ‘New Scot’, a term that highlights the ‘inclusive’ nature of national identity in the Scottish political sphere, while also emphasising the distinction between migrants and ‘majority’ Scots in public discourse.

1.3 ‘New Scots’, ‘Tartan Turbans’ and Haggis Pakoras: Heritage, cultural diversity and national identity in Scotland

*In Search of the Tartan Turban* (2003) is a Bafta award-winning documentary exploring concepts of identity in the UK. It is promoted as an educational resource for exploring young people’s ideas about social and cultural identity in Britain through examining issues of home and belonging. It aims to educate young people on the personal and social responsibilities that form an inclusive, multicultural society (Channel 4, 2003). It is presented by Hardeep Singh Kohli, a Glaswegian Sikh TV presenter. The programme follows Hardeep on a journey across Britain as he negotiates his own sense of identity through conversations with others. Throughout the journey Hardeep discusses the importance of his Scottish identity to his sense of self and belonging. The priority Hardeep places upon his Scottish identity echoes that of many individuals in Scotland, regardless of ethnic background. Since devolution, research has repeatedly shown that people in Scotland place a high priority on their national identity when asked to describe themselves (Bechhofer and McCrone, 2009; Reicher et al., 2009; Hopkins, 2007; Bond, 2006; Hussain and Miller, 2006; Kiely et al., 2005; Ichijo, 2004; Edensor, 2002; McCrone and Kiely, 2000), while a number of academic studies have identified the salient nature of Scottish identity for those from minority ethnic backgrounds, particularly those who identify as Asian or Muslim (Bond, 2011; Hopkins, 2007; Hussain and Miller, 2006; Virdee et al., 2006; Saeed et al., 1999b). This is in contrast to Asian communities in England who have a tendency to identify themselves as British rather than English (Hopkins, 2007; Hussain and Miller, 2006; Saeed et al., 1999a). This difference has been attributed to the idea that ‘Scottishness’ is defined primarily in terms of being ‘not-English’, rather than in contrast to a specific ethnic group. In contrast, theorists working on issues of Englishness such as Clarke and Garner (2010) have noted there appears to be an increasing use of English as an ethnic identity,
signifying ‘whiteness’, in opposition to what is perceived to be the multi-ethnic category of ‘British’, as evidenced in the rhetoric of the English Defence League (EDL), a distinctive organisation from the British National Party (BNP). On the surface the, Scottish identity is seemingly more accessible than English identity, in that individuals from ethnic minority backgrounds are more likely to feel able to claim an identity. This of course is not the same as having those identity claims received and accepted.

In the north of England Hardeep meets a member of the British National Party, who outlines the BNP’s policy on the voluntary repatriation of all ‘non-indigenous’ people to their ‘home’ countries. The BNP member tells Hardeep that despite being born in Scotland he would never consider him to be Scottish because of his ethnicity. Reflecting on his experience making the programme in a film produced by the National Museum of Scotland, Hardeep commented:

A guy from the British National Party once said to me that I wasn’t ethnically Scottish. A thought occurred to me and I said to him ‘well do you want to tell my head that and do you want to tell the hairs on the back of my neck that, ‘cause when ‘Flower of Scotland’ comes on, my body tells me. It’s emotional; it’s not rational (National Museums Scotland, 2009).

Hardeep disputes the notion that his national identity is merely a legal definition based on birth and residency. Instead he explains that he has an experiential and emotional connection to Scotland. For Hardeep, his national identity is not just equated with citizenship, which in the UK context is best described as the relationship between the individual and the state and refers to one’s ability to participate in the political process of that state (i.e. voting) (McCrone and Kiely, 2000), but with belonging to an ethnic group, which in social anthropological terms refers to ‘aspects of relationships between groups which consider themselves, and are regarded by others, as being culturally distinctive’ (Eriksen, 2010:5). Through disputing the idea that he could not be considered ethnically Scottish, Hardeep illustrates the complex and seemingly hierarchical definitions attached to ‘national identity’. While in some contexts ‘national identity’ neatly overlaps with that of citizenship and refers to anyone resident within a country, in others national identity and citizenship are understood as separate categories, whereby someone may possess citizenship of a country, but be unable (or unwilling) to claim national identity (McCrone and Kiely, 2000). In these contexts, national identity may be more closely understood as referring to ethnic identity. Already we can see significant complications when attempting to define these terms and the theoretical
distinctions between them are analysed throughout this research. Chapter 2 explores the different analytical approaches to these terms.

The distinction Hardeep makes between civic and ethnic definitions of ‘Scottishness’ and the value placed upon these definitions is highly significant for this study. As his conversation with the BNP member shows us, the distinction between ethnic and civic identities in popular usage is often hierarchical, with greater weight given to the identity claims of those who can both trace a longstanding historical connection to the nation, and whose culture and values most closely match that of the majority. Although Hardeep is not a migrant himself, his appearance means that others will always question his birth status and label him as belonging to a migrant community. The problems migrants face are summarised in Matarasso’s observation that:

one cannot acquire heritage: it is given, fixed at birth. Heritage claims an essential, and ineradicable difference between someone born in a village, or a country, or a faith, and someone who has chosen to make their life within that social and cultural framework; and that distinction, paradoxically, disadvantages the person who has chosen an identity, making a conscious commitment freely to a place, a group or a set of values. In this world, a migrant can only ever be an honorary member, an affiliate whose status, whether welcomed or merely tolerated, is always at risk of revocation’ (2006: 53-4 cited in Bodo 2012: 181).

Throughout the discussions in later chapters we will see the important impact that the discourse of ‘tolerance’, rather than acceptance may have on individual’s willingness to accept the identity claims of those like Hardeep. We will also see that while many young people in this study would accept Hardeep’s claim to be Scottish, they would still resist the idea that the story of the Sikh community was an integral part of Scotland’s ‘heritage’. Instead, they stressed the importance of distinguishing between historic definitions of identity, and modern multiculturalism.

1.3.1 ‘New Scots’

The identity challenges experienced by Hardeep due to his ethnic background (although he may dispute my use of this term) are an important example of the issues facing migrant communities in Scotland today. In Scottish political discourse the term ‘New Scots’ is commonly used to refer to both those from minority ethnic backgrounds and migrant communities. Originally coined by the Scottish Labour Party to refer to the
Scottish Asian community, the definition has been expanded through political usage to refer to any migrant community, including English migrants (Maan, 1992). The term became prominent in policy during the early years of devolution under the Labour-Liberal Democrats Scottish Executive, mirroring a concern for issues of multiculturalism that came to dominate New Labour policy at Westminster. The term appears to be a deliberate attempt to move away from the usage of Scottish as an ‘ethnic’ category and instead can be seen as an active attempt to integrate new communities into the nation. However, the prefix ‘new’ automatically creates a distinction between settled and migrant communities, a problem that is symptomatic of the challenges of multiculturalism and the politics of difference, issues that are discussed further in Chapter 2.

1.3.2 Heritage and the performance of identity

The distinction between ‘settled’ and migrant communities and the role that concepts of ‘heritage’ play in the construction and maintenance of boundaries between the two is of significant interest to this study. Hardeep’s interaction with the BNP member is characteristic of this distinction between past and present, in which some forms of cultural practices are considered legitimate and others are rejected as new and ‘alien’. Culturally hybrid practices that incorporate new and existing cultural elements—most commonly seen in ‘fusion foods’ such as a haggis pakora—are interesting examples of a disruption to this new/old construction of heritage and national identity.

Hardeep’s ‘identity journey’ takes him to Glasgow, where talking with friends and family, he learns about the strong sense of Scottish identity amongst the Asian community and the popularity of tartan and kilts—the traditional dress of Scottish men—amongst the Sikh community, and the specially designed Singh tartan that he is entitled to wear. His journey culminates in the commissioning of his own kilt, which he wears alongside his Sikh turban. For Hardeep, the combination of these traditional items of clothing from his two cultural backgrounds represents not only a consolidation of his sense of identity, but a defiant statement against those who deny his ‘Scottishness’. Hardeep’s adoption of the kilt as an outward sign of his commitment to his Scottish identity can be understood as an identity ‘performance’ (Goffman 1959; Butler 1990); an enactment of his national identity through adopting a cultural practice that is globally understood to be Scottish. It is also an example of what Gans (1979) terms ‘symbolic
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1 Haggis is a traditional Scottish dish cooked in a cow’s stomach often eaten on Burns Night or St. Andrew’s Day, Scotland’s National Day. A pakora is a fried spicy snack found across South Asia.
ethnicity’, which refers to ethnic identification through symbolic markers that are easily recognisable as symbols of a particular identity. This performance appears to offer a means of challenging those who dispute his claim to ‘belong’ and therefore the legitimacy of his identification as Scottish.

Hardeep’s very public process of identity negotiation through his appropriation of that uniquely Scottish icon, the kilt, reflects a wider interest in the public sphere in the way that some immigrant communities in Scotland have embraced the iconic tartan as a means of asserting their ‘Scottishness’ (See Figure 1).

Throughout this thesis, I argue that the celebration of the ‘tartan turban’ in the public sphere functions as what Ashworth et al. (2007) term an ‘exotic embellishment’ that adds colour and variety to the national culture, without fundamentally challenging ideas of what may be considered ‘Scottish’ or changing the relationship between the ‘margins’ and the ‘core’. Although the ‘tartan turban’ is not a common feature of daily
dress within this community, it is frequently utilised as a metaphor by politicians and other social commentators for what Reicher et al. (2009) term the ‘attractive’ and ‘inclusive’ nature of Scottish identity in political discourse.

British politicians from both the Right and the Left have praised the way in which national identity in Scotland resonates with ethnic minorities and the role that heritage plays in this. Reflecting on what she sees as a vacuum of national identity in England, Conservative Peer Baroness Warsi, has remarked on the strength of national identity in Scotland, a phenomenon she attributes to the celebration of Scottish culture and heritage as something everyone can buy into (Barnes and Dalton, 2011). This story was reported in The Scotsman under the headline ‘Scotland's “tartan with a turban” culture can teach the English how to beat fascism’ (ibid). Her comments appear to be supported by academic research. Geographer Peter Hopkins, who works with Scottish Asian and particularly Muslim communities, argues that identifying with ‘Scottishness’ is appealing to incomers because of Scotland’s rich cultural iconography, which he suggests is more captivating than that to be found south of the Border (The Economist, 2009). Such constructions of Scottish identity are pertinent given current political debates on the constitutional future of Scotland. The next section provides an overview of these debates in order to contextualise the issues addressed in this research.

1.4 National Identity, Citizenship and Belonging: The political construction of Scottish identity

Although heritage is often held to be inherently political in its construction (Smith 2006) I did not specifically set out to study politics or to examine issues of constitutional change in this research. And yet it has been impossible to separate the political from the personal when studying questions of national identity and belonging in Scotland against the backdrop of the build-up to the 2014 independence referendum.

The way in which many young people in this study positioned themselves in relation to particular political ideologies and the values placed upon these could therefore not be ignored. In order to understand the way in which political discourse has shaped the responses of the young it is therefore worthwhile to provide an overview of the political debates that have led us to these constitutional questions in order to provide greater insights into why questions of Scottish identity are currently inseparable from current political issues.
1.4.1 The road to devolution

At the time of writing Scotland is a devolved nation within the UK. It has its own parliament which oversees a number of key areas of policy including education and health, but has limited tax-raising powers and crucially has no jurisdiction over defence or migration policies, which remain in the control UK government. Scotland’s position in the UK is longstanding; Scotland and England became united first in 1603 with the Union of the Crowns and then further in 1707 with the Union of the Parliaments. Although Scotland had no parliament between 1707 and 1999 it maintained key institutions that could be considered markers of nationhood, including separate legal and educational systems, key cultural institutions and a distinctive literary and artistic culture from its English neighbour. McCrone argues that these symbols of governance have created a distinctive ‘Scottish frame of reference’ through which issues are perceived and have helped to ‘Scotticize’ everyday interactions (McCrone, 2005).

Scotland’s constitutional future has been the subject of increasingly intense debate since the latter half of the twentieth century and on 18th September 2014 a referendum will be held to decide whether it should remain in the UK. The date of the independence referendum is significant, falling in a year of celebrations of the 700th anniversary of the Battle of Bannockburn, which saw the English King Edward II defeated by Robert the Bruce. Critics and supporters of the Better Together3 campaign have argued that the SNP are drawing upon a centuries old—but highly emotive—conflict to gain support for independence (Johnson, 2012). Such debates are a prime example of the potential for the past to serve the needs of the present.

Having established the political context that has surrounded the research, the next section will outline what this means in practical terms when researching issues of identity and belonging in Scotland.

1.4.2 National identity and citizenship in Scotland

The independence referendum raises a number of pertinent questions relating to national identity. People in Scotland possess two national identities: Scottish and British. Whether they choose to use both these identities is of course a different question. However, their legal status on official documents such as passports is that of British Citizenship. Whilst researchers have used the theoretical question of who would be entitled to a Scottish passport in the event of independence as a useful methodological
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3 The cross party campaign which opposes independence from the UK
tool for assessing attitudes towards migrants in Scotland (Bechhofer and McCrone, 2010; Bechhofer and McCrone, 2009; Reicher et al., 2009; Bond, 2006; Rosie and Bond, 2006; Kiely et al., 2005; McCrone and Kiely, 2000) the answer to this question could be far more pertinent should Scots vote in favour of leaving the Union. The SNP’s position on citizenship is outlined in Table 1.

Table 1 Proposed requirements for Scottish Citizenship in an Independent Scotland

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Status</th>
<th>Scottish Citizenship?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>At the date of Independence</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British citizen habitually resident in Scotland on day one of Independence</td>
<td>Yes, automatically a Scottish citizen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British citizen born in Scotland but living outside of Scotland on day one of Independence</td>
<td>Yes, automatically a Scottish citizen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>After the date of Independence</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child born in Scotland to at least one parent who has Scottish citizenship or indefinite leave to remain at the time of their birth</td>
<td>Yes, automatically a Scottish citizen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child born outside of Scotland to at least one parent who has Scottish citizenship</td>
<td>Yes, automatically a Scottish citizen (the birth must be registered in Scotland to take effect)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British national living outside Scotland with at least one parent who qualifies for Scottish citizenship</td>
<td>Can register as a Scottish citizen (will need to provide evidence to substantiate)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizens of any country, who have a parent or grandparent who qualifies who Scottish citizenship</td>
<td>Can register as a Scottish citizen (will need to provide evidence to substantiate)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrants in Scotland legally</td>
<td>May apply for naturalisation as a Scottish citizen (subject to meeting good character, residency and other requirements set out under Scottish immigration law)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizens of any country who have spent at least ten years living in Scotland at any time and have an ongoing connection with Scotland</td>
<td>May apply for naturalisation as a Scottish citizen (subject to meeting good character and other requirements set out under Scottish immigration law)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: (Scottish Government 2013: 273)

As we can see, the SNP’s proposed definition of citizenship is thus based on the combined principles of *jus solis* (birth in the territory of the country) and *jus domicile* (migrants may become naturalised after being legally resident), in line with current definitions of British citizenship (Koser, 2007:22-3).
1.4.3 Multicultural nationalism

Although a feature of the rhetoric of all the major political parties, the Scottish National Party in particular has gained notoriety for its emphasis on an inclusive national identity based on principles of civic nationalism (Brown, 2000), and has been characterised as ‘multicultural citizenship’ (Kymlicka, 1995). First Minister Alex Salmond sets out the SNP’s vision of Scotland thus:

We see diversity as a strength not a weakness of Scotland and our ambition is to see the cause of Scotland argued with English, French, Irish, Indian, Pakistani, Chinese and every other accent in the rich tapestry of what we should be proud to call, in the words of Willie McIlvanney, “the mongrel nation” of Scotland (cited in Reicher et al. 2009:34).

Such a statement implies that anyone may be Scottish as long as they show a commitment to the country.

The SNP in particular has gained significant attention from theorists because of its support amongst so called ‘New Scots’ (Williams and De Lima, 2006; De Lima, 2005). The apparent on-going popularity of the party amongst Scottish Muslims has been attributed to its policies on Immigration and Asylum and its position on the Iraq war (The Economist, 2009). Its most prominent Muslim supporter is Humza Yousaf MSP, Minister for External Affairs and International Development (see Figure 2 First Minister Alex Salmond and Humza Yousaf MSP Minister for External Affairs and International Development. Copyright Andrew Milligan/PA (2012))
Figure 2), who has played a prominent role in setting out the party’s pro-immigration stance in the run up to the referendum. This represents a striking difference to the UK Government’s current attempts to cut net migration and the scepticism seen in discussions of immigration in England, seen in the title of Goodhart’s (2013) controversial book *The British Dream: The Successes and Failures of Post-war Immigration*.

The reasons for this departure from UK policy may be motivated by pragmatism rather than ideology. Like many European countries, Scotland faces the problems of an aging population. However, it also struggles to retain its existing population. Already a small nation of around 5 million people, for many years Scotland saw high levels of emigration, particularly in the twentieth century to countries such as Australia, New Zealand and Canada. The Scottish diaspora is claimed to range between 20-40 million people worldwide. Since devolution, a number of high profile schemes have therefore attempted to both retain existing migrants (See Bond et al., 2010) and attract new migrants to Scotland, such as Fresh Talent (Mooney and Williams, 2006) and the now infamous ‘Homecoming’ campaign. The SNP argue that should Scotland become independent, it would have greater success in both convincing existing Scots to stay and encouraging more inward migration. The 2011 Census results showed that since 2001 the Scottish population increased by 233,000 (5 per cent) to 5,295,403—the highest it has ever been (National Records of Scotland, 2013). Whether or not this is due to the strategies of the Scottish Government or simply in line with wider UK migration trends over the past 10 years is difficult to determine. However, the demographics of Scotland differ considerably from that of the UK as a whole, due to historical differences in migration patterns, with fewer migrants to the UK choosing to settle in Scotland than other areas. The 2011 Census results for England and Wales showed that 14% of the population came from an ethnic minority background. Across England and Wales,
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4 Although the title of Goodhart’s book states that his argument is about Britain, he clarifies in his introduction that ‘this is a mainly a book written about and from the perspective of England (the immigration stories in Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland overlap but are somewhat distinct)’ (2013: xiv)

5 The Homecoming campaign was a Scottish Government initiative that aimed to increase visits to Scotland from the Scottish diaspora in countries such as Canada, New Zealand, Australia and the USA. While primarily a tourism initiative, the campaign also aimed to increase business investment in Scotland and as such targeted economic migrants. The first campaign ran in 2009, the anniversary of the birth of Robert Burns. A second campaign is scheduled for 2014 to coincide with the anniversary of the Battle of Bannockburn and the Commonwealth Games in Glasgow (See Lloyd 2009).
London is the most ethnically diverse area, with those from non-white ethnic backgrounds making up 40.2% of the population, followed by the West Midlands, where those from non-white ethnic groups account for 20.8% (Office for National Statistics, 2012). The 2011 Census results show a considerable difference in population make up between Scotland and England and Wales.

The 2011 Census results show a marked increase in ethnic diversity in Scotland. In 2001 just 2.01% of the Scottish population came from non-white ethnic minority backgrounds (Scottish Executive, 2004). In 2011 this figure had increased to 4.1%. Including those from white ethnic backgrounds, individuals from ethnic minority backgrounds make up 8.3% of the total population (General Register Office for Scotland, 2013). The largest visible ethnic minority group in Scotland are those who identified as Asian, Scottish Asian or British Asian in the 2011 Census, making up 2.7% of the population, followed by those who identify their ethnic background as African 0.6% (ibid). Those who identified as belonging to mixed or multiple ethnic groups accounted for 0.4% of the population, while 1.2% identified as White Polish and 1.9% identified as belonging to an ‘other white’ ethnic group (ibid).

Scotland’s relatively small visible ethnic minority community in comparison to England and other countries in Europe, alongside wider debates on its constitutional future within the UK have led to very different discussions on the relationship between multiculturalism and national identity. Reflecting on both German Chancellor Angela Merkel’s statement that ‘multiculturalism is dead’ and British Prime Minister David Cameron’s declarations that multiculturalism has ‘failed’, Ephraim Borowski, a member of the Scottish Parliamentary Committee on racism, argues that what ‘David Cameron described is not what Scots recognise…Here different communities are identifiable and distinct, while at the same time forming a single pattern…Just like the threads in the tartan’ (Borowski, 2011:23). This metaphor echoes the ‘patchwork quilt’, sometimes used to refer to the Canadian model of multiculturalism, also referred to as the salad bowl, rainbow or mosaic model (Ashworth et al., 2007). Some support for Borowski’s assertion can be seen in the work of the One Scotland6 government campaign (Scottish Government, 2009), which celebrates the impact of immigration on Scottish society alongside longstanding diversity in Scotland. The campaign, which has a strong educational focus, stresses the longstanding history of migration to Scotland and the
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6 Previously called ‘One Scotland: Many Cultures’. The campaign now takes a more explicit stance on tackling ethnic and religious discrimination, through its subtitle ‘No Place for Racism’.
People have always moved around the world to live. Our earliest ancestors originated in Africa. They followed the coastline across Europe, moving to find food, shelter and safety….For thousands of years, people have come to live in the country we now call Scotland. The very word 'Scot' comes from people who migrated to Scotland from Northern Ireland around 500 AD (Scottish Government, 2011).

This emphasis on the long history of migration to Scotland can be interpreted as an attempt to deconstruct homogenous conceptualisations of national identity. It is a strategy that certainly appears to adhere to the recommendations of The Future of Multi-ethnic Britain (Parekh, 2000a), which stressed the importance of public policy acknowledging that Britain, which of course includes Scotland, has always been a heterogeneous country. In particular, it argued that the single narrative of history taught in British schools obscured this fact and that more should be done to educate young people on the positive contribution of migrants to the UK. Such recommendations are equally applicable within the devolved context. Importantly the Parekh Report charged public institutions, including museums with the responsibility of challenging attitudes towards migration.

1.5. Museums and Cultural Diversity in Scotland
For many Scottish museums the concept of the ‘tartan turban’ has served as a convenient visual shorthand for the ‘inclusive’ nature of national identity.

Since making In Search of the Tartan Turban Hardeep has appeared in a number of museum displays on Scottish identity, including Salt of the Earth at the National Museum of Scotland. His portrait, (dressed once more in kilt and turban on the banks of the River Ness) also featured prominently in the ‘Hot Scots’ exhibition, at the launch of the refurbished Scottish National Portrait Gallery on St Andrew’s Day 2011. Similarly, the ‘tartanisation’ of ‘New Scots’ can be found in Scottish Identity in Art at Kelvingrove Art Gallery and Museum. The Singh Sisters painting ‘Mr Singh’s India’ (1999-2000) depicts the contemporary Glaswegian Sikh experience (See Figure 3). Commissioned by Glasgow Museums, it depicts a famous Indian restaurant in the West End of Glasgow. The artists sit in the restaurant wearing Punjabi dress made from the Singh Tartan, alongside William Wallace and Maharaja Ranjit Singh, served by kilt-wearing Sikh waiters. The image appears to celebrate how immigrant communities have
adopted Scottish heritage as their own, through embracing traditional dress such as the kilt.

Meanwhile at the National Museum of Scotland, Hardeep’s brother Sanjeev, an actor and comedian can be found discussing the delights of a deep-fried haggis pakora in the Scotland: A Changing Nation gallery. The curatorial aims of the gallery were as follows:

It will be a space for dialogue and discussion, essentially providing varying perspectives on the question, ‘Who are the Scots?’ through an exploration of perceptions of Scottish identity. It will encourage
Scottish visitors to assess their own perceptions, and others to understand the vital ingredients that have made us who we are. (National Museums Scotland, 2006:21)

The learning outcomes placed specific emphasis on:

- illustrating the complexities of identity
- raising awareness of diversity in Scottish society e.g. geographic and ethnic differences
- increasing understanding of issues surrounding stereotypes and myths about Scotland
- encouraging visitors to engage with the debate about identity and recognise their own prejudices (National Museums Scotland, 2006:36).
Significantly, the gallery draws parallels between historical migrant groups and population movement since the twentieth century, seen particularly in inclusion of the lyrics of *Scotland’s Story*, by Scottish icons, The Proclaimers (See Figure 4), which draw parallels between ‘the Gael, the Pict, the Angle and the Dane’ and more recent migrant groups. The curatorial decision to include this perhaps shows an attempt to deconstruct the dichotomy of ‘white past/multicultural present’ that Littler and Naidoo (2004) argue is commonly found in museums in the UK. Scotland is depicted in the

Figure 4 Scotland’s Story display in Scotland: A Changing Nation, National Museum of Scotland. Photo by Lloyd, reproduced with permission of National Museums Scotland (2013)
gallery as a country with historically diverse roots, of which post-war immigration is only one part of the story.

The positive contribution of immigrant communities to Scotland is explored further through the stories of two successful migrants from Pakistan and Italy, whose experiences are represented through two display cases containing personal objects (See Figures 5 and 6).

Figure 5 Scotland: A Changing Nation, National Museum of Scotland. Photo by Lloyd, reproduced with permission of National Museums Scotland (2011)
The inclusion of ‘New Scots’ within these museum displays can be viewed as curatorial attempts to get visitors to think about national identity in plural terms, through challenging stereotypes and attempting to disrupt ‘settled’ notions of nationhood by drawing upon the longer history of migration.

**1.5.1 Museums and the construction of an ‘inclusive’ national identity**

The way that museums in Scotland have engaged with current debates on national identity in the public sphere has been of significant interest for theorists (Mason, 2013; Aronsson et al., 2012; Whitehead et al., 2012; Mason, 2007; McLean, 2005; Macdonald, 2003; Cooke and McLean, 2002; Fladmark, 1999; McCrone et al., 1999; McLean and Cooke, 1999). This interest may in part be attributed to a wider interest in how museums ‘do’ national identity in an age of international migration, globalisation and the role of museums in addressing questions of citizenship, ethnicity and multiculturalism in Europe (Whitehead et al., 2013; Aronsson et al., 2012; Peressut and Pozzi, 2012; Whitehead et al., 2012). Increasingly there appears to be an acknowledgement within the European museum community that museums must recognise the heterogeneous nature of the communities that they pertain to represent and strive to be more ‘inclusive’. However this mode of thinking is of course not uniform.
across the sector and the interpretation of what constitutes an ‘inclusive’ approach to representations of national identity varies from country to country, and indeed between institutions.

In Scotland, the language of ‘inclusion’ is prominent in discussions of museums and national identity. The importance of heritage in constructing an inclusive sense of national identity is seen in the *National Strategy for Scotland’s Museums and Galleries* (2012), developed by Museums Galleries Scotland (MGS). MGS officially became the National Development Body for the sector in 2013 and is now funded at arms-length by the Scottish Government. Aim 2 of the strategy is to ‘Strengthen connections between people and places to inspire greater participation, learning and well-being’. This is explained as follows:

Museums and galleries serve as focal points for communities and as inclusive spaces where people from different backgrounds can come together. They provide opportunities which help people explore issues of identity and better understand their heritage and historic landscape (2012:22).

The strategy was developed following consultation with the museums and gallery sector in Scotland between 2011 and 2012. It is important to note that a specific focus on national identity and inclusion was present in the language of the initial consultation, as Figure 7 below shows.

However, the focus on national identity was less explicit in the final strategy and the subsequent delivery plan: *From Strategy to Action: A Delivery Plan for Scotland’s Museums and Galleries* (Museums Galleries Scotland, 2013). It is possible to speculate that the downplaying of the importance of issues of national identity between the consultation and the final strategy was a response to concerns expressed in the sector regarding Scottish Government involvement in cultural institutions in the run up to the 2014 independence referendum, particularly given the assertion of the former Culture Minister Mike Russell MSP that Scotland’s cultural sector had a key role to play in the Scottish Government's ‘national conversation’ (Scottish Government, 2009b).
All publically funded bodies within Scotland are expected to contribute towards the Scottish Government’s National Performance Framework. Introduced in 2007 and updated in 2011, it focuses on 16 National Outcomes. Of these, heritage plays a specific role in the outcome ‘We take pride in a strong, fair and inclusive national identity’. The explanation of this outcome is as follows:

Scotland’s national and cultural identity is defined by our sense of place, our sense of history and our sense of self. It is defined by what it means to be Scottish; to live in a modern Scotland in a modern world; to have an affinity to Scotland; and to be able to participate in Scottish society. It is the tie that binds people together. (Scottish Government, 2009a)
In order to achieve this aim, the Scottish Government has identified a number of areas of development, of which points 1, 2, 3, and 6 are particularly relevant to this study (see Figure 8).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>National Outcome: National Identity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>We want all of Scotland's people to take pride in their country. However, the factors that affect this are wide-ranging and complex. These include:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. The quality of our landscapes and cityscapes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Our heritage and our diverse and vibrant cultural life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The influence that new Scots bring to our communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Our international development agenda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The awareness and advocacy for Scotland by the Scots Diaspora</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Our education system and our success in ensuring that our young people are confident individuals and responsible citizens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Our languages and the place of Gaelic within our communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Our sporting achievements and the hosting of major events such as the Glasgow Commonwealth Games 2014, Ryder Cup 2014 in Gleneagles and a second year of Homecoming in 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. The place of key events and festivals in the Scottish calendar</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 8 Scottish Government National Outcomes: National Identity. Source: (Scottish Government 2009)

The National Strategy for Museums appears to mark an increased attempt by the Scottish Government to increase coherency in policy relating to the heritage sector and no doubt focus spending in a time of recession. However, the social aims of the strategy can be seen as part of a wider emphasis on social outcomes in relation to heritage, evidenced in the consultation *The Historic Environment Strategy for Scotland*, which aims: ‘to ensure that the cultural, social, environmental and economic value of Scotland’s heritage makes a strong contribution to the wellbeing of the nation and its people’ (Scottish Government, 2013). ‘Heritage’ therefore plays an instrumental role in public policy in the construction of Scotland as an ‘inclusive nation’. This thesis attempts to gain a greater understanding of how public conceptualisations of heritage and national identity relate to this political and policy rhetoric.
1.6 Young People and National Identity in Scotland: From the political to the personal

What then are we to make of this celebration of ‘New Scots’ and ‘tartan turbans’ in both Scottish political discourse and public institutions such as museums? Although politicians congratulate themselves on the construction and celebration of an inclusive Scottish identity, is there sufficient evidence to support their assertions when we consider the experiences of individuals? Do people in Scotland accept the plural model of national identity found in political rhetoric? Is Scotland understood to be a historically heterogeneous society, with the stories of migrants recognised as an integral part of the national narrative? Or are some stories more valuable to constructions of national identity than others? Furthermore, to what degree is it possible to change individual understandings of national identity through re-examining historical narratives in institutions such as museums?

This thesis explores these issues through examining the experiences of young people. My personal interest in this age group stems from my background in museum education, both in Scotland and Canada. Having developed and delivered workshops on issues of national identity and cultural diversity in two nations with very different historical narratives regarding immigration and cultural difference, I developed an interest in museums’ approaches to issues of diversity and their capacity for influencing young people’s attitudes towards ‘others’. While the focus of this research is on ‘identity’ rather than ‘learning’ this research aims to contribute towards our understanding of how museums that aim to address these issues can achieve their goals.

The responses of young people have been largely overlooked in research on national identity in Scotland, with few studies specifically examining the experiences of those attending school (Eichhorn et al., 2013; Oliver, 2002; Hague, 2001; Carrington and Short, 1996). This is surprising, as the experiences of this age group have been shaped by a significantly different social and political context to that of previous generations. Unlike their parents, the young people in this study have grown up in a Devolved Scotland, where, to consider oneself Scottish is not necessarily considered a radical political position synonymous with nationalism, but merely a statement of reality for many. To emphasise this point, it is worth considering that the youngest participant in this study was born in 1998, a year after the devolution referendum, while the oldest was only 5 years old when Scotland’s new parliament opened. It stands to reason therefore, that there may be substantial differences in the way that this age group
perceive and respond to questions of national identity than their parents. The attitudes of young people towards national identity, and particularly political autonomy are therefore of considerable academic interest in the run up to the referendum on independence in 2014 and are an emerging area of research (see Eichhorn et al., 2013). For the first time, Scottish citizens over the age of 16 will be entitled to vote in a referendum, with up to 124,000 young people believed to be eligible. As a result, all of the young people who participated in this study will be eligible to vote on whether Scotland should remain part of the UK. The results of this research are therefore fascinating when considered against this backdrop.

Although popular opinion would have us believe that young people are ill-informed or driven by emotion and passions and therefore more likely to vote for independence than their supposedly cautious, rational elders, the picture that has emerged throughout this research proves far more complex. The findings here support the initial conclusions of Eicholm et al’s. (2013) study of young people’s voting intentions that those aged 16-17 are no more in favour of independence than the general population, although I concur with the caution that they exert over what this means in terms of actual voting behaviour. It is important to stress that throughout this research I have encountered many eloquent, thoughtful responses to issues of constitutional change. It has been a privilege to work with these individuals during this exciting period in Scotland’s history and, in age of apparent political apathy amongst young people, this experience has been inspiring.

1.6.1 National Identity in the School Environment

The value of understanding individual’s social worlds and the way in which these experiences shape constructions of national identity is central to this research. Throughout this thesis I argue that further research is needed on how individuals think about heritage beyond the museum or heritage site though focusing on national identity as it is ‘constructed and negotiated at a local or everyday level’ (Mann, 2006: n.p). Criticisms of approaches that stop at the museum are epitomised in Dicks' argument that this current research ‘tends to isolate historical understandings from its embedding in wider ideological and cultural discourses, by conceiving of that knowledge as the outcome of the museum’s self-contained dynamic of message and response’ (2000:202). By broadening the scale of research beyond the study of visitor responses to museum displays, it is possible to gain insights into the role that other environments play in shaping individual’s constructions of heritage and national identity. Dicks argues that
by studying how an individual’s ‘social positioning and cultural identifications (including class, ethnic and generational understandings) along with their personal biographies and family histories, shape their understanding of displayed times and places’ it is possible to ‘investigate range of different domains for the mediation of history in people’s lives’ (Dicks, 2000:202).

As this thesis was concerned with the experiences of young people, the research therefore took place within what is arguably the most influential environment in young people’s lives beyond the family home: schools. While it is recognised that schools, like museums, are institutions and thus have a particular impact on the nature of social interactions, I argue that the classroom has a more profound impact on young people’s daily lives than a museum visit.

As Nayak, in his work on young people and racism in the North East of England observes, research in the school environment offers a valuable opportunity to study the ‘locally embedded experience and the manner in which social interactions are situated in time and place’ (2003:29). Such an approach also provides the opportunity to combine theoretical understandings of macro-level societal change, with the ‘micro-politics of youth life worlds’ (Nayak, 2003:6). Understanding the way in which the classroom environment shapes young people’s attitudes towards issues of national identity and cultural diversity has been very useful for providing insights into the way in which variations in individuals’ experiences at a local level shape their responses to heterogeneous representations of the nation and Chapter 9 considers the relevance of the issues identified within the classroom environment for museums.

Research on national identity in a school context is highly significant within the context of a consultation on the potential for a new Scottish Studies subject. The plans have been met with some scepticism in the media over what is perceived to be the promotion of nationalist agenda in schools. Such concerns are perhaps understandable, given Eriksen’s assertion that ‘the manipulation, selection or reinterpretation of history for political of other purposes becomes an important activity in the creation and re-creation of ethnic allegiances’(1993:91). Rather than criticise any attempts to develop a programme of learning related to Scottish Studies, this thesis considers some of the challenges facing teachers who wish to engage young people in learning about their culture and heritage, whilst also developing a global outlook and appreciation for cultural difference both outwith and within the nation.
1.7 Thesis Synopsis

This thesis is divided into three parts: introduction, context and methods; findings and discussion; and conclusions and implications for practice. Chapter 2 outlines the key themes in the literature relating to heritage, national identity and cultural diversity. It firstly analyses theories of identity as ‘performance’ and ‘narrative’, before examining the role that heritage plays in the construction of national narratives. It then situates the current study within the wider European context, through the examination of the issues raised by multiculturalism, and questions of citizenship and national identity and considers the perceived role of museums in critical debates on these issues. Finally, it examines changes in policy and practice relating to ‘heritage’ and cultural diversity, particularly within the UK by tracking the move from targeted cultural diversity initiatives to new approaches that seek to deconstruct the concept of ‘place’ as fixed and settled.

Chapter 3 outlines the methodological approaches of the study. It identifies the theoretical challenges facing researchers who study identity in the postmodern and post-structural paradigms and examines the specific theoretical and methodological issues of working with young people, including the ethical and practical considerations that shaped the research design. In particular it focuses on the importance of place to the research questions and explains the selection of the localities and schools where the research took place. It justifies the use of qualitative research methods and explains the choice of visually mediated encounters as a means of generating narratives of identity. The final section evaluates the limitations of the methodology and highlights the impact of the research design on the findings.

Chapter 4 provides a framework for the subsequent discussion chapters by examining the importance of place in mediating young people’s experiences of national identity. In order to achieve this it firstly examines the literature relating to place, identity and belonging and identifies the false dichotomy between ‘parochial’ and ‘cosmopolitan’ conceptualisations of place identity in the literature. It highlights the relational nature of place based identities by examining how participants positioned themselves through identification with local, national and transnational identities. In particular, it focuses on the role that family and political identifications have on place-based identity, and the effect this has on individual’s conceptualisations of the nation.
Chapter 5 situates this research within existing sociological studies on national identity, citizenship and belonging in Scotland. It examines how young people negotiated the tensions between their own sense of ‘being Scottish, which was frequently based on ‘ethnic’ characteristics such as ancestry, parentage and heritage, with ‘civic’ markers of identity, such as place of birth, place of residency and pride and commitment to the nation, used to evaluate the identity claims of others.

Chapter 6 presents the findings from the focus group discussions and addresses issues of structure and agency in the construction of national heritage by examining the way in which individuals negotiate group and personal experience when defining national identity. It aims to contextualise the discussion in Chapter 7 and 8 by examining the issue of why young people might be invested in the concept of a singular, coherent national identity and thus seek to maintain the established definitions of homogenous Scottish heritage. It examines the importance of ‘heritage’ and ‘place’ in providing young people with a sense of stability and thus ontological security. It identifies the importance of ‘heritage’ as a means of emphasising cultural distinctiveness in a globalised world. It also highlights the importance of local experience to narratives of exclusion.

Chapter 7 considers the challenges that museums may face in attempting to re-imagine the relationship between the margins and the core by examining the degree to which the young people in this study were willing to accept plural representations of Scotland. It argues that although the majority of young people were willing to accept ethnic minorities and migrant communities as ‘exotic embellishments’ that enhance the core without challenging mainstream conceptualisations of Scottish heritage or identity, they struggled to accept the idea that museums could present such stories as part of Scotland’s heritage. It identifies the distinction many young people made between historical definitions of the nation (heritage) and modern day Scottish society (culture). It critically assesses the differences in values placed on these two categories and the reasons for this. It also highlights some young people’s suspicions of definitions of national identity (including those of museums and education programmes) that they categorised as ‘politically correct’ or ‘multicultural’.

Chapter 8 draws together the findings of the previous chapters and considers the importance of young people’s existing sense of self in shaping their responses to the issues discussed. It highlights the importance of demonstrating ‘inclusive attitudes’ to
many young people’s self-identity and analyses the way in which this identity was ‘performed’ during the focus group and interview process. It argues that discussions of ‘heritage’ or ‘culture’ appeared to present a challenge to the self-image of many of these participants, by forcing them to discuss issues of identity and belonging in terms that they usually avoided or had not previously considered. Drawing upon Giddens’ concept of ‘identity maintenance’, as well as psychological studies on impression management, it analyses the way in which young people used narrative strategies in order to construct and maintain a positive self-identity. It also examines the way in which some young people utilised discourses of ‘tolerance’, ‘political correctness’ and exclusive definitions of place in order to reject plural representations of the nation. The impact of these findings for museums is considered in relation to Rounds’ (2006) concept of ‘identity work’, which suggests that museums visitors strive to maintain a coherent sense of self in the face of challenges to their identity, rather than radically alter their existing viewpoints when faced with new information.

Chapter 9 outlines the key findings of the research and maps these onto the aims and objectives. It focuses in particular on the finding implications from Chapter 8 and examines the issues raised for museums that aim to destabilise ‘fixed’ concepts of the nation through displays that emphasise the longstanding heterogeneity of place. It considers how existing museum approaches could be improved to take into account the views expressed by the young people in this study and proposes avenues for future research to address these issues in both the case of Scotland and the wider international context.
Chapter 2. Heritage and Identity in Plural Societies

Chapter 1 identified a shift in the way that theorists and practitioners have approached the issue of cultural diversity and representations of national heritage and identity since 2010. In order to understand this shift and how current debates are a response to social and political changes since 1997, this chapter aims to provide an overview of how approaches to issues surrounding heritage, identity and belonging in museums have changed.

The literature discussed primarily stems from the field of Heritage and Museum Studies, and, more specifically, concentrates on perspectives from the emerging field of Critical Heritage Studies, as discussed below. Heritage Studies has long been an interdisciplinary field however, and the research engages with theory from sociology, politics, geography, social anthropology and social psychology. The research also seeks to separate the study of national identity from studies of nationalism and the important distinction between these approaches is discussed later in the chapter. Although potentially relevant to the research topic, literature from the fields of Developmental and Child Psychology and Educational Studies are largely overlooked by this work. These areas are beyond my expertise and preliminary research indicated that there were many theoretical areas that could not be satisfactorily reconciled with sociological approaches to identity that privilege participants’ view of themselves and the world, which is an important principle underlying this work.

The literature specifically examining the combined issues of heritage, identity and cultural diversity in the Scottish context is underdeveloped, as argued in Chapter 1. This chapter therefore seeks to explore theoretical perspectives on the issues from a range of international contexts and reflects on how the Scottish case offers an interesting prism through which to consider these issues further. The vast majority of the heritage studies literature discussed here stems from the UK and European context, as these countries have the most similar demographic profile and thus social issues to Scotland and therefore the critical insights are the most useful for understanding the Scottish case. However, this is not to say that these issues are not relevant in other areas of the world and a number of examples are drawn upon from post-colonial settings including Canada, New Zealand and Australia. Largely absent from the discussion is literature relating to Asian countries which is an emerging area of interest for European theorists
specialising in heritage studies. There is also a notable absence of examples from Spain, which makes a natural point of comparison to Scotland given its separatist movements and is an area that I wish to explore further in future projects. This oversight is acknowledged and the research findings should be viewed in light of this Eurocentric and Anglophone bias.

This chapter proceeds as follows. Firstly, the key terms discussed in the research—heritage, identity, belonging, ethnicity and citizenship—are critically analysed before examining how issues relating to these terms have been taken up in debates on multiculturalism, cultural diversity and identity politics. In the final section I look at emerging arguments for the possibility of a focus on place as an alternative paradigm to approaches that essentialise categories of difference and consider the challenges facing such an approach.

2.1 Heritage and Identity: Constructions of Belonging
Heritage is intimately bound with ideas of identity and belonging, evidenced in its everyday usage as interchangeable with terms such as ancestry or ethnicity. While heritage is increasingly accepted as constructed and negotiated in academic thinking however, throughout this thesis I argue that heritage in its vernacular definition is considerably more ‘fixed’ than the fluid definitions found in theoretical discussions. Indeed, it is this gap between academic and public discourse that can lead to tension or conflict, particularly when so-called ‘revisionist’ discourses of heritage challenge the definitions upon which individual identity or group belonging are based. In order to understand the differences between theoretical and vernacular definitions the next section critically analyses the current literature on heritage and identity.

2.1.1 Heritage
Heritage can mean everything and nothing. As Hewison notes, Lord Chateris of Amisfield, Chair of the National Heritage Memorial Fund famously declared that ‘Heritage is anything you want’ (1987:82), whilst Smith argues that there ‘is no such thing as heritage’ (2006:11). Already then a definition of heritage is proving elusive. At its simplest, ‘heritage is a knowledge, a cultural product and a political resource’ (Graham et al. 2005:30). To take this further, current critical thinking regards heritage as process and a discourse, produced in accordance of the needs of the present, drawing
upon concepts of the past, both real and imagined, with a view to constructing the future, as seen here in Ashworth’s definition:

Heritage is not an artefact or site. It is a process that uses objects and sites as vehicles for the transmission of ideas in order to satisfy various contemporary needs. It is a medium of communication, a means of transmission of ideas and values and a knowledge that includes the material, the intangible and the virtual. Heritage is a product of the present yet drawing upon an assumed imaginary past and an equally assumed imaginary future. (Ashworth, 2007:7)

As such, heritage—in academic terms at least—is more about values and ideas rather than artefacts and sites, while Critical Heritage Studies is concerned with questions of how these values and ideas are constructed, by whom and to what end?

Heritage is not as a product, but rather as process of meaning making and a culturally defined communicative practice (Smith, 2006; Dicks, 2000a; Dicks, 2000b). In an attempt to study this process of meaning making, increasingly theorists working in the paradigm of critical heritage such as Macdonald (2013) have been influenced by assemblage perspectives and Actor Network Theory, with the work of Latour (2005) receiving considerable discussion at the Inaugural Conference of the Association of Critical Heritage Studies in 2012. Such approaches offer considerable potential for studying the way in which heritage is constructed and negotiated beyond the museum of heritage site, focusing instead on the mediatory role that heritage may play in ‘assembling and reassembling other entities’ such as definitions of citizenship (Macdonald, 2009:17).

The relationship between heritage, discourse and power is an important feature in the literature and underpins much of the research regarding the construction and maintenance of categories of ‘majority’ and ‘minority’, particularly regarding discussions of the nation. The impact of what Mason (2011) has termed the ‘Foucault effect’ in has been highlight significant in Museum Studies, following the influential work of Tony Bennett (2006; 2001; 1995). His seminal text The Birth of the Museum draws upon both Foucault’s ideas of ‘power/knowledge’ and his concept of ‘governmentality’ and Gramsci’s notion of ’hegemony’ in his analysis of the way in which museums in the nineteenth century were designed to elicit particular ways of thinking and behaving in their visitors. The focus on discourse and power in heritage studies is seen most explicitly in Smith’s (2006) concept of the ‘Authorised Heritage
Discourse’ or ‘AHD’. Smith explains that the AHD: ‘takes its cue from the grand narratives of Western national and elite class experiences, and reinforces the idea of innate cultural value tied to time depth, monumentality, expert knowledge and aesthetics’ (2006:299). She further explains that: ‘heritage is a culturally directed process of intense emotional power [that is] both a personal and social act of making sense of, and understanding, the past and the present’ (2006:304). For this reason, there is a distinct strand amongst literature on the topic of heritage that analyses the role that heritage plays in hegemonic discourses of nationhood and the way in which this leads to homogenous understandings of national identity and belonging. This is clearly seen in the work of Hall, who also draws on the concept of ‘governmentality’ in his analysis of what he terms ‘The National Heritage’, which he views as playing an important role in ‘how the state indirectly and at a distance induces and solicits appropriate attitudes and forms of conduct from its citizens’ (2005: 24). Museums, galleries and heritage sites have been called upon by policy makers to foster certain attitudes that are viewed as desirable for society and theorists such as Sandell (2007) are strong advocates for the potential of museums to tackle prejudice. However, such an approach is in direct conflict with ‘new museological’ thinking, in which museums are envisioned as spaces where a plurality of opinions may be explored (Clifford, 1997; Bennett, 1995; Vergo, 1989). Indeed Macdonald notes that ‘we have seen heritage being drawn upon in less declarative and more provocative modes. That is, we see heritage being actively deployed not in service of ontological and legitimacy claims but as part of a more tentative setting out of alternatives or even an explicit provocation to debate’ (2013: 186).

A number of theorists therefore advise against over-emphasis on the analysis of heritage as a discourse of power, imposed ‘top-down’ through government policy and institutional practice. Ashworth and Graham suggest that critiques of ‘official heritage’ and the focus on hegemony in the literature overlooks the complexity of the ways in which heritage is used in everyday life (2005:4). Indeed, this is where assemblage approaches offer useful insights into the dispersed processes which lead to the construction of ‘heritage’. Dicks (2000b) in particular stresses the importance of what she terms ‘vernacular heritage’, while Mason and Baveystock argue ‘that heritage is constructed at an individual, personal and everyday level and is as much to do with immediate social groups and family contact as with larger national frameworks and public, institutional practices.’ (2009:17).
The inherent difficulty in defining heritage has resulted in the introduction of another term in the literature: dissonance. Ashworth and Graham use the term ‘dissonant heritage’ to refer ‘to the discordance of lack of agreement and consistency as to the meaning of heritage’ (2005: 5). It is no accident that the emergence of critical heritage studies has gone hand-in-hand in many cases with the development of postmodernism and postcolonialism, which both emphasise the fluidity and subjective nature of experience and destabilise the concept of a singular objective viewpoint that has long been associated with the practice of history and the search for ‘truth’. As Anico and Peralta assert:

heritage is more concerned with issues of contestation and contradiction and less with single, unitary and stable views of the past. Today, heritage is not able to provide us with stable meanings; it instead expressed the fragmented identities present in the contemporary world...More than ever, heritage is a social and cultural arena where disputes concerning the affirmation of identities take place (2009:2).

While heritage can be interpreted and reinterpreted in any number of manners; it is this fluidity that frequently results in considerable conflict in some over what may or may not be categorised as ‘heritage’. Such is the power of heritage in terms of legitimising certain view-points or positions that to have something rejected or excluded from official definitions of heritage can be highly problematic. Consequently, social movements that seek to change political systems have frequently been accompanied by increased calls for acknowledgement and recognition of previously omitted and overlooked groups in society, as seen in the revisionist histories stemming from the feminist and civil rights movements, as well as the focus on the working classes seen in the development of the social history movement and more recently discussions of sexuality. Where once such histories would never be told in major museums, we now have entire institutions dedicated to them, such as the People’s History Museum in Manchester. Observing these changes, Graham and Howard argue that ‘it is towards small heritages that much attention, policy and practice is focused at present; as confidence of meta-narratives of heritage purpose is being questioned, it is through small heritages that an answer may be at hand’ (2008:2). As Anico and Peralta observe, ‘this is not to say that these particular narratives have taken over the hegemonic versions or that they always provide an example of a counter-narrative. It simply means that these narratives have become increasingly negotiated and multivocal, challenging the
unilinearity and universality of the modern self’ (2009: 2). It is the overlapping nature of debates regarding challenges to hegemonic narratives and movements that seek the affirmation and acceptance of particular minority heritages that leads us to the considerable body of research on the role that heritage plays in the construction of identity.

2.1.2 Heritage and identity

‘Heritage’ plays an integral role in the construction of our own and others’ identities. In the introduction to the edited volume *Heritage and Identity*, Anico and Peralta suggest that the title of the work ‘comes as no surprise as it is common sense now that heritage has everything to do with identity’ (2009:1). Indeed, heritage and identity are often used interchangeably within everyday usage. The relationship between the two is a topic of significant interest for theorists (Macdonald, 2013; Aronsson et al., 2012; Whitehead et al., 2012; Kaplan, 2011; Mason and Baveystock, 2009; Graham and Howards, 2008; Ashworth et al., 2007; Mason, 2007; Watson, 2007; Whelan and Moore, 2007; Rounds, 2006; Ashworth and Graham, 2005; Littler and Naidoo, 2005; Macdonald, 2003; Paris and Mercer, 2002; Macdonald and Fyfe, 1996). In contrast to the critical attitudes of theorists towards the ‘heritage obsession’ of the eighties (Lowenthal, 1998; Hewison, 1987; Lowenthal, 1985; Wright, 1985), in more recent years theorists have reflected in a more positive manner on what Dicks refers to as ‘identity centred relationship with the past’ (2003:125). Mason suggests that heritage provides credence for our identity claims by supplying them with a sense of continuity through the evocation of ‘tradition’ (2004: 18). Heritage may serve as a ‘cultural marker’ of difference or commonality, a point that is returned to shortly. ‘Heritage’ is therefore frequently utilised in narratives in order to position oneself as belonging to a particular collective identity, and Mason and Baveystock rightly identify that the dominant discourses in heritage organise ‘social relations and identities around nation, class, culture and ethnicity’ (Mason and Baveystock, 2009). For this reason there is a considerable focus on the topic of national identity in heritage studies (Macdonald, 2013; Mason, 2013; Kaplan, 2011; Macdonald, 2009; Mason and Baveystock, 2009; Mason, 2007; McLean, 2005; Macdonald, 2003; Fladmark, 1999; McLean and Cooke, 1999).

Discussion of heritage and identity are not always positive however and Smith argues that ‘heritage may be used to regulate, legitimize and justify the maintenance of national narratives and social hierarchies’ (2006:6). Concerns over the relationship between dominant narratives of identity and those of minority groups have been magnified
within the context of debates on national identity and cultural diversity in modern societies as we shall see later in this chapter.

While there is significant interest in heritage and identity, research relating to museums has too frequently focused on received identities, rather than how and why individuals come to identify themselves in certain ways. Mason (2004) argues that the public too often seen as empty vessels and thus passive consumers rather than active in the construction of meanings. Similarly, Falk and Dierking (2000) have suggested that visitors do not simply absorb the intended meaning of a display, but rather create their own understanding based on their existing knowledge, experience and values. Graham (2002) argues that while the work of Bourdieu has been highly useful for understanding how individuals come to identify themselves in certain ways the cultural capital thesis has led to a tendency in the literature to focus on received identities, overlooking the way in which heritage may be used to subvert such identities. The need to further understand how identities are negotiated and constructed is therefore an increasingly valuable field of research. However, few studies have been identified that seek to examine this process without reference to a particular heritage site or museum, defined in the broadest sense to encompass digital mediums. This study therefore offers new perspectives on the role that heritage plays in the construction and negotiation of identity beyond the museum, with a view to understanding how this process may impact on the experiences of visitors within the museum. Rounds’ concept of ‘identity work’ is particularly useful for developing this understanding further. He suggests that ‘when we switch our perspective to identity as process, we become less concerned about what a visitor’s identity is, and more concerned about what the visitor is doing about the problem of identity’ (2006:135). In order to achieve this it is therefore necessary to examine the literature on identity from beyond heritage studies in further detail in order to understand this process in greater detail.

2.2 Identity

Concerns over who we are and how we define others have dominated much of sociological thinking during the twentieth century and remains just as pertinent a concern today. It is important to state from the outset that this study is concerned with what Thomas Hylland Eriksen, an anthropologist, terms social identity, rather than a psychological approach, focused on the workings of the inner mind (2010:62). Whilst
there is much disagreement, sociologists generally argue that identity is created through *identification*, a process through which we are situated in socially constructed categories, either by ourselves or by others (Marshall, 1998:294).

Identity implies both sameness but also uniqueness. In defining our own identity, we draw upon what we have in common with others, whilst emphasising the differences. Eriksen argues that ‘every community or identity is exclusive in the sense that not everybody can take part. Groups and collectives are always constituted in relation to others’ (1993:62). Identities are therefore relational and are ‘formed between, rather than within persons’ (Lawler 2008:7), in what Jenkins (1996) refers to as ‘situational identity’. Identities must therefore be interpreted as ‘socially produced and socially embedded’ (Lawler 2008:8).

Within both sociological and psychodynamic traditions, theorists have challenged essentialist understandings of identity, arguing that instead identities are invented and constructed. Whereas in the pre-industrial period identities were conceived as being private and fixed, identities are increasingly conceptualised as public and negotiable in current academic thought. The challenges to static notions of identity and difference have largely stemmed from postmodernist and poststructuralist social theory, and the works of Freud (1949), Saussure (1959), Foucault (1972), Lacan (1977) and Derrida (1981) have all been highly influential in shaping current approaches. Theorists such as Hall (1990) in the field of Cultural Studies have been prominent in stressing the multiple and fragmented nature of identities, while the work of Jenkins ([1996] 2004) on social identity has emphasised that identities are always negotiated.

The multiple nature of identities may be seen in the prominence of the use of hyphenated identities, seen in Bhabha’s (1994) influential theory of ‘cultural hybridity’, as we saw in examples such as ‘Scottish Muslim’ or ‘British Asian’ in Chapter 1. However, these forms of identity have been criticised by Çağlar, who argues that hyphenated identities limit the understanding of heterogeneity by simply joining two essentialised categories of identity together (1997:172). She cites the work of Friedman (1997), who suggests that such categories serve to ‘museumise’ culture as an objective ‘thing’. Vertovec’s (2007; 2006) theory of ‘super-diversity’ is an attempt to address this issue, and serves to emphasise the complexity of identities and the social structures and political movements that shape them.
In the introduction to *Identity in the 21st Century: New trends for Changing Times*, Wetherell suggests that for many commentators in the social sciences, understandings of identities as stable entities, primarily centred around social class hierarchies, have been replaced by concepts of a ‘liquid sense of self’ constituting multiple and fragmented identities, frequently based upon ‘life-style’ and consumer choices (2009:1). This line of thinking is largely attributed to Bauman, who argues that:

> If the modern ‘problem’ of identity was how to construct an identity and keep it solid and stable, the postmodern ‘problem of identity’ is primarily how to avoid fixation and keep the options open. In the case of identity…the catchword of the modern was creation; the catchword of postmodernity is recycling’ (1996:18)

The extent to which identity is truly fluid is a point of contestation to which we will return shortly.

The negotiation and debates surrounding the validity of certain identities are frequently referred to as ‘identity politics’. The use of this term goes beyond describing the everyday process of individual identity negotiation and instead is utilised to describe the way in which this process takes place within the public sphere, particularly through platforms such as government rhetoric and the media (Muir and Wetherell, 2010; Wetherell, 2009; Muir and Stone, 2007). However, the challenges that ‘super-diversity’ brings to identity politics are considerable, as cultural policy always struggles to keep up with shifting conceptions of identity, race and citizenship and although ‘attempts to do so are often made with good intentions, there is always the suspicion that cultural politics vastly outpaces the lumbering discourses of cultural policy’ (McGuigan, 1996:136).

The next section examines the processes through which identity is negotiated and the way in which individuals may adapt or indeed maintain their sense of self.

**2.2.1 Narrative**

Throughout this thesis I analyse the way in which identities are produced and consumed through a process of narration and the resources which these narratives draw upon in order to create the ‘self’ and indeed ‘other’. The examination of narratives has a long, if somewhat marginal, tradition in the field of sociology, particularly that of the Chicago school and its emphasis on biographical accounts (Lawler, 2008: 13-14). However, as Lawler identifies, the use of narrative inquiry is now far more prevalent in the field of
Sociology and beyond. In order to understand why narratives are important for this study it is firstly necessary to explain what we mean by ‘narratives’.

Narratives, at their most fundamental level, are stories that make sense of the world around us. Although semantically related, they are theoretically distinct from the concept of ‘discourse’. Drawing on the work of Laclau (1988), Anthias provides a helpful distinction between discourses as ‘decentred structures in which meaning is perpetually negotiated and redefined’ whereas ‘narratives may be seen from the point of view of individual narrations as performed identities’ and ‘as forms of social action’ (2002:499). The interrelation of concepts of narrative and performance is fundamental to this work and the specific dynamics of identity as ‘performance’ are explored later in this section.

The work of Ricoeur (1991) is essential to our understanding of how we use narratives to make sense of the social world and construct our sense of self. For Ricoeur, the key element of a narrative is its ‘plot’. However, the plot cannot exist without the narrative. Rather, it is the narrative itself that produces the plot. Ricoeur refers to this process as ‘emplotment’, a process that he defines as ‘a synthesis of heterogeneous elements (1991: 21). In other words, the plot is an active process that brings together otherwise unrelated elements, such as characters, settings and events. It is this ‘emplotment’ that creates the narrative. This process of emplotment is essential for understanding how narratives shape identities. When we talk about how identities are constructed, we often discuss the elements that people draw upon in order to situate themselves within the social world. These are frequently referred to as identity ‘markers’ or ‘resources’ in sociological studies (Bechhofer and McCrone, 2009; Rosie and Bond, 2006; Kiely et al., 2005), which are explored further in Chapter 5. So, in discussing local identity for example, individuals might talk about where they or their parents were born, where they live, what football team they support and so on. These elements are not intrinsically connected. It is the narrative that links these together to produce the ‘plot’.

The ‘assemblage’ of events or ideas into coherent narratives by individuals is the product of spatial-temporal contexts. That is to say, narratives are relational and a product of specific situations and locations. Anthias suggests that narrative is a ‘medium by which reality is constructed and performed at different points in time and space…it is mediated by intentionality and intersubjectivity in terms of ‘for what’ and ‘for whom’ the narrative is intended’ (2002:499).
While narratives may change, as Lawler notes however, the ‘repertoire of emplotted stories’ is not limitless (2008: 20). She argues that the social world puts constraints on the way that we tell stories, as our narratives need to make sense to those who hear them. She argues that we draw upon existing narratives that are already familiar to us, using them as resources when creating our own. We use these stories as resources or frameworks for producing our own ‘unique’ version of the narrative. It is because of this ability to draw upon different ‘pre-existing narratives’ that we are able to produce identities that make sense to others. This is particularly relevant in the case of collective identities, such as national identity. Our choice of ‘pre-existing narratives’ from which we construct our own identity is shaped by the social world in which we are situated, an important issue that is explored further in Chapter 6. Narratives are thus both a personal and social construction.

2.2.2 Identity narratives as ‘performance’

A key element of storytelling is the interaction between the storyteller and their audience. The story comes alive when it is shared with others; plot details may be altered and changes in intonation and pace may occur in order to resonate with the needs and desires of a particular audience. The performance of the story is thus inseparable from the plot. For this reason, identity narratives can be usefully conceptualised as a ‘performance’.

The concept of identity as a performance was first introduced in Goffman’s (1959) *The Presentation of the Self in Everyday Life* and was popularised by Butler (1990) in her influential work *Gender Trouble*, although as Lawler notes, Butler does not use the concept of identity, preferring the term ‘selves’ (2008:149). The concept is also gaining significance in the field of heritage studies (Chapman, 2008; Bagnall, 2007). For Goffman, identity is not a state of being but a state of ‘becoming’. There is no essential character, but rather a series of roles that we adopt which may change in response to social interactions. Goffman argues that identity ‘is not a material thing to be possessed and then displayed; it is a pattern of appropriate conduct, coherent, embellished, and well-articulated’ (1959:75). He famously draws on Sartre’s observations of the way in which a waiter ‘performs’ his role:

His movement is quick and forward, a little too precise, a little too rapid. He comes toward the patrons with a step a little too quick. He bends forward a little too eagerly; his voice, his eyes express an interest a little too solicitous for the order of the...
customer...All his behaviour seems to us a game...He is playing, he is amusing himself. But what is he playing? We need not watch long before we can explain it: he is playing at being a waiter in a cafe...The child plays with his body in order to explore it, to take inventory of it; the waiter in the cafe plays with his condition inorder to realise it. (1956: 59 cited in Goffman 1959: 75-6).

This ‘performance’ does not occur in isolation however. Goffman stresses that the self is a product of social interactions; without an audience there is no performance. The roles that we perform are a response to the actions of others. If we consider the example of the waiter, we have specific ideas about how waiters should behave. When the waiter does not meet our expectations we challenge the legitimacy of his position. His performance is not ‘convincing’. Identity is therefore not something that is wholly a matter of individual choice.

In order for an identity to be accepted by others it must ‘make sense’ to others. As Appiah notes ‘our identities are neither wholly scripted for us nor wholly scripted by us’ (2005:234). Consequently, we can think of identity not just in terms of identification, i.e. the identity that we claim, but also in terms of ascription, those identity labels that are applied to us over which we may have little control. It is for this reason that Bauman’s (2000) concept of ‘liquid modernity’, which suggests that that there are no limits to the negotiability of identity, is highly problematic. While we might be able to claim a particular identity, such a claim can become meaningless if it may be challenged by others. For Goffman, self-identity is therefore dependent on the audience receiving the performance. This is a view supported by Wetherell, who suggests that identity ‘is about becoming intelligible to oneself and to others’ (2009:3). At times, we may be aware that our performance is not ‘convincing’ and take steps to address this. Goffman is interested in the way in which we may at times consciously attempt to make ‘invisible’ aspects of identity are visible through performance. Thus, if we return to the example of Hardeep from Chapter 1, we can think about the way in which his adoption of the kilt was an attempt to make his Scottish identity ‘visible’ to others who questioned the authenticity of his ‘performance’. Goffman refers to this active form of impression management as ‘dramatic realisation’. The degree to which individuals are actively engaged in attempts to manipulate the perceptions of others is, however, a source of tension in Goffman’s work and an issue that is important for this study.
While highly influential in the field, there are significant ambiguities in Goffman's work, regarding the degree to which the ‘performed’ self is 'real', an issue that is pertinent to this study. Goffman's use of the term 'performance' implies that a role can be consciously adopted at will, which in turn can be interpreted as an active attempt by the performer to deceive the audience. In this context, our actions in the public realm can be interpreted as just that, an 'act'. This leads us to important questions regarding the existence of an 'authentic' private self that is hidden 'behind-the-scenes' in social contexts. Doniger argues that

Goffman speaks of ‘the field of public life’ wherein our public self must play its part, versus a ‘backstage’ where the individual can relax before having to put on a theatrical persona; only when we are alone can we take off the mask. Goffman assumes that the private self is unmasked, that we are the most genuinely ourselves when alone (Donieger 2005: 203-4).

In this reading of Goffman, any changes in an individual's 'performance’ in response to a change of 'audience' or setting, may lead to contradictions that 'expose' the constructed and thus 'false' nature of the previous performance.

This has significant implications for the use of ‘identity narratives’ as a form of making oneself intelligible to others, both within the context of the research environment and indeed the social world. As stated above, identity narratives are shifting and relational; they alter in response to changes in social context. To return to the example of local identity, the way in which we might describe this to others may change depending on whether the person we are speaking to is from the same place, or has an awareness of that place. If they are from a ‘rival’ place we might suppress certain aspects of our feelings about that place in order to ‘keep the peace’; in contrast, when speaking to a neighbour we might emphasise our pride in that place, or indeed vice versa. If we were to compare the two conversations we might encounter considerable contradictions between the opinions expressed. However, this does not mean that either performance is ‘false’. Rather, its shows that individuals are capable of behaving in different ways in different settings, a phenomenon that may result in individuals holding multiple viewpoints on the same issue. These viewpoints may receive greater or lesser significance depending on the context of the performance. Where issues may arise however, is when others notice these changes in behaviour or viewpoint and consequently challenge the legitimacy of our previous ‘performance’, an issue that is examined closely in Chapter 8.
Lawler (2008) suggests that Goffman’s work is essential for understanding these tensions that may arise between ‘performances’. She argues that Goffman focuses on whether performances are accepted as convincing or unconvincing by their audience, rather than establishing a judgement of whether they are ‘true or false’. As such, she rejects the argument that Goffman’s work implies the existence of an ‘authentic self’, highlighting instead Goffman’s emphasis on the adoption of different ‘roles’ as an integral part of what makes us human. Consequently, identity performances do not conceal the true person but rather are inseparable from what makes us ‘us’ (Lawler 2008: 105-7). This reading of Goffman is convincing and for this reason his work is utilised in the analysis here. However, recognising the ambiguity in Goffman's work, the analysis also draws upon the work of Giddens, whose work on narrative as a form of identity maintenance directly addresses issues of authenticity and self-identity.

2.2.3 Identity maintenance, ontological security and reflexivity

Throughout this study there were many tensions between young people’s professed attitudes and their actions. On numerous occasions participants asserted opinions that contradicted previous statements in response to new information or changes in context. Many young people were aware of these contradictions in their narratives and became distressed or frustrated as a result of being unable to reconcile these multiple and shifting positions. While Goffman’s work is useful for understanding the way in which individuals may adopt multiple roles, it does not offer much critical insight into how individuals respond to these shifts in roles and how they manage the contradictions that may emerge between identity performances. The work of Giddens (1991) on the importance of truth and authenticity in individuals’ understanding of the self provides important insights into these issues.

For Giddens, the nature of identity as 'multiple' and 'fragmented' in postmodern theory is contentious. While Bauman's argues that concerns over identity as something solid and stable are now longer relevant in the postmodern age, Giddens questions the degree to which individuals experience the self as 'fluid', suggesting that rather than celebrate the shifting nature of identity, individuals may experience considerable anxiety in response to ever-expanding social diversity. Consequently, he argues that while individuals may change their identity in response to different situations, they also need to maintain feelings of stability and continuity in their understanding of the self, a phenomenon that is absent in Goffman’s discussion of performance.
Feelings of authenticity are central to Giddens’ work. Throughout *Modernity and Self-Identity* Giddens examines the concept of 'being true to oneself', a concept that stemmed from psycho-analysis that has become ubiquitous in self-help books. While this concept has been criticised for overstating the agency of the individual and indeed promoting a sense of narcissism in the modern age—an issue that Giddens acknowledges in the introduction (1991: 8)—it is nonetheless an important issue that emerges in the narratives of the young people in this study, as we will see in later chapters. Giddens argues that when we feel we are behaving in an 'authentic' manner, that is, being true to our self, we feel secure in our identity. For Giddens, the 'authentic person' is therefore 'one who knows herself and is able to reveal that knowledge to the other'. (186). Conversely, to behave in a manner that is perceived by the individual as being 'false' or 'out of character' may lead to feelings of insecurity. Returning to the issues raised above regarding authenticity and performance, it is important to assert that Giddens does not use the term authenticity to refer to the self as something that remains fixed in response to changes in social situations. He asserts that '[t]o be true to oneself means finding oneself, but... this is an active process of self-construction' (1991:79). Consequently, he emphasises that 'self-mastery is a necessary condition of authenticity' (1991: 96).

While Giddens acknowledges that individuals are required to respond to ever-shifting social contexts, he takes issue with notion that the self inevitably 'fragments' or disintegrates into multiples selves. Instead, in a clear divergence from Goffman, he argues that the diversity of social contexts encountered by the individual in the globalised world can also lead to the promotion of an integration of the self (1991: 190). He argues that contextual diversity can be utilised by the individual to 'create a distinctive self-identity which positively incorporates elements from different settings into an integrated narrative. Thus the cosmopolitan person is one who draws strength from being at home precisely in a variety of contexts' (1991:190).

Giddens argues that identity is dependent on our ‘capacity to keep a narrative going’ (1991:54). While narratives play an important role in explaining ourselves to others, they also serve an important role in providing a sense of coherency to our existence as individuals: ‘narrative is a strategy for placing us within a historically constituted world...If narrative makes the world intelligible, it also makes ourselves intelligible’ (Moore 1994: 119 cited in Lawler 2008:13). Giddens argues that the construction of a coherent narrative of identity requires a reflexive sense of self, as the individual must constantly adapt their actions to the on-going changes in activities and structural
conditions. Narratives also play a key role in establishing what Giddens refers to as ‘ontological security’, which refers to the need for stability, continuity and order in individuals’ experiences and their sense of self. According to Giddens, this sense of stability provides a state of comfort and allows individuals to maintain a positive sense of themselves and their position in the world by avoiding feelings of chaos and anxiety.

Rounds’ (2006) concept of ‘identity work’ draws heavily on Giddens and examines the way in which visitors may use museums to try out different identity positions, without necessarily having to alter their identity once their visit is completed. Although Rounds’ work is largely theoretical rather than empirical, it offers a useful perspective on how visitors to museums may respond to ideas that are in conflict with their own sense of identity. This raises useful questions for this study, as Rounds’ work, viewed in the context of wider discussions regarding the need for ontological security, appears to suggest that visitors to museums are unlikely to adapt their identity, but rather adopt strategies that allow them to maintain their existing sense of self.

We have seen some of the key issues identified by theorists on the topic of identity which will be returned to in the discussion chapters. It is therefore appropriate to move on to the examination of a related but analytically distinct concept: belonging.

2.3 Belonging

The terms identity and belonging are used throughout this research. Although in many ways the two concepts are similar and frequently used interchangeably, there are significant theoretical distinctions made between the two and their use here as discrete although interrelated categories is deliberate. Advocating the usefulness of belonging as a conceptual term, Anthias argues that by ‘focusing on location/dislocation and on positionality…it is possible to problematize the epistemological and ontological status of identity and critique the forms of politics based upon these more effectively, while still treating identity as a socially meaningful concept’ (2002: 494). While recognising the importance of belonging as a useful analytical category, I argue that important distinctions are made in the narratives of young people in this study between ideas of identity and belonging. It is possible to possess a particular identity and feel as if one does not belong, while conversely it is possible to feel a sense of belonging without claiming a particular identity, an idea that is explored further in the discussion of citizenship later in this chapter. For example, while I would never wish to claim to be
Scottish, I do feel I ‘belong’ in Edinburgh and possess strong feelings of place attachment to my current ‘home’. It is these distinctions found in the migrant experience that explain why the dominant strand in the literature on belonging relates to issues of diaspora and settlement. In order to understand the distinctive analytical worth of belonging it is therefore necessary to examine the theoretical definitions of the concept.

At its simplest, belonging is ‘an emotional (or even ontological) attachment, about feeling ‘at home’ (Yuval-Davis, 2011:10). This feeling of ‘home’ transcends the idea of the domestic sphere and refers instead to ideas of ‘rootedness’. Feelings of belonging may be constructed around specific social collectives, such as gender, sexuality, race, class, nation, age group, kinship group or profession, or spatial boundaries referring to specific localities or territories. Yuval-Davis argues that it is important to distinguish between ‘belonging’ and ‘the politics of belonging’ which she suggests ‘comprise specific political projects aimed at constructing belonging to particular collectivity/ies which are themselves constructed in these projects in very specific ways and in very specific boundaries’ (2011:10). We can therefore see there are distinct similarities between issues regarding ‘identity’ and ‘belonging’. The differences between the two therefore need to be explained further.

Hedetoft argues that ‘cultural belonging’, unlike identity, is not constructed in relation to an ‘other’ (2002:3). This does not mean that belonging is unproblematic and unchallenged. However, in contrast to identity, theories of belonging appear to centre on the importance of feelings of attachment. Hedetoft identifies four analytical parameters for the study of belonging:

1. Sources of belonging—relating to locality and familiarity
2. Feelings of belonging—identification with a ‘locality’
3. Ascriptions and constructions of belonging—such as nationalism
4. Fluidities of belonging—ideas of globalism and cosmopolitanism (2002: 2)

Discussing the usefulness of Hedetoft’s approach in relation to studying the relationship between museums, peoples and place, Whitehead et al. note that Hedetoft’s framework implies that these parameters are to be considered sequentially, rather than as ‘fluid and inter-dependent’ (2012:19), an approach with which this study concurs.
Theories of belonging are therefore often linked with concepts of ‘place’. In response to the importance of mobility rather than solely state based territoriality in modern society (Clifford, 1992), Urry suggests that belonging should not be seen as a fixed concept relating to territory, but rather a ‘dialectic of roots and routes’ (2000:132). Issues of mobility, migration and diaspora are therefore central to theories of belonging. Like identity, belonging is seen as fluid and subject to change, whilst theorists also highlight the social dimension of belonging. As Savage et al. note:

Belonging should be seen neither in existential terms (as primordial attachment to some kind of face-to-face community), nor as discursively constructed, but as a socially constructed, embedded process in which people reflexively judge the suitability of a given site as appropriate given their social trajectory and their position in other fields (2005:12).

This ‘reflexivity’ is central to understanding Savage et al.’s (2005) concept ‘elective belonging’, which they describe as the distinction between people who reside in specific places and those who elect to belong. In other words, elective belonging stresses the importance of an active commitment to a particular place, rather than merely an accident of birth. Engagement with ‘heritage’ such as taking part in cultural events, joining a local history society or participating in ‘intangible heritage’ activities such as playing folk music or learning a language such as Gaelic may play a key role in the formation of this attachment to place, as studies on English migrants’ experiences in Scotland have shown (Bond, 2006; Hussain and Miller, 2006). These ideas of place attachment and commitment and the role that heritage plays in constructing these feelings are explored further in Chapter 4 and 5.

Within heritage studies there is a growing interest in the potential for heritage to play a positive role in shaping individual’s identities and building and sustaining communities centred around place. However, as Graham et al. (2009) argue further empirical research into the relationship between place, heritage and identity is required. In their literature review *Historic Environment, Sense of Place and Social Capital* they identify a number of studies that indicate that engagement with heritage not only helps develop a ‘sense of place’, but also increases self-esteem, pride and supports shared values and citizenship. They highlight a focus in policy under the previous UK Labour Government on the potential of engagement with heritage as a means of building social capital within communities. They attribute this to the argument put forward in policy that communities with a strong sense of identity were conceptualised as being more secure
and therefore welcoming to newcomers. In other words, communities who do not feel their identity is threatened do not identify ‘outsiders’ as challenging their identity, or so the logic of policy suggests. However, as they rightly identify, the development of social capital is not a straightforward process that leads to higher levels of integration. Drawing on Bourdieu they point to theories regarding different types of social capital, arguing that the accumulation of social capital may not necessarily be ‘good’ in terms of developing inclusive communities. Whilst ‘bridging’ or ‘linking’ capital offers the potential for building links between different people, ‘bonding’ capital is seen as more problematic, leading to exclusive communities that may reject outsiders (Graham et al 2009: 13).

According to Savage et al., conceptions of place and belonging should not be viewed as tensions between ‘insiders’ and ‘outsiders’, but rather between those who are seen as transient and thus have ‘no ties to the place they now live in’ (2005: x). This distinction has clear ramifications for the discussion of those who are labelled ‘migrant populations’. Younge (2013) argues that this term is still synonymous with discussions of race in the UK, as it implies that individuals only intend to live in a place on a temporary basis and therefore their ‘commitment’ to that place is questionable.

It is because of this that Lord Bhikhu Parekh noted that ‘one might enjoy all the rights of citizenship and be a formally equal member of the community and yet feel one is an outsider who does not quite belong…Belonging is about full acceptance and feeling at home’ (Parekh, 2000b:237). The power of belonging or indeed not belonging is an important theme in Hall’s work. Drawing upon Anderson’s concept of an ‘imagined community’ he suggests that national identity is dependent upon ‘cultural meanings, which bind each member individually into the larger national story…The National Heritage is a powerful source of such meanings. It follows that those who cannot see themselves as reflected in its mirror cannot properly “belong”’ (2005: 24). Although Parekh’s observations largely stem from the position that more could be done to make citizens from ethnic minority groups feel ‘at home’ by the majority, this does not appear to be the way in which current UK government policy approaches this issue: rather, it is the migrants who need a stronger sense of ‘citizenship’ in order to feel that they belong as we will see shortly in the on-going debates surrounding the importance of the citizenship test. Firstly however the next section analyses the terms of citizenship, ethnicity and national identity and examines how these terms come to have different meanings and values in political discourse.
2.4 National Identity, Ethnicity and Citizenship

As we saw in the example of Hardeep Singh Kohli in the introductory chapter, the terms national identity, ethnicity and citizenship can, at times, be used interchangeably, whilst at others they refer to very specific conditions of belonging and acceptance. That the term ‘Scottish’ may refer to all three was a point of continuing confusion for many of the young people in this study. It is therefore important to examine the theoretical distinctions between these terms.

2.4.1 National identity

National identity is a distinct concept from nationalism. While scholars of nationalism tend to be interested in the political apparatus of the state, (although this is not always the case given the prominence of nationalist movements in so-called ‘stateless nations’ (McCrone, 1992) and other separatist movements), theorists of national identity are interested in the way in which individuals draw upon the concept of the nation when defining themselves. However, as acknowledged by Bechhofer and McCrone—sociologists who have specialised in studying national identity in Scotland since the nineties—defining what we mean by national identity is incredibly difficult given the fluid nature of identity already described above.

Let us begin then with the oft-quoted words in studies of national identity of Scottish author Willie McIlvanney: ‘Having a national identity is like having an old insurance policy. You know you’ve got one somewhere but you’re not sure where it is. And if you’re honest, you would have to admit that you’re pretty vague about what the small print means’ (cited in Bechhofer and McCrone, 2009:7). Whether or not we choose to have a national identity, with few exceptions we all possess a national identity. As Bechhofer and McCrone note, it is conferred on us by the state, either through our nationality or citizenship. They point to the work of Gellner (1983), whose work suggests that we are all ‘nationals’ now and that nationalism is the most important feature of political ideology, although as Mason (2013) notes in her discussion of the ‘post-national’, the degree to which this is still true is a topic of debate.

Individual’s investment in their national identity as a form of self-identification plays a key role in the formation of what Anderson (1983) terms the ‘imagined community’ of the nation. This is not to say that this imagined community is not perceived as real; such is the power of national identity that individuals are prepared to die for their country. National identity also provides one of the strongest means by which
‘outgroups’ are identified, that is, the binary between ‘us’ and ‘them’, a feature that is highly important to postcolonial theorists such as Gilroy (2002). It is this need to define national identity in opposition to something else which is seen as worrying by theorists such as Eriksen, who suggests that:

Nationalist ideologies tend to be more concerned with clear-cut unambiguous boundaries than other ethnic ideologies. An explanation for this could be that nations are territorial and political units with an inherent need to divide others into insiders and outsiders on the basis of citizenship. Cultural similarity among citizens becomes a political programme vested in the state’ (1993: 116).

However, once again we should be cautious of overstating the role of the state in dictating identity. Both Billig’s (1995) definition of ‘banal’ nationalism and Edensor’s (2002) everyday national identity highlight a growing interest in humanities of the way in which individuals negotiate identity in their everyday lives. National identity, like other forms of identity, is a product of the ‘interplay of social structure and social action’ (Bechhofer and McCrone, 2009: 14), that is, it is a process of both identification and ascription: ‘People are neither extemporising actors on a stage, making it up as they go along, nor are they puppets dancing to the hidden strings of state and institutional power’ (ibid). Our national identity is thus shaped by our social surroundings, while in turn shaping how we see the world around us. This does not mean that we are free to claim any national identity that we wish, an issue that is even more pertinent in discussions of ethnicity.

2.4.2 ‘Race’ and ethnicity

There are competing theories regarding the nature of ethnicity, which may broadly be categorised into two distinct schools of thought: primordialism, which suggests that one’s ethnicity is fixed at birth and instrumentalism, which approaches ethnicity in a similar way to the concepts of identity as defined above as situational, reflexive and negotiated. The literature on ethnicity, which largely stems from anthropology, is vast and the constraints on space mean that it cannot be fully explored here. However, it is important to state that this work has been influenced by the work of Barth (1969) on the socially constructed nature of ethnicity, which stresses the importance of the establishment and maintenance of boundaries between groups. Building upon Barth, Jenkins stresses that ‘boundaries, and the interactions across them, are intimately and indissolubly bound up with the cultural contents of ethnicity’ (1997: 121–2). It is for this
reason that heritage plays a key role in the construction of ethnic identities, as we saw in the case of Hardeep in Chapter 1. The way in which these boundaries are socially constructed is of significant interest to this study. It is important at this point however to understand how ethnicity differs from the commonly found term of ‘race’.

Ethnicity has replaced the outmoded notion of ‘race’ in much academic discussion. Cannadine notes that while there is no agreement amongst historians as to when race gained prominence as a key form of collective identity and the basis for conflict, it came to prominence in the decades prior to the First World War alongside theories of racial hierarchy (2013:177), which, we must note, museums played a key role in supporting through research on biological differences and thus supposed social differences between peoples. Although ‘race’ has lost credence in much academic writing, it remains in public discourse. Ironically, the term ‘race’ is used most prominently in relation to anti-racism measures; ‘race’ remains one of the protected characteristics in the UK Government’s Equality Act 2010. This sends out a rather confusing message on the validity of ‘race’ as an identity category, with individuals expected to adopt a stance of ‘colour-blindness’, while still recognising diversity.

Rattansai argues that ‘cultural’ understandings of race come close to the concept of ethnicity in everyday usage, that is a group with shared characteristics such as history, cultural traditions, common geographical origin or descent from common ancestors, and other shared features such as language, literature and religion (2007:87-8). This definition largely concurs with Eriksen’s definition of ethnicity, who suggests that ‘shared origins are usually crucial for ethnic identities, and interpretations of history are therefore important to ideologies seeking to justify, strengthen and maintain particular ethnic identities’ (1993:59). He does however problematize this concept of shared origins, observing that the ‘notion of ancestry is itself ambiguous, for if a shared ethnic identity presupposes a notion of a shared ancestry, how many generations should one feel compelled to go back in order to find a starting point for one’s present ethnic identity? (1993:69). Eriksen notes that this perceived continuity with the past provides a sense of reassurance through facilitating a sense of an ‘unchanging, stable core of ethnic belongingness’ (1993:68). This is in keeping with the ideas of ontological security discussed above.

Hutchinson and Cohen (1996) stress the need to distinguish between an ‘ethnic category’ and an ‘ethnic community’. Whereas the former may be ascribed to a group,
the latter is primarily a form of self-identification. Rattansi notes the way in which ethnic categorisations on official government forms such as the census conflate racial characteristics (black, white, Caucasian) with national identifications e.g. Indian, Pakistani, Bangladeshi and geographical classifications such as Asia, Caribbean and African (2007: 90). While such categorisations are used in order to address issues of inequality and discrimination, they also serve an additional unintended purpose of creating distinctions between the ethnic ‘majority’ of a nation and its ‘ethnic minorities’. Indeed, the term ‘ethnic’ is rarely used in discussions of the majority, rather it is a term frequently reserved for those labelled ‘immigrant peoples’, whilst the majority are simply ‘the nation’. This sets up a ‘dichotomy between non-ethnic “us” and ethnic “others”’ (Hutchinson and Smith 1996: 4). There are, however, some distinctions between the ways in which ethnic minority communities are referred to in specific contexts. In Scandinavia for example, the term ‘National Minorities’ is commonly used to distinguish between ‘new immigrants’ and established communities who are ‘recognised as having lengthy experience within the national borders and attachment to the country’, such as long-standing Swedish-speaking populations living in Norway and vice versa (Goodnow 2008: x-xii).

2.4.3 Citizenship

The final term to be examined in this section is that of citizenship. Citizenship is broadly linked with political participation in democracy, most specifically the right of an individual to vote (Bellamy 2008: 1), although it is important to note that this is not always the case when we consider the status of women as citizens in particular states. In the English language, the term citizen is frequently used in relation to the state; however, in other countries such as Italy, citizen is defined more closely with being ‘of the city’. As we have seen, citizenship may be closely linked to national identity. However, as Delanty notes, the simple ‘marriage’ between citizenship and national identity has broken down in an age of increasing population movement. There is no straightforward relationship between ‘nationality, as a member of the political community of the state, and citizenship, as membership of the political community of civil society’ (2000:19). This distinction can be seen most clearly in the examples of France, Spain, Canada and Scotland, where being a citizen makes you French, Spanish, Canadian or British, while your national identity may be Breton, Catalan, Quebecois or Scottish (Bechhofer and McCrone, 2009:1). Unlike national identity, citizenship refers explicitly to an individual’s membership of a particular political community, and refers
to the right and duties that are features of the relationship between the individual and that community (Delanty, 2000). This community may extend beyond the boundaries of the nation-state and thus we see discussions of European citizenship and the concept of ‘global citizens’ or ‘cosmopolitan citizenship’, a concept that is discussed later in this chapter.

Delanty notes that there are divergences in theories of citizenship between citizenship as a product of the administrative state and notions of ‘active’ citizenship, which focuses on the importance of participation. This definition of citizenship is frequently found in educational approaches which aim to equip students for ‘active participation in a global multicultural society’, as seen in the Curriculum for Excellence in Scotland (Education Scotland, 2013). However, Bellamy argues that to broaden the definition to one encompassing human relations ‘detracts from the importance of the distinctively political tasks citizens perform to shape and sustain the collective life of the community (2008:3)’.

While citizenship in its theoretical usage primarily refers to issues of political membership, this is not to say that questions of citizenship are divorced from cultural identities. Macdonald (2013) asserts that in Europe heritage plays an important role in the establishment of stable, demarcated boundaries of political states, despite the combination of on-going renegotiations of identity in countries such as Spain and Scotland and increased immigration, which both challenge the concept of a settled European political community.

In the UK the role of heritage in the construction of citizenship can be seen in the content of the most recent UK citizenship test, which was introduced in 2005 by Labour and was part of a wider attempt to foster a sense of belonging and improve social cohesion, in an attempt to tackle some of the issues raised by the Parekh report. The 2013 Life in the United Kingdom test has been widely criticised for focusing too heavily on Britain’s history, with little information that is of relevance to modern-day life (Brooks, 2013). This emphasis marks a departure from previous citizenship tests, which had a greater focus on practical elements of life in the UK, such as how the Welfare system operated. Applicants for British Citizenship need to know about select aspects of Britain’s history, including a focus on Scottish figures such as Robert Burns, Mary Queen of Scots, Bonnie Prince Charlie, events such as Culloden and the Highland Clearances, periods of history including the Scottish Enlightenment and inventors John
Logie Baird (television) Robert Watson-Watt (radar) and John Macleod (insulin) (Home Office, 2013:7). The importance of these figures to the young people in this study is highlighted in Chapter 6, while the requirement for ‘incomers’ to learn about these aspects of Scotland’s heritage as evidence of their commitment to the nation is examined in Chapter 7.

The degree to which discourses of heritage, and more specifically, how museums are utilised in defining the terms of citizenship in the European context is a growing issues for theorists, evidenced in the aims of MeLa: European Museums in an Age of Migration, an EU-funded research programme: ‘MeLa will help museums become agents of European citizenship-building, by drawing on common heritage as a cardinal bonding factor’ (MeLa, 2011). It is here in the discussion of citizenship in policy outcomes that we see the way in which engagement with heritage may produce feelings of attachment and belonging has become prominent in debates on ‘social cohesion’ in increasingly diverse societies. As Beel (2009) notes, this was a particular feature of cultural policy in Scotland under New Labour and can be attributed to wider UK Government discussions on citizenship, belonging and multiculturalism in the wake of 9/11 and the 7/7 bombings.

Having established an understanding of the key terms of ‘heritage’ ‘identity’, ‘belonging’ ‘ethnicity’ and ‘citizenship’, engaged with throughout this work, the next section explores the role that heritage has played in an age of ‘identity politics’.

2.5 Cultural Policy and the Politics of Difference

In their book Pluralising Pasts, Ashworth, Graham and Tunbridge (2007) explore the ways that modern societies utilise heritage to construct and maintain collective identities, focusing on issues of national identity. They build upon existing models of plural societies found in the wider literature on multiculturalism and examine the role that heritage plays in each model, using country specific case studies. These models are described as assimilation, melting pot, pillar, salad bowl and core+.

The first model that could be used to understand the Scottish case is the salad bowl, also referred to as the ‘patchwork quilt’. In this model, diverse cultures are brought together collectively to create a whole, whilst retaining their distinctive characteristics. The second models that could be used to describe the Scottish approach is ‘core+’. These
societies are characterised as having ‘a consensual core distinctiveness to which other
different cultural identities are added…the critical relationship is that of the core to these
add-ons.’ (Ashworth et al. 2007:141). These peripheral ‘add-ons’ are either perceived as
separate but unthreatening to the core, or alternatively as enhancing the core, often as
exotic embellishments, which can be selectively ‘added’ when appropriate or
advantageous. Although it is tempting to suggest that the conceptualisation of heritage
in political discourse and policy in Scotland fits with that of the salad bowl or
patchwork quilt, as Borowski’s account of distinct communities ‘woven together’ as
one tartan in Chapter 1 suggests, throughout this thesis I argue that the core+ model is
more useful for understanding the Scottish case. This assessment is supported by
Ashworth et al.’s argument that the response to minority heritages in England fits the
definition of the core+ model. Although it is important to differentiate the approaches to
heritage and national identity in Scotland and England, Scotland’s position within the
UK means that in reality the distinction between policies in the two countries frequently
blurs.

The next section situates the current approach to issues of national identity and cultural
diversity in museums in Scotland within the wider UK and international framework.

2.5.1 Museums, multiculturalism and cultural diversity

Between 1997 and 2010 ‘cultural diversity’ was the predominant term used to discuss
issues relating to cultural differences in the Museum Studies literature in the UK
context, seen most explicitly in Hooper-Greenhill’s (1997) Cultural Diversity:
Developing Museum Audiences in Britain. The issues of representing and engaging with
culturally diverse audiences are prominent in the museum studies literature in the UK
(Dewdney et al., 2012; Sandell and Nightingale, 2012; Sandell, 2007; Macdonald, 2006;
Littler and Naidoo, 2005; Littler and Naidoo, 2004; Macdonald, 2003; Sandell, 2002;
Sandell, 2000; Hall, 1999; Macdonald and Fyfe, 1996). It is also a significant concern
for researchers working in post-colonial societies such as Canada, Australia, New
Zealand and to a lesser extent the USA, where issues relating to indigenous
communities have combined with issues of migration (Harrison, 2010; Sherman., 2008;
Bennett, 2006; Pieterse, 2005; Macdonald, 2003; Witcomb, 2003; Szekeres, 2002;
Young, 2002; Murphy, 1999; Lidchi, 1997; Simpson, 1996; Karp et al., 1992; Karp and

The 2001 UNESCO Universal Declaration on Cultural Diversity define the term as
follows:
Culture takes diverse forms across time and space. This diversity is embodied in the uniqueness and plurality of the identities of the groups and societies making up humankind. As a source of exchange, innovation and creativity, cultural diversity is as necessary for humankind as biodiversity is for nature (2001:13).

In the UK context, this broad discussion of diversity was specified further, with the Museums Libraries and Archives Council (MLA) in England defining cultural diversity between 2004-2010 as:

The range of visible and non-visible differences that exist between people. These differences include those relating to ethnicity and race, class, intellectual and physical ability, urban and rural living, faith and gender, sexuality and age (MLA, 2004).

Definitions such as these, which go beyond questions of ethnic difference, were the subject of criticism due to their breadth, epitomised in Holden’s view that ‘everyone is now a minority group’ (2006:1).

It is important to note that in Scotland the definition of cultural diversity in cultural policy during this period is significantly different. The terminology of diversity is frequently used in Scotland’s Cultural Strategy between 2000 and 2006 to refer to regional and linguistic differences, specifically issues regarding Gaelic. Explicit discussions of ethnic or religious differences are notable in their absence, which shows a distinct departure from policy in England. However, in the Scottish Arts Council’s Cultural Diversity Strategy 2002-2007, the definition centres on ‘minority ethnic communities, particularly those from South Asian, Chinese, African and Caribbean backgrounds.’ Although it was acknowledged that provisions for the protection and promotion of Gaelic could also be covered by the strategy, the SAC made the case that this was already covered by separate policy elsewhere. This difference in definitions is confusing, although could be considered a somewhat typical feature of the arms-length model of cultural policy in the UK, where strategy is developed across multiple organisations working towards different agendas, rather than in response to a singular, government-dictated set of objectives (although arguably the National Performance Framework in Scotland provides a greater deal of structure than previous models of government). Thus ‘cultural diversity’ in Scotland at this time appears to centre on discussions of ethnic difference and must be understood as subtly different from broader recognitions of differences in society in Scottish public policy.

7 Note the Scottish Arts Council was replaced by Creative Scotland in 2010
Although the definitions of diversity in English cultural policy appear broader in definition, the focus of much of the literature on heritage and ‘cultural diversity’ at the level of the UK still focused on issues of ethnic and religious difference. The reasons for this focus can be attributed to the fact that the term ‘cultural diversity’ gradually replaced the highly politicised term ‘multiculturalism’ from the late nineties onwards, although this change in terminology was by no means uniform.

‘Multiculturalism’ originated as a both a term in Canada in the early 1970s and was used to refer to public policy that recognised the importance of cultural differences, in contrast to previous ‘assimilation’ immigration policies (Joppke and Lukes, 1999:3). The term can be used to describe both ‘a society characterised by cultural pluralism’ (i.e. as solely a descriptive term) or as political ideology which ‘celebrates cultural variety…and may be contrasted with assimilationist ideals’ (Marshall, 1998). In Europe, the term is particularly used in discussions of how to address the impact of migrant communities. As such, the term has been widely understood to be concerned with concepts of ‘race’ and ‘ethnicity’ in the UK, and increasingly encompasses concepts of religious differences as well, seen particularly in debates over Islam. As we saw in Chapter 1 however, multiculturalism as a political doctrine is increasingly being challenged (Kymlicka, 2010; Joppke, 2004; Kundnami, 2002).

Questions over the effectiveness of cultural diversity initiatives have been raised across the political spectrum, both within and outside of museums. In September 2005 Trevor Phillips, then Chair of the Commission for Racial Equality8, gave a speech entitled ‘After 7/7: Sleepwalking to Segregation’ (Phillips, 2005). The speech marked a turning point in debates in cultural diversity and positive action, with Phillips arguing that current policy approaches to the ‘problem’ of ethnic minority communities were in danger of further isolating those groups, by treating them as essentialised and separate. These criticisms resonate with those of Munira Mizra, Director of Arts, Culture and the Creative Industries for the Mayor of London, who has argued that cultural diversity initiatives have led to further segregation, exclusion and inequalities in British society (Mirza et al., 2007). Such debates illustrate what Holden (2006) sees as the ‘crisis of legitimacy’ that was a feature of cultural policy of the UK Labour Government, which advocated culture as a valuable means of achieving socially instrumental outcomes,

8 Now replaced by the Equality and Human Rights Commission, which has a separate strand concentrating on Scotland, not to be confused with the separate Scottish Human Rights Commission.
whereby museums were envisaged as a tool to tackle social problems not only relating to issues of ‘race’, but also crime, poverty and poor health. These criticisms are seen in the Third Text Report for Arts Council England *Beyond Cultural Diversity: The Case for Creativity* (2010), which criticises the ‘tick-box’ approach to diversity and funding and is part of a wider movement towards an end to ‘identity politics’ (Fanshaew and Sriskandarajah, 2010).

Within the museum sector, the conference *From the Margins to the Core?* held at the V & A in 2010 marked a turning point in debates, with questions raised over the categories of ‘core’ and ‘margins’ that as we have seen in Ashworth et al.’s analysis above were a primary feature of approaches to cultural diversity under New Labour. The conference was opened by Journalist Gary Younge, who set the tone for the debate with his assertion that ‘what is categorised as marginal and what is understood to be core has, at its root, nothing to do with numbers and everything to do with power’ (Younge, 2012:106). Such criticisms were by no means new. Indeed, one of the Parekh Report’s key criticisms was the issue of ‘concentration on marginality that leaves those at the centre unchallenged’ (Parekh, 2000a: n.p.). Critics have argued that the social inclusion approach to cultural diversity in museums does little to challenge pre-conceived ideas of a ‘national heritage’ (Ashworth et al., 2007; Hall, 2005; Littler, 2005; Naidoo, 2005; Pieterse, 2005; Szekeres, 2002; Young, 2002; Walsh, 1992). As Littler and Naidoo (2005; 2004) have argued, current approaches that target the margins serve to re-establish the dichotomy between ‘white past/homogenous present’.

Discussing these issues in relation to the devolved context in the UK, Jones argues that the distinction between what she terms ‘majority-white-indigenous’ heritage and ‘minority-“non-white”-immigrant’ heritages is problematic as it ‘allows multiculturalism and cultural difference to be situated outside of the constructed core of these normative national cultures’. Consequently, the ‘core underlying homogenous national heritage is maintained, with the problem of cultural difference located…in terms of “non-white” post-1945 immigrant multicultural heritage’ (2005:95). She argues that heritage organisations in the Scottish context should do more to disrupt this dichotomy, by focusing on diversity within the core, an argument that is returned to later in the discussion.

2.5.2 The cultural diversity sceptical turn
A number of theorists have challenged the ‘celebratory’ approach of existing cultural diversity initiatives, which does little to challenge deeper structural issues. These critics
are not challenging the value of ‘diversity’, but rather the simplistic way in which these issues are frequently addressed. This criticism is found in both Wendy Brown’s assessment of ‘happy multiculturalism’ in the Museum of Tolerance and Macdonald’s motif of the ‘happy hybrid citizen’ (2008:56), which she states is an all too common feature of museum displays on diversity and particularly migration:

Too often, however, it is reduced to a rather insubstantial formula of the smiling face accompanied by a text which shows multiple cultural affiliations—a liking for chapattis and hip hop and Manchester United (Macdonald 2013: 185).

Macdonald argues that such displays ‘Crystallise rather than dissolve a division between migrants and non-migrants’ (ibid). A key concern in this research is the question of how audiences respond to such representations that explicitly and often clumsily attempt to explore ideas of identity and difference. A prime example of this from beyond the museum context is the reaction to Danny Boyle’s London 2012 Opening Ceremony, which, while praised for its inclusion of stories such as the Empire Windrush and its use of volunteers representative of the population of London to depict Blake’s nineteenth-century England, was notoriously criticised by one Conservative MP as ‘lefty multicultural crap’ (Watts, 2012). Throughout this work I highlight the issues surrounding what are increasingly labelled ‘politically correct’ representations and the way in which young people who grew up under Labour’s policies are well-versed in the language and principles of cultural diversity and thus conditioned to ‘read for’ such messages. However, throughout this thesis I argue that this familiarity with ‘happy multiculturalism’ does not necessarily mean that individuals necessarily adopt such views, as we will see in Chapter 8 in particular.

The next section examines the way in which current policy in the UK, including Scotland, appears to be moving beyond the tokenistic approaches of cultural diversity ‘initiatives’ towards a more integrated approach to issues of cultural equality.

2.6 From Diversity to ‘Equality’ and ‘Intercultural Dialogue’

In 2010 a shift occurred in the language used to discuss issues of cultural difference in the UK context from that of ‘cultural diversity’ to the broader principle of ‘equality’. The introduction of the UK Equality Act in 2010—which is applicable in Scotland—
saw a further shift from issues of ethnic and religious diversity to a much wider range of ‘protected characteristics, including:

- Age
- Disability
- Race
- Gender
- Religion / belief
- Sexual orientation
- Transgender / gender reassignment
- Pregnancy and maternity

The Equality Act replaced the previously separate legislation on race, sex and disability and, as with previous legislation, it places a requirement on all publically funded bodies in the UK, including museums to promote equality and work towards overcoming barriers that may be faced by individuals from these groups.

The change in legislation was a response to both increased scepticism of cultural diversity initiatives and an attempt to acknowledge the intersecting ways in which categories such as ‘race’ and class may affect discrimination. However, the degree to which this new legalisation will change existing museum approaches is debatable. Nightingale and Sandell acknowledge in their introduction to *Museums, Equality and Social Justice*: ‘Equality and diversity are closely linked; there can be no equality of opportunity if difference is not understood, taken into account of, valued and harnessed’ (2012:3).

Changes in UK approaches have occurred in parallel to a movement toward ‘interculturalism’ in the European context, seen most clearly in the 2008 EU initiative *European Year of Intercultural Dialogue*. The language of ‘dialogue’ is significant, and marks an attempt to rectify the issues identified with ‘multiculturalism’ and the ‘community of communities’ (Parekh, 2000a) approach which has been criticised for failing to establish links between communities. Bodo identifies that while the way in which museums have engaged with approaches to intercultural dialogue varies, the key principles centre on attempts to ‘encourage increased knowledge and greater recognition

---

9 It is important to note that in Scotland additional guidelines exist regarding the protection of Gypsy/Scottish Traveller communities, who are not covered under existing UK definitions of ‘race’. 
of “other” cultures’ (2012:182). In contrast to strategies that focus on migrant communities, intercultural approaches aim ‘to promote a “knowledge orientated multiculturalism” directed principally at an autochthonous public’ (2012:182). Drawing on Bennett (2006) she identifies a key problem with this approach however, which is that the ‘other’ becomes an object, rather than a person with whom we can engage in dialogue. As such, these approaches serve to reaffirm the concept of a ‘dominant culture’ from which cultural variations are considered deviant. These criticisms of current intercultural approaches echo debates amongst political theorists, who question the wisdom of replacing multiculturalism with the somewhat vague language of ‘interculturalism’, which does not appear to offer a radical alternative (Brahm Levey, 2012; Meer and Modood, 2012; Werbner, 2012; Wieviorka, 2012).

2.7 Place and Reflexivity
An alternative approach that appears to be gaining popularity in European museum practice are displays that seek to focus on destabilising the relationship between the margins and the core by deconstructing the concept of nations as ‘fixed’ and homogenous prior to twentieth-century migration, instead emphasising the longstanding diversities within places. The examination of the heterogeneous nature of place, rather than targeting specific ethnicities, appears to offer a potential solution to some of the issues raised in relation to the essentialisation of difference discussed in this chapter. In Mason’s (2013) proposition for a ‘cosmopolitan museology’ her use of cosmopolitanism is distinct from Macdonald’s use of the term to refer to ‘deterritorialised memory’ (2013:186). Mason suggests that rather than being made redundant by societal changes caused by globalisation, postnationalism and cosmopolitanism, museums, though their collections extend beyond national boundaries, have the ability to show the diversity within nations. She advocates a cosmopolitan approach to museum practice, that does not discount the importance of place and particularly locality, but rather encourages a ‘reflexive awareness of ones’ “own location”’ (2013:47). Mason’s cosmopolitan perspective offers a useful toolkit for developing individuals ‘reflexive sense of self’, so that individuals are not just asked to accommodate the ‘other’, but rather required to re-examine the ‘self’, a position that is far more flexible and robust in an age of constantly shifting boundaries of ‘self’ and ‘other’.
Evidence for attempts within the UK museum sector to move towards this ‘place-based’ approach can be seen in the case of the permanent displays *Galleries of Modern London* at the Museum of London (Ross, forthcoming; Suggitt, 2010) and *Destination Tyneside* at the Discovery Museum, Newcastle, while the development of a new Migration Museum for Britain also seeks deconstruction of ‘settled’ notions of place (IPPR, 2009; Stevens, 2009). Similar approaches can also be seen in European museums. Describing the ethos behind the exhibition *Becoming a Copenhagener*, a historical examination of the city, Parby discusses the curatorial intention to encourage visitors to reflect on what he terms the ‘pervasive mobility’ of the city since it was founded and the impact that ongoing population movement has had on the identity and identifications of its inhabitants (2014: n.p). In developing the exhibition, the curatorial team actively engaged with political debates on migration in Denmark. Parby notes that a key motivating factor was the desire to provide an alternative discourse of migration and its long-standing contribution to Danish society to that found within political rhetoric since the 1980s. By highlighting the ‘cosmopolitan’ nature of Copenhagen since its earliest beginnings, the curators hoped to move debates about immigration away from discussions of migrant communities as a threat to Danish culture and society, and instead create a historical understanding of the role that migrant communities have played in the formation of modern Denmark. Indeed, while stressing the importance of curatorial ‘objectivity’, Parby explicitly states that a key curatorial aim was to ‘correct’ what he describes as public misunderstandings of Copenhagen as homogenous prior to the twentieth century, by providing a counter-argument to the dominant political discourses in Denmark.

It is important to note that with the exception of the plans for the Migration Museum, all of these displays are city museums. The stories told within them show the longstanding ‘global’ nature of these places, built as centres of trade and now home to individuals from all over the world. The question remains as to whether this strategy of deconstructing particular places can be generalised to a discussion of the nation. Do visitors understand the experience of cities as just one example of the way in which all places have been affected by population movements? Or are cities seen as the exception to the rule, their ‘cosmopolitan’ status undermining any claim they may have to represent the ‘nation’. These criticisms were certainly apparent in the BNP leader Nick Griffin’s comments that London’s ethnic diversity meant that it is a city ‘that is no longer British’ (Hazelton, 2009).
Mason identifies further challenges for this ‘place-based’ approach. She argues that museums have ‘the potential to demonstrate the contingent and constructed nature of contemporary nations, *if* they are reframed and interpreted through a reflexive and cosmopolitan perspective and *if* the visitor is inclined, enabled and encouraged to “read for” such an account’ (2013: 42). The success of ‘place’ as an alternative paradigm within which to address issues of identity and belonging therefore lies in the degree to which visitors seek out museum representations that reaffirm, rather than challenge or disrupt their identity. The thesis therefore builds on Mason’s theory by providing empirical evidence of how individuals respond to attempts to deconstruct ‘homogenous’ and ‘fixed’ conceptualisations of the nation.

### 2.8 Conclusion and Issues for Consideration

This chapter has identified a number of pertinent issues that must be considered when attempting to understand how individuals may respond to attempts to re-imagine the nation in plural terms. We have seen that there is a movement within current museum practice in some European countries towards representations of place that aim to disrupt the concept of the nation as ‘fixed’ and homogenous. We have also seen that one proposed method of encouraging visitors to engage with these ideas is through interpretative strategies that encourage visitors to critically reflect on their own sense of identity and feelings of belonging. However, existing research on the importance of consistency and stability to individual’s sense of self raises considerable challenges regarding the degree to which museum visitors may embrace this ‘reflexive’ position and respond positively to plural representations of place.

Throughout this thesis I argue that in order to gain insights into how individuals may respond to these issues within the museum environment, it is first necessary to gain a greater understanding of how individuals negotiate these issues beyond the museum walls. Throughout this thesis I examine how young people responded to deliberate attempts to challenge their existing definitions of nationhood, through analysing the narrative strategies individuals utilised in order to ‘manage’ these challenges to their identity and thus adapt or reject alternative definitions of nationhood. As we will see in the discussion chapters, while those who were already inclined to identify with ‘multicultural’ and ‘inclusive’ representations of identity responded positively during the research and found the opportunity to re-evaluate their preconceptions a useful and
even enjoyable experience, those who sought to maintain their existing sense of identity employed strategies of resistance in order to reject challenges to their sense of self.

The importance of place was fundamental to understanding these responses. While Chapter 4 seeks to understand this finding by considering the role of place in shaping identity and feelings of belonging, the next chapter outlines the way in which the research was designed in order to examine how the lived and imagined experience of place influenced young people's responses to issues of identity and belonging.
Chapter 3. Methodology

This chapter outlines the methodological approach of this study which centred on the use of visual material in conjunction with traditional qualitative interviews and focus groups with young people, alongside exploratory interviews with teachers. Drawing upon literature from childhood studies, sociology, geography, anthropology and heritage studies, this chapter examines the advantage of these approaches for analysing the way in which individuals construct and utilise concepts of heritage, as well as highlighting some of the methodological limitations and the impact this had on the research findings.

This chapter proceeds as follows. Firstly the epistemological and ontological position of the research is outlined through an examination of the theoretical issues surrounding the study of identity. It identifies the importance of methods that prioritised participants’ subjective experience to the principles of the research and highlights a number of issues that are pertinent in research with young people. It explains why visually-mediated focus groups and interviews were chosen as appropriate methods for generating narrative responses to questions of identity. The second half of the chapter provides a detailed account of the methodology used to conduct the research and analysis of the fieldwork material. Finally, important contextual information about the schools worked with during the research is highlighted.

3.1 Researching Identity

As we saw in Chapter 2, identity has long been established as a legitimate field of enquiry. Despite the acknowledgement by researchers working in postmodern, poststructuralist and postcolonial paradigms that identity is a ‘constructive process’ (Lawler 2008), a number of theorists have highlighted a lack of reflexivity over the way in which the topic of ‘identity’ is utilised in qualitative research.

Brubaker (2004) argues that researchers need to apply greater levels of critical analysis to the way in which identity categories such as ‘ethnicity’, ‘nationality’ or ‘race’ are used in the research process and the way in which the use of these terms may influence discussion. Similarly, Mann argues that researchers play an active role in co-producing how identity is discussed in an interview, suggesting that the qualitative interview operates as a reflexive form of interaction (2006: n.p). ‘Identity’ should therefore not be approached as a fixed topic of discussion that can be neatly captured and analysed.
through research, but rather as a process that emerges through narration (Anthias 2002: 495). Methodologies that rely on presenting participants with a range of pre-determined identity categories, even if they are given the option of rejecting them, reduce the opportunities for studying the way in which individuals construct their own sense of identity. Ideally, the researcher should therefore avoid limiting the way in which participants can narrate their own sense of self.

The research design therefore focused on methodological approaches that prioritised the subjective experiences of participants and allowed respondents to talk about their social worlds in their own words. This approach was in keeping with interdisciplinary approaches to young people that emphasise the need ‘to try and understand children as social actors in their own right’ (Scourfield et al., 2006:29).

3.1.1 Qualitative research methods: Focus groups and interviews

Focus groups and interviews were the primary methods used to conduct this research. Researchers working with younger participants frequently advocate the use of interviews and focus groups, as they allow children to express their own experiences and opinions in their own words, directly to the researcher (Scourfield, 2006). They also give the opportunity to explore the motivations and belief systems behind behaviour and statements.

Focus groups are an interactionalist method that seek to explore how issues are constructed or changed both through and in response to group dynamics and discussion (Flick, 2009:205). Morgan argues that the key advantage of focus groups is the way in which the interaction of the group produces insights that would not be seen in individual interviews (1988:19). Focus groups were therefore identified as a suitable methodology for understanding how concepts of identity and heritage are produced through social relations. However, focus group methods are less suitable for identifying the views of individuals and it is for this reason that they are used here in combination with small group interviews. Qualitative interviewing is grounded in an interpretivist epistemology (Heath et al., 2009:80). As such, it ‘emphasises the subjective meaning of social action, and therefore gives priority to seeing the world through the eyes of those who are being researched’ (ibid). For this reason, qualitative interviews are the most commonly used research method employed in youth (ibid). The strengths of both these approaches can however only be realised through an acknowledgement their limitations.
The success of both interviews and focus groups lies in the verbal abilities of the respondent. This is an issue that is just as relevant for adults, particularly when considering the complex language frequently used by researchers. As Anthias (2002) points out, using terminology that is commonplace in academic discourse, rather than language that is more familiar to participants, is likely to hinder the research process. However, this is an issue that becomes more pronounced when working with younger participants who may not yet have the vocabulary or confidence to express themselves. For this reason a number of studies argue that research with children should avoid traditional forms of qualitative research commonly used with adult participants such as individual interviews and focus groups (See Aitken and Wingate, 1993; James, 1990). Acknowledging these criticisms, the research design focused on methods that eased the pressure on participants to express themselves verbally by introducing other activities that would stimulate discussion, rather than simply asking participants to respond directly to questions throughout the entire discussion. For this reason, ‘visual research methods’ were used alongside traditional focus group and interviews.

3.1.2 Visual research methods
Within educational research the use of visual material alongside more traditional qualitative research methods is increasingly common (Woolner et al., 2009; Thomson, 2008). ‘Photo elicitation’, also known as the ‘photo-interview’ or, the more convoluted ‘visually mediated encounter’ originated in anthropology and has since become common in other disciplines as a means of generating verbal responses, either through group activities or one-to-one discussions (Woolner et al.,2009). Collier and Collier argue that this approach is useful for studying how individuals use resources to construct narratives because the ‘potential range of data enlarges beyond that contained in the photographs themselves’ (1986:99). Harper, an anthropologist and advocate for photo-elicitation, suggest that the method offers insights into participants’ experiences that are inaccessible through verbal interviewing alone. He suggests that this method generated meaningful responses as ‘images evoke deeper elements of human consciousness than do words’ (2002:13). He suggests that photo-elicitation offers an opportunity to bridge understandings between the researcher and participant by providing something tangible which both parties can reference when attempting to create understanding (2002:20). However, he also advises caution, observing that visual methods can generate research findings ‘that beg for greater theoretical and substantive significance’ (2002:19). These concerns are shared by Pink, a visual anthropologist, who advises caution when using photo-elicitation, arguing that ‘it is not simply a matter
of asking how informants provide ‘information’ in ‘response’ to the content of the images. Rather, ethnographers should be interested in how informants use the content of the images as vessels in which they invest meanings and through which to produce and represent their knowledge, self-identities, experiences and emotions’ (2007). She stresses that informants are responding to images selected by the researcher, which therefore adhere to the researcher’s perception of reality and hold particular sets of meanings. Consequently she emphasises the need to establish the different understandings of the images held by the researcher and participant through the interview process (2007:84).

A key precedent for this study was Scourfield et al.’s (2006) research into Welsh children’s constructions of national identity. They stress that the most important method of researching children’s identification with the nation is through studying verbal expression. They therefore used a mixed method that employed the use of a number of visual stimuli in order to generate the participants’ narratives about national identity. In the initial focus group they used ‘visual prompts’ including a map, a video clip from the Welsh Tourist Board and postcards in order to stimulate discussion (2006:33). They also varied the style of the discussion by combining activities such as asking participants to complete a sentence, selecting and sorting cards to describe their identity and writing their own suggestions down. This mixed-method approach was closely followed in the development of the methodology.

3.2 Researching Heritage and Identity
Two studies conducted from a museum and heritage studies perspective were influential in shaping the methodological approach of this research. The first of these was Mason and Baveystock’s (2009) study of the Icons of England website. The Icons of England project aimed to stimulate debate over what it means to be English through asking visitors to vote on what constitutes the national heritage of England. This was achieved through displaying a series of images and asking people to post comments underneath them. Mason and Baveystock’s research analysed the online responses and debates that the images instigated and considered these responses in relation to wider discourses of English and indeed British national identity.

The study provides a useful precedent for the study of public, rather than institutional, definitions of national identity and heritage. Particularly interesting is the way in which
the methodology allows for the study of the differing meanings that the online participants attribute to the images. As Mason and Baveystock highlight, a cup of tea may simultaneously represent England’s colonial history and also signify the comfort and companionship associated with the act of drinking (2009: 25). The study is particularly useful from a museum education perspective, as it demonstrates the way in which visitors to the site ‘resist’ what might be considered the preferred reading of certain images, as the example of tea drinking shows. Rather than offer radical new perspectives on the definition of English national heritage and identity, the majority of contributors to the site appear to focus on the familiar and comforting, rather than on ideas that challenge their pre-existing definitions of Englishness, a finding that as we see in later chapters resonates with the responses of the participants in this study. Unfortunately, due to the nature of online research of this type, little background information is available on the participants beyond the online comments. Further qualitative research would therefore be useful for helping us to understand why individuals respond in this way to attempts to deconstruct national identity.

An alternative approach that offered a potential means of investigating how self-identity shapes responses to institutional narratives for this study was Paris and Mercer’s (2002) research into the relationship between museum objects and identity formation. The study aimed to understand why certain objects became significant for individuals; a topic which they assert has received little empirical investigation. The research focused on visitors responses to a series of photographs of objects from the museum’s collections, apparently selected at random. In doing so, the researchers hoped to study the way in which engaging with objects ‘sparks memories, self-discoveries, and prior experiences that are personally meaningful (2002:402), processes that they link to identity construction and confirmation. In the pilot study, the researchers gave visitors a set of photographed objects and asked participants to give them a rating on a number of different identity ‘topics’. These were all pre-determined, rather than offered by the participants. They included questions about what gender they associated with the object, the time-period or generation they attributed it to and whether they connected the object to a particular ethnic or racial group. They were also asked whether the object made them think about themselves or their family.

We can see problems with this approach if we return to the ideas discussed about the use of pre-determined identity categories at the beginning of this chapter. Rather than
follow the process by which individuals construct their own understandings of identity through objects, the use of pre-determined categories imposes a restrictive framework that gives little value to the meanings attributed by the individual that do not fit within these categories. This is in contrast to the responses obtained in Mason and Baveystock’s study, where although the participants were asked to consider the images in relation to national identity, the nature of the internet message board allowed commenters to discuss the images with a much greater degree of freedom. Through this approach, it was possible to see the other aspects of self-identity that visitors felt were relevant when discussing national identity, such as the intersection of local and national identity.

Recognising the limitation of their first approach, in Paris and Mercer’s second study, participants were shown another set of objects and asked to sort them into categories that were significant to them. However, the researchers found that rather than participants drawing upon what might be called the ‘traditional’ identity categories found in social science research, such as nationality, religious identity, ethnicity, gender, class or sexuality, they instead sorted the images in relation to taxonomic categories that typify museum displays, such as ‘technology’ or ‘transport’. The participants were replicating the pre-existing categories that they witnessed in the museum displays, rather than discussing the types of identities that the researchers were primarily interested in. This finding illustrates the challenges that may arise when participants attempt to guess the goal of the researchers and adapt their responses accordingly.

This study is useful for highlighting key problems with using images in studies on identity. Caution should be exercised when attempting to generalise findings on the basis of image selections without further investigation into the meanings attributed to each image. Further interviews are therefore necessary in order to understand how and why certain images were chosen and whether the goals of the researcher are understood by the participant. The methodology used by this study builds on both of these methodologies, taking into account the limitations identified in their respective approaches.

3.2.1 Exploring identity in museum practice
Ideally, this research would have also considered young people’s reactions to existing museum displays, in addition to the group activities and interviews conducted in schools. However, due to time and financial restraints this was not a possibility. The
importance of studying a wide variety of locations meant that it was not feasible to bring students from across Scotland to a single museum display, while studies of different museums would have made comparisons difficult. Instead, I drew upon existing museum practices in the construction of the methodology. This was not an attempt to replicate the museum experience, which may elicit very particular responses, but rather a means of gaining insights into how young people respond to the sort of topics addressed by museums.

Two examples from museum practice in Scotland were particularly useful in shaping the methodology. The first was the film ‘One Nation, Five Million Voices’ (See Figure 9), produced by the National Museum of Scotland. The film features individuals discussing their response to questions such as ‘what is your identity?’ and ‘what do you like about living in Scotland?’ In the museum, the accompanying text asks visitors to reflect on their own sense of identity and think about their responses to the questions asked. The film is available as a learning resource both on the museum website and on the Scottish school intranet Glow. For this reason I decided to use this film as a stimulus for the initial discussions about national, local and other forms of identity.

Figure 9 ‘One Nation, Five Million Voices’ in Scotland: A Changing Nation, National Museum of Scotland. Photograph by Lloyd, reproduced with permission of National Museums Scotland (2009)
The second example that was influential in shaping the methodology was the displays in the gallery *Scottish Identity in Art* at Kelvingrove Art Gallery and Museum (see Figure 10).

![Figure 10 Panel from Scottish Identity in Art, Kelvingrove Art Gallery and Museum. Photo by Lloyd, reproduced with permission of Glasgow Museums (2011)](image-url)
The gallery explores the myths and realities surrounding Scottish identity through the display of its most iconic images. It aims to engage visitors in debates about national identity by asking how they feel about popular elements of Scotland’s heritage, such as traditional dress, Highland landscapes, and historical figures such as Robert Burns, through the interpretation text (See Figure 12) and a touch screen interactive, which shows different people discussing what Scottish identity means to them. The displays surrounding the theme of ‘Tartanalia’ appear to reflect most clearly the wider debates in the Scottish political sphere over heritage and national identity discussed in this chapter. The gallery features two images that were significant in shaping the methodological approach to this study. The first of these is *Mr Singh’s India*, which we saw in Chapter 1. The second is Ron O’Donnell’s photo-collage *The Scotsman* (1987), a piece that examines the stereotypes of a Scot as a tartan wearing, beer drinking, football watching male. The accompanying text asks visitors how they feel about such an image of Scotland. Visitors are asked to write down their thoughts about the version of ‘Scottishness’ on display in this piece and the gallery as a whole and these are on display for other visitors to comment and reflect upon. During an internship in the education department I witnessed Learning Assistants asking young people to reflect on the different representations of Scotland and Scottish identity in these images and to consider which they felt was more accurate, or indeed what they would include instead. The interpretative approaches used in both these galleries were perceived as useful methods for introducing the topic of identity and therefore the research design drew inspiration from both displays.

### 3.3 Research Design

Two forms of visual stimuli were chosen for this research: film and photographs. As discussed above the One Nation, Five Million Voices film was perceived as a useful way of introducing the topic of identity. The wide variety of ‘hyphened’ and ‘nested’ identities used by respondents in the film were perceived to be a good way of introducing the topic of identity and encouraging the participants to be as creative in their responses, rather than simply selecting from a list of categories pre-determined by the researcher. Interestingly, some participants commented that they had not thought of describing themselves using terms such as a ‘Gael’ of ‘Hebridean’ prior to watching the film but felt these were useful identifiers. This is a good example of the way in which the research method may have influenced the findings and this has been taken into account in the analysis.
The second visual stimuli was a selection of 60 photographs, each chosen to examine particular types of identity or discourses about what heritage in Scotland could be. The images were primarily sourced from SCRAM, an online learning database that provides access to museum, library and archive collections. These were supplemented by my own photographs and images sourced from the internet. Specific images were chosen because they were felt to represent particular types of aspects of identity such as ethnicity, religion, national, local, linguistic, class and political identifications. In addition, images that are stereotypically associated with ideas of Scottish heritage such as tartan, haggis, bagpipes, thistles, castles and lochs and glens were all included, alongside aspects reflecting contemporary life, such as sport and modern buildings. Alongside these were images that were deliberately chosen to facilitate discussions of migration and ethnic and religious difference. Many of these images were chosen as they reflected material found in existing displays in Scottish museums. Examples of these images can be found throughout the discussion chapters.

Although I was keen to understand what meanings the participants attributed to the images, it is important to state this was not the primary purpose of the photo-sorting exercise. Discussing the use of images in their methodology, Scourfield et al. explain that whilst the choices that the participants made in these activities were of interest, their methods were designed to facilitate narrative responses of the children; the visual prompts used were secondary to these findings. They state that: ‘It was the child’s discussion of this exercise that interested us more than quasi-quantification of the responses’ (2006: 33). Following this approach, the photos in this study were used to introduce very specific subjects to the group discussion. This created difficulties, as whilst I did not wish to impose my own meanings on these images during the research process, I could not remain objective and simply record the conversations that naturally occurred surrounding each image. I shaped participants’ responses through both the language I used to refer to certain images and by focusing the discussion on the images that I felt were significant for this study, such as those related to ethnicity and religion. A more objective approach would have been to listen to which images participants talked about. However, given the very tight time parameters of the study it is possible that this approach would have resulted in only a handful of images being discussed.

3.3.1 Researching with young people
The research design was primarily a pragmatic response to a number of ethical and practical concerns surrounding the discussion of ideas of national identity and cultural
difference in a classroom environment. As with all research, the study was a necessary balance between what was theoretically interesting and what could be practically achieved.

Researching with young people in particular presented a number of practical challenges. Scourfield et al. argue that ‘researchers studying anything other than a topic that is strictly about schooling should of course have reservations about school-based research on children’s views’ (2006:34). They note that ‘questions of timetabling, time constraints and absenteeism all impinge on the quality of the data, as do classroom norms. These norms include the positioning of adults in the teacher role, gendered peer-group interaction...and of course, children’s expectations of acceptable discourse within the school’ (Scourfield et al. 2006:34). All of these factors emerged as issues in this research. The next section provides an overview of the practical issues addressed by the research design and highlights the way in which these issues shaped the methodology and subsequent findings.

3.3.2 Gaining access to schools
Gaining access to schools was very difficult. Initially a wide range of schools were identified on the basis of pupil demographics. However, while a wide range of schools were contacted across Scotland through letters to head teachers or school administrators it quickly became apparent that this method was unsuccessful. Instead, I approached teachers identified through existing networks. Further schools were then identified through ‘snowballing’ techniques. This resulted in the bias towards Edinburgh schools in the research. The pupils at these schools were also from a similar range of socio-economic backgrounds. The findings should be viewed in light of both of these issues. Once teachers had been contacted and confirmed that they were interested in the research, permission was sought from the school management and/local education authority as required. This process caused significant delays in the research project, particularly in the case of the Glasgow school.

The aim of the study was not to be statistically generalizable but rather to investigate the way in which the experience of place shaped young people’s responses to questions of national identity and belonging. Six groups of young people from five schools participated in the research. The schools approached to participate in the research were chosen as it was believed that they would generate interesting results based on their specific geographical area. This echoes Scourfield et al.’s study of Welsh children’s
national and local identities. Their selection of six schools aimed to represent ‘diversity of life of Wales’ (2006: 32). The researchers therefore selected schools that represented the ‘socio-economic, ethnic, geographical and linguistic character of their various locations’ (ibid). The locations of the schools in this study are by no means representative of the whole of Scotland, however they do offer a broad geographical spread, covering the Highland and Islands, the Central Belt and the Lowlands, all of which are associated with particular regional identities, and encompass both urban and rural locations. This comparative focus offers a unique contribution to knowledge by going beyond studies on national identity and ethnic diversity in Scotland that have predominantly focused on single location studies in the major urban centres of Glasgow and Edinburgh.

While more schools from a greater variety of areas would have no doubt produced even more interesting results, the number of schools I was able to work with was restricted by both the practical costs of conducting fieldwork and the contacts that I was able to make. This was a weakness in the methodology and the results here should therefore be viewed in light of this bias. Nevertheless, the responses gained in this research have been both fascinating and extremely diverse, as we will see shortly.

3.3.3 Choosing an appropriate methodology for classroom and age group
The methodology was developed in consultation with the teachers from the Scottish Borders, where the pilot study took place, and Barra, both of whom I knew through personal contacts. Exploratory interviews were conducted with both of these teachers in order to identify appropriate age groups for the research and to choose methods that would resonate with existing classroom practice. Through these conversations the appropriate age group were identified as 13-14 year olds, and 16-17 year olds. Both teachers felt that these age groups would be most suitable primarily due to greater flexibility in the curriculum in these age groups. This range of age groups presented a challenge for the research design, as the methods chosen needed to be suitable for a wide age range. The research method also needed to accommodate the variations between young people’s abilities. In order to meet these requirements, the activities and basic questions in the research were kept the same for all groups and can be found in Appendix C and D. The complexity of follow-up questions varied however based on my perceptions of participants’ verbal abilities and interest in the topic.
Suitable subject areas were also identified as History, Modern Studies and Religious, Moral and Philosophical Studies. Both teachers felt that the research would contribute to the learning outcomes of the Curriculum for Excellence in these areas. The impact of the subject of the lesson in which the research took place on participants’ responses is considered later in this chapter.

3.3.4 Limits on pupil and teacher time

Time restraints meant that it was important to develop a methodology that would not cause too much disruption to the existing timetable for both teachers and pupils. The exploratory interviews indicated that teachers would be more likely to agree to the research if they were not required to do any significant preparation work beforehand, or the time spent on the research would not result in gaps in pupils learning. Fieldwork therefore needed to take place within regularly scheduled class time, making the maximum length for the group discussions between 1½ to 2 hours during a double period. The research also needed to be designed in a way that would allow for a comfort break and sufficient changes in activities to keep participants’ attention for a sustained time. During the gap between periods I offered participants a chance to talk freely to one another while I set up the next activity, although I reminded them that the research was still being recorded. These informal conversations provided many useful insights, as participants often spoke more freely about difficult topics. For ethical reasons I decided not to include this material here, however the insights gained have informed the analysis.

In order to minimise disruption the fieldwork occurred over two sessions in consecutive weeks, with the group discussions taking place in the first week and the follow up interviews the next. This caused problems, as some of the young people identified for interview were absent in the second session. It also limited the number of young people who could be interviewed, as the short length of the session meant that a maximum of three small group interviews could be conducted at each school. In total, I visited each school four times:

1. Exploratory interviews with teachers,
2. Introductory session with consent forms
3. Group activity and discussions
4. Interviews

These repeat visits gave me some useful insights into the wider school environment and indeed the neighbourhood. However, these brief encounters did not provide me with as
much contextual information as I would have liked and I relied heavily on further supplementary information from the teachers gained during the informal exploratory interviews before and after the research.

3.4 Research Method
This section outlines the research method used. It also identifies some of the challenges encountered during the research and considers the impact that the chosen methods may have had on the findings.

3.4.1 Selection of Participants
A key goal of this research was to establish the way in which young people conceptualise national identity in their everyday experiences. It was therefore important to gain insights into the way in which every day social interactions shape understandings of national identity. As such, I did not want to form artificial focus groups through selecting participants on the basis of particular characteristics such as ethnic or religious group. Instead, I was more interested in studying how the peer groups within the classroom environment influenced the nature of the discussions. For example, how do the views of young people who are all from a similar ethnic background differ from those who attend a school with individuals from a variety of different ethnic backgrounds or nationalities? These differences have formed a key part of the findings and subsequent analysis, as we will see in later chapters.

Although the specific classes were selected in collaboration with the teachers at each school, the participants in this study were self-selecting. It was essential to obtain consent to carry out the research not only from the relevant educational authorities, school management and parents, but also from the participants themselves. Youth researchers such as Hopkins (2010) have problematized the issue of obtaining consent from younger participants, raising questions of the level of comprehension of the research and its potential implications, as well as the agency of young people and the degree to which they feel able to say no to researchers. Cohen and Manion summarise the main issues regarding applying for informed consent from younger participants as: competence, voluntarism, full information and comprehension (1994:350). Significant attention was paid to the way that the research topic was introduced to participants to ensure that they were clear from the outset of what the research entailed and how the
findings would be presented, as well as their freedom to choose to leave the study at any point.

3.4.2 Consent
The teacher sought parental permissions for all pupils in their class (See Appendix A) and those who had permission were then asked personally if they would like to participate. A week prior to the research I introduced myself to the class and gave them some contextual information about research in general, explained why they would be filmed and recorded and what they could expect in terms of confidentiality. They were told that the research was investigating issues relating to Scotland and that the study was examining the opinions of young people in Scotland (See Appendix B). The information given at this stage needed to be sufficiently vague so as not to influence the participants’ responses, however it was important that the young people had some indication of the research topic. Following this, they were asked if they would like to participate in the research and fill in a consent form (Appendix B). Only those who agreed to be filmed were asked to take part in the research. Whilst it would have been possible to involve these pupils by asking them to remain off-screen during the group activity, this caveat enabled the selection of a much smaller group, although it may have excluded some participants with interesting responses.

3.4.3 Group discussions
Focus groups work most effectively with small groups so that discussions can be easily moderated and to allow all individuals a greater chance for participation. In contrast to group discussions, focus groups tend to be guided by a facilitator, and this method was deemed most appropriate given the classroom environment and the precedent for a teacher to ‘lead’ the session in this context. For this reason 6-12 participants took part in the focus groups as it was felt that working with a full class of between 25-30 pupils would be unmanageable within the research context. However, in the case of the second Edinburgh State School group this was the only option available.

The focus group began by asking participants to think about their identity. This first exercise was completed in isolation, with participants asked to record their written answers in secret without talking to their peers. By asking participants to undertake this first activity in private, I aimed to build their confidence in responding during the group discussions, by having something they could refer to. By keeping these responses private, it also allowed those who expressed difficulties in describing their identity to keep these feelings private if they wished. It also provided insights into the identities of
those participants who did not say very much during the research, acknowledging the issues described above regarding the issues with verbal research methods with this age group.

Participants were asked to respond to three questions, each worded slightly differently in an attempt to generate a broad definition of how young people positioned themselves, without simply asking them to describe a national, local or other form of identity:

1. Write down on a post-stick note how you would describe yourself to someone you’d never met before. You can write down as many things as you want.

2. Are any of the things that you have written down more important to you than the others?

By asking the question in this way I was able to get a broader sense of participants’ sense of self beyond the specific topics of interest to the research. The implications of this are considered further in Chapter 4.

The third question focused on issues of place identity explicitly. This topic was introduced by showing participants the first minute of the *One Nation, Five Million Voices* film described above:

3. These people were all answering the question ‘what is your identity?’. They said things like ‘Scottish’, ‘British’, ‘Scottish Glaswegian’, ‘Scottish Traveller’, ‘a Shetlander’, ‘Hebridean’, ‘English but feel Scottish’. I’d now like you to write down your answer to the question

The film was humorous in places and therefore served as a useful icebreaker to begin a discussion about the written responses. Participants were asked if they wanted to share their responses with the group and the conversation focused on what they found easy or challenging about describing their identity. The full list of prompt questions can be found in Appendix C.

In the second exercise, participants were given the following written instruction, which was identical for all groups:

Imagine you’ve been asked to select some images to show someone who has never been to Scotland. You are going to use the images to tell that person about Scottish culture, history and daily life. Choose ten images that you feel summarise Scotland.
All research influences and shapes the responses of participants and the method used in this thesis is no exception. In the pilot study it became apparent that this question was somewhat contradictory, as it asked participants to consider both their own personal views and the imagined responses of an outsider. However, despite being a potential flaw on the research design, it provided extremely useful insights.

Although initially the young people focused on outsider perspectives, the group discussions moved between ‘insider’ and ‘outsider’ definitions of Scotland, with the latter position frequently utilised as a means of discussing more difficult concepts regarding ethnic diversity. For this reason, the question was used throughout the research, with greater attention paid to teasing out the views of ‘self’ and the perceived ‘other’ in the follow up questions.

Although participants were asked to only choose ten images due to time constraints, they were allowed to choose more images if they requested to do so on the condition that they explain why those additional images were so important. This often led to far more nuanced responses than some of the other justifications for image selections.

The second part of the image selection exercise asked the young people to identify which images they would possibly use to describe Scotland in particular circumstances. This exercise was undertaken after participants had already discussed their initial responses in the first exercise, including why they had overlooked certain images. They therefore had significantly more time to look at every picture and listen to the meanings attributed to them by others. With the exception of the initial pilot study in the Borders, the instructions for the second and third parts of the exercise were combined as follows:

Now I’d like you to spend a couple of minutes looking at the images you didn’t choose.

Put a question mark (?) next to any images that you might say are Scottish

Put a cross (X) next to any images you don’t think are Scottish.

You can put as many crosses or question marks as you want.

This change was made as it became apparent in the pilot study that many respondents placed question marks next to images that they later requested to exclude. Participants were reminded that they had the choice to either put a cross or a question mark. No restrictions were placed on the number of images that could be chosen for this exercise
as I wanted to generate as much discussion as possible about these images. Importantly, participants were reminded that all the images could be considered relevant to Scotland before undertaking this exercise. That a significant number chose to exclude images was an important finding therefore and is investigated in Chapter 6.

### 3.4.4 Recording fieldwork

The group discussions were recorded using audio and film equipment in order to provide as accurate an account of the discussions as possible. The use of film in addition to audio recording made the transcription process easier, allowing the correct voice to be attributed to each participant. This was important given that the classroom environment was noisy and the participants had a habit of talking over each other. It also made it easier to capture the discussions that the participants had amongst themselves. This meant that during the selection activity I was able to observe the interactions and responses of the young people from further away, which enabled them to communicate more naturally than if I was stood over them with a clipboard.

The film also allowed me to gain additional information that was not available from listening to the recording alone. For example, I was able to record how the participants encouraged each other to consider certain images through pointing, or how certain images came to be overlooked as the participants tended to cluster together, looking at what other people had chosen, rather than looking at every single image independently. This supplementary information has been very useful for offering additional perspectives in the analysis. For example, rather than assume that participants deliberately avoided discussing some of the more controversial images, as discussed in Chapter 8, it is possible to assert that in many cases participants simply had not noticed such images, as other people blocked access to them or photos got accidently moved. These additional insights have been recorded in the transcription process where they were deemed relevant, a process that was of course highly subjective.

It must be stressed that the primary material used for analysis was the resulting verbal narratives transcribed from the audio and film recordings, rather than this ‘visual’ material. The use of film has become an increasingly common ethnographic approach in anthropology and is the basis of other methods such as Interaction Analysis. As visual researchers who work with film stress, analysis of this material is highly subjective and therefore difficult to use in empirical investigations. Jordan and Henderson (1995) identify that a tendency to engage in ‘ungrounded speculation’ about the motivations behind individuals’ actions when analysing non-verbal communication in research
films. They argue that collaborative viewing is the only effective means of addressing the subjectivity of the researcher. They suggest that if multiple researchers conduct the analysis there are fewer tendencies for the researcher to ‘see’ what they are conditioned or want to see in interactions of the participants (1995:45). They stress that films produced for this purpose should be made available to the wider research community in order to provide verification of findings where necessary. While these conditions represent best practice in visual research, they could not be met within during the scope of this project. Given the highly sensitive approach to film and photography of young people in the UK it was felt that stipulating that images of the participants would not be circulated in environments beyond the researcher’s immediate control was essential. Not only did the inclusion of this caveat in the research explanation make the study more attractive to teachers with concerns about these issues and thus help gain access to schools, it also helped to address issues of anonymity and confidentiality in the research process.

All participants were made explicitly aware that the research would be recorded and filmed prior to signing their consent forms through verbal and written explanation and their attention was drawn to the recording and camera equipment at the start of the workshop. Initially the presence of the camera made some participants self-aware, evidenced by individuals staring at the camera and positioning themselves in front of it or pulling faces during the selection activity. This self-awareness may have had an impact on whether they felt at ease discussing their ideas. However, generally as the sessions progressed the awareness of the camera was less apparent.

Following the focus group I reviewed the written responses and watched the films in order to identify participants who might have interesting additional insights, either because their opinions were unusual or representative of the wider group discussions. This approach echoes the work of Scourfield et al, who stated that in their researched the focus groups ‘functioned as a platform from which to draw a sample of children with something interesting to say about themselves and their identity choices to take part in individual interviews’ (2006:33). Potential interviewees were selected in consultation with the teacher on the basis of the opinions they had expressed, either verbally or in their written answers or the images they had chosen. In making this assessment, teachers frequently provided useful background information on the pupils, such as where their parents were from or whether they had expressed opinions in the past that were relevant to the research questions.
Whilst this information was highly useful in both managing group dynamics and facilitating a better understanding of the participants’ behaviour, it is important to note that the opinions of the teachers may have influenced my approach to young people’s responses and therefore my analysis of the data. The degree to which I was able to prioritise the worldview of my participants is therefore brought into question.

### 3.4.5 Small Group Interviews

Short, semi-structured interviews were used with a smaller number of participants to provide additional insights into their decisions and comments in the group activity. In total 35 participants were interviewed across the study. 4-6 pupils were interviewed at each school. Interviews only took place with participants who had given permission to take part in further research. All participants were given the option of revising their decision following the group activity or to request an interview if they had previously declined. This option meant that roughly half of the participants from each of the groups were available for interview.

Interviews were conducted in pairs or threes, as it was felt that one-on-one interviews might be intimidating. These sub-groups were compiled after watching the group dynamics on the film and consulting with the teacher about any issues within the peer group. Most of the interview groups appeared to be friends, which helped create rapport and led to lively discussions between the interviewees in many cases.

Interviews took place within regular lesson time and thus had to be very short, lasting between 20-30 minutes. This approach has significant limitations, not least because the short length of the interview period left little time for in-depth discussion. However, the material generated from these interviews has been highly useful in ascertaining more contextual information about participants’ backgrounds, such as where their parents are from, where they grew up or their political beliefs, information that has proved highly useful in the analysis of the material.

At the start of the interview participants were reminded that their participation was voluntary and they did not need to answer any questions that made them uncomfortable. They were also reminded that I was filming and recording the research and that they could ask me to turn off the camera or recorder at any time. I also used this opportunity to ask if there were any points that they wished to clarify from the group discussions, or a topic that they particularly enjoyed that they wanted to talk about during the interview.
The interview schedule was a combination of standardised questions that were asked in the same order with each group, which were supported by additional follow up questions in response to young people’s answers (see appendix D). Participants were also provided with a list of the images they had selected in each exercise and asked to reflect upon their choices. The images themselves were also used as prompts if the participant could not remember what a certain image was or did not understand my verbal or written description of it. This also provided an opportunity to examine what meanings the participant had attributed to the images.

3.4.6 Ethics: Racism and the classroom environment
Ethical concerns were at the very heart of the research design and the study was designed in accordance with the British Sociological Association Ethical Guidelines (2002). Information was requested from teachers about participants, primarily to establish whether there were any issues with behaviour, learning difficulties or personal circumstances such as bullying. This contextual information was sought in order to ensure that participants were not put in a vulnerable position or made to feel uncomfortable during the research process.

From the outset I was concerned about the problems that could be encountered when encouraging young people to discuss cultural differences in the classroom situation. As an adult working in classroom environment I was particularly aware of the power I possessed to legitimate certain viewpoints, either through my failure to challenge them or by accidently agreeing with them through the use of affirmative language. As Mann (2006) identifies, the establishment of rapport is vital to the research process in order to put participants at ease; the researcher who seeks to challenge interviewees opinions rather than try to understand them risks undermining this rapport. It was therefore important the research method allowed careful monitoring of the discussion at all times so that any difficult issues could be examined immediately and action taken to minimise distress to other participants as quickly as possible. It was important for participants to feel comfortable to express themselves that ‘negative’ viewpoints would not be challenged directly, unless extreme language was used. Instead a strategy whereby participants were asked to explain why they held such viewpoints was preferable. This was a successful strategy for the small group interviews and led to many candid discussions.

A different approach was required for the focus groups, as the numbers involved and my relative inexperience in a classroom situation meant that closely monitoring all the
conversations taking place in the room presented a challenge. Discussions were held with teachers about how to address issues of overtly racist or otherwise derogatory language and it was decided that if participants were deliberately trying to be offensive then the teacher would intervene. Teachers agreed to keep a note of the discussion topics and raise any areas of concern with the group in their regular lesson time, after the research was completed. In cases where participants were less aware of the sensitive nature of their remarks, it was decided that an exploratory approach would be taken, asking participants to explain what they meant by their comment and asking others what they thought about it. In the majority of cases, the groups ‘self-regulated’, with other members telling them that their comments were insensitive or unfounded. However, in a small number of cases, particularly in the case of anti-Englishness, some comments were unchallenged by the group. In these instances, the group was told that these were issues that the teacher would talk about with them after the research and the discussion was moved away from the topic.

It is worth noting that in the case of the Scottish Borders School and the Glasgow School the teachers were unable to remain in the room as they had to supervise those who were not participating in the research in the adjacent classroom. In these focus groups the young people seemed more ‘open’ in their responses, as I witnessed fewer examples of participants ‘correcting’ themselves or awkward silences when a difficult question was asked, a finding which raises interesting questions regarding how participants in the other groups would have reacted had their teachers not been present.

At the end of the research, participants were asked if there was anything they wished to add that I had not asked them about, or if there was anything that they had said that they felt uncomfortable about. Participants were advised to contact me or the teacher if any issue that had been raised by either themselves or someone else that they found troubling. They were also informed that they could ask for certain topics to be removed from the transcript if they no longer felt they were accurate reflections of their views. In one instance, a participant asked me to remove a racist word he had used in the group activity that had not been shared with the wider group. While this incident was very interesting theoretically, it has not been discussed in this thesis for this reason.

It is importance to stress that, with the exception of this incident, language that could be perceived as overtly racist or derogatory was absent from the discussions and upon re-watching the films certain discussions could have been explored further without
creating significant issues. There were therefore some limitations in adopting this approach. However, I was nervous about discussing issues of race at the outset of the research and the considerable time spent thinking about the ethics of the project perhaps left me hyper-sensitive to areas of conflict. The final section of this chapter reflects further on the way in which the chosen methodology and my role as a researcher shaped the research and analysis.

3.4.7 Transcription and Analysis of Material
The fieldwork produced a considerable amount of complex material for analysis. Qualitative research software was initially used to analyse and code both the films and audio recordings immediately after the research had taken place in order to record initial impressions and additional insights gained from participant observation. The focus group and interviews were then transcribed using both the film and audio recordings in order to provide written transcripts. These were then coded by hand using highlighter pens using themes identified from the literature review, as well as additional themes that emerged during the discussions. The coded transcripts were then re-read whilst re-watching the research films, in order to ensure that comments had not been taken out of context or misunderstood, as written text does not convey the complexities of tone. This process was time-consuming, but has ensured that the personalities of the young people in the research remain present when analysing their narratives. The research films were revisited on several occasions during the writing in order to minimise the loss of context and nuance that can occur when analysing textual representations of individual’s verbal responses.

3.4.8 Reflexivity
As with any study, the responses generated during the fieldwork must be seen as a product of the methodology used. This impact must be considered in the subsequent analysis and conclusions.

An essential feature of any research project is the establishment of trust between researcher and participants. The young people in this study have trusted me to represent their views fairly and without judgement. Throughout the discussion chapters I have strived to represent the opinions and views of the young people in this study as accurately as possible. However, my interpretation of their words will always be subjective. Where I am uncertain as to the accuracy of my analysis I have highlighted this to the reader.
As identified in the introduction, my own identity has also had a significant impact on the research process. Although I have lived in Scotland for ten years, I grew up in the North of England, although I was born in Germany to English parents. At the outset of the research I described myself as a student at Newcastle University and explained that I lived in Edinburgh. Throughout the research I was careful not to describe myself as either English or Scottish, primarily because in my daily life I do not feel comfortable with either category, preferring to describe myself as someone who lives in Edinburgh and works in the North East of England. For this reason I am comfortable with categorising myself as British, a label that I feel encompasses my Irish ancestry and Welsh surname. However, these nuances were not immediately apparent to the young people in this study. Interestingly, based on the information given at the outset of the research and my accent (which frequently shifts, albeit unconsciously, between Scottish and English, with the odd Canadian inflection, the result of a year spent living abroad) I was perceived as English by some participants, Scottish by others, or simply as being from Edinburgh or Newcastle. All of these interpretations subtly influenced how participants responded to me and the questions asked, particularly when discussing how Scottish identities related to English identities.

It is of course impossible to objectively assess to what degree my identity had on participants’ responses across the study as a whole. However, at times the young people made explicit references to my identity and indeed questioned me on my own sense of identity when attempting to understand their own feelings of belonging and indeed differences from other peoples. Rather than attempt to remain a ‘passive bystander’ in such discussions I embraced these questions and offered up my own observations of my experience of moving from the North East of England to Edinburgh for them to consider further. While an interest in identity based on this experience was already a motivating factor for undertaking the project, the research process itself has led me to further evaluate my own sense of identity and feelings of belonging to and indeed ‘otherness’ within both these places. These mutual identity explorations between participant and researcher are included within the analysis in order to emphasise this reciprocal relationship and remind the reader of my role in influencing participants’ responses. Throughout the analysis I have highlighted instances where participants asked me about my identity or I shared information in order to assess if their attitudes would change.
My identity thus positioned me as both an ‘insider’, and an ‘outsider’ within Scotland. On the one hand, having a high level of knowledge about daily life in Scotland and current political and social issues enabled me to examine issues that were pertinent to participants and helped in the establishment of rapport. However, being seen as an outsider by some participants, either to Scotland or their locality, might have helped me to obtain information that participants would deem as being ‘obvious’ and therefore unnecessary to give to someone they perceived as Scottish. The discussions here should be viewed in light of this dynamic.

Having outlined the research methodology and the justification for the methods chosen, the next section provides important contextual information about the schools where the research took place.

### 3.5 Contextual information about schools

Table 2 provides an overview of the schools and outlines the timescale of the research and significant events that occurred that may have shaped responses to questions of identity.

**Table 2 Overview of school groups**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Total number of participants</th>
<th>Number interviewed</th>
<th>Date of research</th>
<th>Significant contextual information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scottish Borders (13-14 years old)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>February 2011</td>
<td>Research took place Religious, Moral and Philosophical Studies Class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Recent sectarian violence linked to Glasgow football clubs Rangers and Celtic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2011 Scottish Census-pupils had seen census forms and expressed interest in language politics e.g. Scots, Gaelic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Group Description</td>
<td>Age Range</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Edinburgh Private School | Older Group              | 16-17     | 2011 | February | 6   | Research took place during History/Politics Class  
Other contextual information as above  

| Barra                     | Younger Group            | 13-14     | 2011 | May    | 5    | Research took place during History/Gaelic Class  
Royal Wedding influenced discussions of Britishness.  
Scottish elections  

| Edinburgh State School    | Older Group              | 16-17     | 2011 | June   | 6    | Research took place during Modern Studies Class  
Other contextual information as above  

| Edinburgh State School    | Younger Group            | 13-14     | 2011 | June   | 7    | Research took place during Modern Studies Class  
Other contextual information as above As above  

| Glasgow                   |                          | 13-14     | 2011 | December | 5    | Research took place during History Class  
SNP officially launch independence campaign October 2011  
Preparations for London 2012 Olympics - discussions of Britishness  
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The next section provides an overview of the schools worked with during this research and highlights important contextual information that was relevant to the research findings. The importance of local experience in shaping social interactions was central to this research. However, it has been necessary to omit some important contextual information regarding the demographics of the schools and their local environments in order to preserve the anonymity of the young people who participated in this study (Hopkins, 2010:62-64). Despite attempts to remove key identifying factors without losing vital contextual information, these schools may still be identifiable to those with an intimate knowledge of the locations discussed. The balance between preserving anonymity and confidentiality has been assessed and it has been determined that due to the importance of the social, political and economic contexts to the study that this information is necessary.

3.5.1 Scottish Borders State School
The initial pilot study for this project was conducted in a small town with a population of 8,000 people in the Scottish Borders. The Scottish Borders have the highest proportion of individuals born in England of any area in Scotland.

In the 2011 Census 0.7% identified as White Irish, 1.1% described themselves as White Polish, while 1.7% came from another while ethnic background. 0.6% of the population described themselves as Asian, Asian Scottish or Asian British, while 0.7% described themselves as belonging to another ethnic group (General Register Office for Scotland, 2013). The participants in this group were all from white ethnic backgrounds. All the young people in this group were female, with the exception of one participant. This was due to self-selection for participation, as outlined in later in this chapter.

3.5.2 Barra State School
Barra is a small island in the Outer Hebrides (also known as the Western Isles), a remote group of islands off the mainland coast of Scotland, accessible by ferry or plane. The island has a population of just 1,174. The majority of participants in this group lived on Barra, although a small number lived on the neighbouring island of Vatersay. The islands are historically Gaelic speaking, and are one of the few places in Scotland where Gaelic is still spoken, Of the 57,602 people who stated that they could speak Gaelic in

---

10 The teacher at this school requested that the town was not named as this information would make the pupils at this school easily identifiable. Other identifiable information has therefore not been included.
the 2011 Census, 14,092 of these lived in the Western Isles (General Register Office for Scotland, 2013).

Language politics were a pertinent issue for many of the participants in this group, as discussed in later chapters. Religion plays an important part in many communities in the Western Isles—the northern Islands of Lewis, Harris, North Uist are predominantly Protestant, whilst the southern islands of Benbecula, South Uist and Barra have large Roman Catholic communities. The school followed the Roman Catholic Religious and Moral Education syllabus of the Scottish Curriculum for Excellence, which puts a stronger emphasis on the Christian faith than the non-denominational syllabus. Specific census data on ethnic minority populations is not available for the island, however, for the whole of the Western Isles, 0.5% identified as White Irish 0.2% identified as White Polish, 1% belonged to another white ethnic background, 0.5% identified as Asian, Asian Scottish and 0.4% identified with another ethnic group (General Register Office for Scotland, 2013).

3.5.3 Edinburgh State School

Edinburgh is the capital of Scotland and is the second largest city. The 2011 Census recorded the population of Edinburgh as 476,626 (General Register Office for Scotland, 2013). Edinburgh has the second largest population of ethnic minorities in Scotland. The 2011 Census recorded that 16% of the total minority ethnic population of Scotland (including those from white ethnic minority groups) live in Edinburgh, constituting 18% of the total population of the city (General Register Office for Scotland, 2013). People from Asian backgrounds are the largest ethnic minority group at 5.5% of the total population, while White Polish account for 2.7%, White Other 5.1%, White Irish 1.8% and those from Other ethnic groups making up 2.8% (ibid).

The Edinburgh State School is situated in the most ethnically diverse council ward, south of the city centre and close to the University and the Central Mosque. The school also has a high number of Gaelic speakers, as it shares a catchment area with the Gaelic medium primary school.

Two studies were conducted at this school. The first group, referred to throughout this study as the ‘Edinburgh State School Older Group’ was made up of Highers students who were all taking Modern Studies at Higher level. All of the participants in this group came from a white ethnic background, which was unusual given the demographics of the school.
The teacher at this school asked me to return and conduct the research with her younger class, as she felt that the discussions with the older group had been very beneficial. The second group at this school is referred to as the ‘Edinburgh State School Younger Group’ throughout the research. This was a much larger group of twenty-seven pupils, from a much broader range of ethnic backgrounds, as Chapter 4 outlines. The size of this group made discussions in the group activity extremely difficult and for this reason the comments made by this group during the image selection exercise are not referred to throughout the discussion in later chapters, as they could not be easily attributed to specific speakers. However, the small group interviews produced many fascinating insights, particularly because of the unique ethnic make-up of this group, as we will see shortly.

3.5.4 Edinburgh Private School
This fee-paying, residential school is located in an affluent area of Edinburgh, although the majority of its pupils are from other areas of the UK or overseas. The participants in this group were A-Level students taking Politics and History. Although the school is co-educational, only one participant in this group was female. The majority of the participants in this group who identified as Scottish pupils came from other areas of Scotland, or had family who now lived overseas.

Emphasis was placed on the importance of the school’s military history, with all pupils required to undertake military training and many going on to further service. During visits to Ypres to visit war graves as part of the History and English syllabus, pupils were encouraged to find the names of former pupils, further cementing the importance of serving in the British Army to the school ethos. This may have had a significant impact on the young people’s identification as British, as we will see in the next chapter.

3.5.5 Glasgow State School
Glasgow is the largest city in Scotland with a population of 593,245 at the 2011 Census (General Register Office for Scotland, 2013). Glasgow has the largest proportion of ethnic minorities in Scotland totalling 24% of the total minority ethnic population of Scotland (ibid). 17% of the population come from ethnic minority backgrounds. Of these, the largest is those who identified as Asian, Asian Scottish or Asian British at 8.1%, followed by those from Other ethnic groups, who make up 3.6% of the population. 1.1% of the population are identified as Irish, 1.4% as Polish, and 2.4% as ‘White Other’ (ibid). The school is located in the Maryhill/Kelvin area of the city, of
which the largest minority group are those from ‘other white ethnic’ backgrounds (Glasgow City Council, 2012).

3.6 Impact of lesson context on young people’s responses
As stated above, the lesson context within which the research took place varied across the schools. The groups who participated in this study are not a representative sample and therefore the impact of the subject area on the discussions cannot be accurately measured, although this would be an extremely worthwhile avenue to pursue within a larger research project. However, some interesting themes did emerge throughout the research and these are considered here.

In two of the groups that took place in history classrooms (Barra and Glasgow), references to important Scottish historical figures featured prominently within the discussions. The classrooms in both of these schools featured images on the walls relating to the Wars of Independence, a prominent topic within the Scottish History curriculum, as discussed in Chapter 9. Although participants did not make direct references to this material, there can be no question that this environment had a significant impact on the perceived status of certain images. It is also reasonable to speculate that participants expecting a normal history lesson were more likely to approach the research task from a historical perspective and thus assess images based on their historical significance, rather than their contemporary relevance, an issue that is apparent in the discussions in Chapter 6 in particular.

Interestingly, in the case of the Edinburgh Private School, where the classroom itself was used for both history and politics and the majority of participants took both subjects, discussions were slightly different. It is important to remember that these participants were following the A-level History curriculum and therefore the focus on Scottish history was minimal. The images on the walls in this classroom focused on ‘British’ history, with posters relating to the Second World War and student work analysing the rise and fall of Thatcher dominating the walls. This emphasis on politics and, in particularly, the role of the Conservative party in British history, can be clearly seen in the responses of the young people from this group. It is also tempting to attribute the ‘lack’ of a distinctly Scottish dimension to the curriculum as a contributing factor to the tendency amongst this group to define themselves as British, rather than Scottish, as Chapter 4 illustrates.
Two of the groups took place in a Modern Studies class, where the classroom walls were covered in student work relating to issues in social housing and comparative studies of government structures between the UK and other countries. It was interesting to note that in the discussions within both these groups there was a strong focus on questions of citizenship, rather than ethnicity, when assessing identity claims. Participants from this group were also the most vocal in their views on Independence, which were conveyed in a nuanced way and focused on social issues, avoiding arguments based on historical precedence, as seen in the Borders, Glasgow and Barra groups. It is worth remembering that both of these groups were within the same school, so it is impossible to separate the class context from the wider school ethos, which is discussed in detail in Chapter 8.

Discussions of cultural difference were a significant theme within the discussions of participants from the Scottish Borders, who took part in the research during a Religious, Moral and Philosophical Studies class. The walls of the classroom featured posters from the ‘One Scotland, Many Cultures’ campaign and specific reference to this material was made by two of the participants, potentially showing a heightened awareness amongst these participants regarding the ‘intended outcomes’ of the research and what responses were deemed ‘acceptable’ in this context. Questions of citizenship, Human Rights and issues relating to women’s freedom in other countries, an issue closely related to religion, were all topics featured in the discussions. This finding raises interesting questions regarding whether an educational emphasis on cultural differences fosters ‘empathy’ or merely ‘tolerance’, an issue discussed in Chapter 8.

As stated above, language politics unsurprisingly came to dominate the discussions of the Barra group, where the focus group took place within a double period across a History and Gaelic lesson. Two Gaelic teachers sat in on the research for alternate periods and, despite my attempts to limit their influence, raised points during the group discussion. This was most apparent during the discussion of the ‘One Nation’ film, when participants were asked how they felt about the Gaelic speakers. The teachers appeared embarrassed that the young people did not appear to understand the language or were uncomfortable discussing it and tried to prompt them into engaging by explaining. This intervention appeared to shift participants’ attention away from questions relating to ethnicity towards those that their teachers were interested in, an issue that highlights the difficulties of researching in the classroom, where the researcher’s autonomy may be limited.
While it is difficult to entangle the differences brought about by lesson context from other variables such as place and age group, the possible influence of the classroom environment has been taken into account in the analysis and instances where this context appeared pertinent are raised throughout the discussion chapters.

3.7 Conclusions
This chapter has provided an overview of the research design and considered the implications of this design on the findings. The use of qualitative methods in combination with visual stimulus produced rich responses, allowed participants to express their views and feelings in their own words. The combination of both group discussions and small group interviews allowed a broad range of opinions to be examined, while also providing opportunities for in-depth analysis. Wherever possible I have strived to represent the conversations that took place in full in the discussion chapters in order to show the complex and shifting nature of young people’s responses to the issues raised. The focus on multiple locations, rather than the experiences of young people in one place has also provided valuable insights into the way in which the experience of place shapes young people’s perceptions of the nation. The final chapter of this thesis examines some of the limitations of the methodology and considers the way in which the study could be expanded in order to examine the issues further.
Chapter 4. Placing the Self

While there is no doubt that “national” identity is a very strong component in people’s lives, there remains a key part of our being which sits at the level of the local. As a nation we sometimes forget that...what it means to be Scottish, or living in Scotland, tends to take precedence in these debates over what it means to be from or even just in any one of its constituent parts (West, 2012:76).

This thesis engages with Mason’s (2013) argument that museums have the potential to develop heterogeneous understandings of place and thus facilitate plural definitions of national identity, through encouraging a reflexive awareness of individuals’ own ‘location’. As Mason has already identified, the effectiveness of this approach lies in the degree to which individuals are willing and/or able to accept such definitions. Throughout this research the lived and imagined experience of place emerged as the most significant factor in determining whether young people accepted heterogeneous definitions of Scottish identity.

Throughout this research I assess the relevance of discussions of diversity at the level of the nation—by which I mean Scotland and the UK—to young people’s own experience of place and what it means to belong to that place. As we saw in Chapter 2, much of the discussion of heritage and cultural diversity in the UK context stems from England, with an understandable bias towards major urban centres such as London. However, I argue that discussions of ethnic and religious diversity as synonymous with British identity may have little resonance with an individual in Scotland who rejects being identified as British. Similarly, museum representations of cultural diversity in Glasgow or Edinburgh may be viewed as irrelevant to discussions of Scottish identity by an individual from the Western Isles who has never visited mainland Scotland and views such places as ‘other’. In contrast, individuals living in such ‘diverse’ places may reject the validity of their experience as representative of wider Scotland and instead seek to emphasise the homogenous nature of the country as a whole. In order to understand how young people’s experience of place shapes their response to issues of national heritage and identity, this chapter aims to contextualise the research findings by examining the
relevance of national identity to the way in which young people think about themselves. In doing so it contributes to my wider argument that, by understanding how individuals think about issues of identity and belonging in their everyday lives, we achieve greater insights into how museums can encourage visitors to develop a reflexive awareness of their own identity and the potential outcomes and challenges of this approach.

This chapter examines how the young people in this study located their identity through narratives of place. It thus provides important context for the discussion in the next chapter which will examine how young people negotiated the importance of place to their own sense of identity when evaluating the identity claims of others. Through analysing the way in which young people negotiated the importance of place to their sense of self, I identify the shifting importance given to national, regional, local and cosmopolitan identities and highlight the relational nature of these forms of identification. In doing so, I engage with theoretical approaches to place identities and examine what I argue is a false distinction between ‘parochial’ and ‘exclusive’ versus ‘cosmopolitan’ and ‘inclusive’ forms of place identification and feelings of belonging.

This chapter proceeds as follows. Firstly, the key themes in the literature on place identities are examined, before consideration is given to the specific issues relating to young people, identity and place. I then provide an overview of participants’ written responses to the questions ‘how would you describe yourself?’ and ‘what is your identity?’ and these responses are then analysed alongside additional insights gained from the focus groups and small group interviews. These findings are analysed thematically in relation to Scottish, British, local and transnational identities, while the final section examines the experiences of those young people who felt unable to assert an identity based on place.

4.1 Heritage, Place, Identity and Belonging

Experiences of the nation and definitions of national identity are locally situated. Our understanding of ‘who we are’ is linked to our sense of ‘where we are’. National identity is thus a product of local subjectivity (Dixon and Durrheim, 2000). Escobar asserts that ‘local knowledge is a mode of place-based consciousness, a place-specific (even if not place-bound or place determined) way of endowing the world with meaning’ (2001:153). This knowledge may be based on lived experiences of our ‘own’ and other places, or may draw upon imagined ideas of place formed through reference
to social networks and wider public discourse about places and their perceived characteristics. This point is beautifully illustrated in a conversation between two characters in Alasdair Gray’s novel *Lanark*:

‘Glasgow is a magnificent city. Why do we hardly ever notice that?’ ... ‘Because nobody imagines living here’ said Thaw … ‘Think of Florence, Paris, London, New York. Nobody visiting them for the first time is a stranger because he’s already visited them in paintings, novels, history books and films. But if a city hasn’t been used by an artist, not even the inhabitants live there imaginatively’ (1981:243).

Thus while we may have never visited a place, we may have very specific ideas about that place whether from the stories we hear from friends and relatives, from its depictions in literature, film and television, or even a more simple notion of ‘it can’t be like here’.

In attempting to understand how place identities are formed and sustained it is important to distinguish between concepts of ‘place’ and ‘space’. This is not to say that places have no relationship to physical space. However, the differentiation between place and space as analytical categories points to the way in which individuals actively construct places through self-conscious references to both the physical environment and, vitally, the people within it. Identity therefore plays a key role in turning spaces into *places* (Ashworth, 2007). It is important to remember, however, that ‘neither heritage nor identity are inevitably place-bound. Both can be, and frequently are place-less’ (Ashworth 2007:7). Both Ashworth (2007) and Cresswell (2004) remind us that while place remains an important icon of identity, there are many other aspects of individuals’ identities that have little to do with place.

### 4.1.1 Place and stability

Place identities are not inherent. Rather, just as history provides an essential resource in narratives of identities, the perceived attributes of a particular place and the people within it are utilised to construct and sustain place-based identities (Ashworth, 2007). Giddens argues that self-identity ‘has to be routinely created and sustained in the reflexive activities of the individual’ (1991:52). Through actively drawing upon concepts of place and heritage, individuals are therefore able to make sense of their own identities and position themselves in relation to wider collective identities. Like heritage, place may therefore provide individuals with a sense of ontological security. As Whitehead et al. argue ‘[p]lace is material for unstable identities: it is matter from
which, or in relation to which, geo-political and cultural realities are constructed, reconstructed and bordered’ (2012:14). If the nation is an ‘imagined community’ (Anderson, 1983), then its physical borders and documented heritage provide reassurance that it indeed ‘exists’. In a world of increased globalisation and ‘super-diversity’, place therefore offers both individuals and groups the possibility of a sense of continuity and cultural distinctiveness. While ‘place’ identities may be theoretically understood as constructed and relational, in individuals’ daily lives, place offers the opportunity for ‘ontological moorings’ allowing identity to be conceptualised as ‘fixed, solid and beyond question’ (Tilley 2006:11-12). It is precisely for this reason that many theorists view place identities as problematic, because of the tendency for ‘fixed’ definitions to generate ‘exclusive’ concepts of belonging.

4.1.2 Parochialism versus cosmopolitanism
Concern over the relationship between place identities and exclusive notions of belonging is well established in the field of geography. Cresswell identifies the problematic nature of place for many geographers thus:

the humanistic conception of place, which has been the predominant understanding of places since the 1970s, is simply too fixed, too bounded and too rooted in the distant past. As a consequence of these notions of fixity, boundedness, and rootedness, place often becomes the locus of exclusionary practices. People connect a place with a particular identity and proceed to defend it against the threatening outside with its different identities (2009:176).

For many theorists, place identities are therefore inherently exclusionary. Studies that emphasise the importance of local identities may consequently be perceived as perpetuating the ‘myth’ of a fixed and stable notion of place.

A key example of this critique is the work of Massey (1991), who argues that a preoccupation with the local inevitably leads to questions of belonging and consequently issues of exclusion. In her influential article ‘A Global Sense of Place’, she argues that attachment to place and locality has been conceptualised by progressive thinkers as a reactionary response to the insecurity and vulnerability brought about by globalization (1991: 26). As a geographer, Massey is highly concerned with boundaries and the way that they both construct and sustain notions of ‘them’ and ‘us’. Significantly for this study, she attributes what she terms the ‘introverted obsession with “heritage”’ to this exclusionary construction of boundaries’ (ibid). For Massey, place
identities can therefore be problematic. Consequently, she rejects the notion of a stable conceptualisation of place and instead proposes that we understand place as a ‘spatio-temporal event’. Massey’s work has been highly influential for those working in post-modern and post-structuralist paradigms. However, the value of such an approach is highly contested by many researchers working on issues of place and identity.

In his defence of the ‘parochial’, Tomaney (2013) argues that theoretical understandings of place attachment are often conceptualised in the binary terms of liberal cosmopolitanism versus illiberal localism. He is highly critical of Massey and the adherents of her theoretical approach for what he sees as their disdain towards feelings of local attachment and belonging. He suggests that Massey’s work is representative of a wider academic trend that stresses the importance of cosmopolitanism, rather than local or national identities, as the progressive solution to perceived essentialised and inward-looking notions of place. He argues that rejection of the local as a ‘modernist fetish’ fails to take into account the ‘formation and content of local identification, attachment and belonging and the role these play in the matter of dwelling’ [Original emphasis] (2013: 659). Although he correctly identifies that, in this paradigm, places are defined in relation to global networks and are not confined to pre-determined territorial boundaries, he is highly critical of the outcome of this approach (2011: 6). He is particularly sceptical of ‘relational’ perspectives that understand place to be a process rather than a fixed and stable point. He includes in this criticism Massey’s (2005) concept of the ‘throwntogetherness’ of place identities and Allen and Cochrane’s (2007) notions of ‘regional assemblage’ or ‘multi-actor topological geometry’. He suggests that assemblage perspectives are unhelpful for understanding local identities and concepts of belonging. For Tomaney, cosmopolitanism fails to appreciate the very real attachment to place experienced by individuals in the real world.

Such concerns are echoed by Tilley, who points to a fundamental problem with post-structural approaches to identity that seek to destabilise essentialised notions of place. He explains:

That persons and groups ultimately have no stable identity is a logical outcome of a non-essentialist position. Identity is transient, a reflection on where you are now, a fleeting moment in a biography of the self or the group, only partially connected
Similarly, Kockel (2012b; 2012a) challenges the use of the term ‘essentialised’ in discussions of place, belonging and identity. He queries the way in which ‘essentialism’ has become shorthand for an irrational preoccupation with the unchanging nature of place. He argues that an understanding and appreciation for the local does not necessarily mean a ‘parochial’ or exclusive approach to issues of identity and belonging. Rather, in his discussion of the role of ethnology in the understanding of human development, he suggests greater attention is required to the principle of Heimatkunde, which he defines as ‘the thorough appreciation of…one’s locality as a microcosm of the larger world’ (2012:59). He therefore cautions against cosmopolitan approaches that deny individuals feelings of attachment to place, arguing that such positions ignore the very real need for people to feel a sense of belonging and the benefits this may bring. As an ethnologist by training I share Kockel’s enthusiasm for the local and I hold the position that place identities are neither inherently inclusive or exclusive.

While theorists may seek to emphasise the fluid nature of identity and the constructed nature of place, beyond academia the desire to hold a ‘fixed’ understanding of place serves a very real purpose in allowing individuals to gain a sense of stability and coherency. For this reason, I draw upon Mason’s cosmopolitan approach to place that acknowledges the importance of the local. Macdonald’s (2009) use of assemblage theory in the study of place has also proved highly valuable to this research. For Macdonald, this approach is useful because it provides a more nuanced account of complex relationships such as between that of the ‘local’ and the ‘global’. Whilst Tomaney argues that the rejection of ‘scalar ontologies’ has led to a lack of empirical understanding of place attachment, Macdonald suggests that scalar models rely too heavily on pre-existing analytical categories. She argues that approaches that view the ‘micro nestling inside the macro, or the local inside the global’ fail to understand the fluid nature of such concepts (2009:118-9). She suggests that rather than dismissing concepts of place and local attachment as irrelevant, assemblage approaches seek to understand how such categories and divisions are produced and sustained (ibid). She argues that this approach is particularly useful when considering the role that heritage plays in shaping collective identities, suggesting that heritage provides a means of not only ‘assembling’ concepts of the local but also the cosmopolitan. Indeed, she argues
that heritage is itself a ‘global assemblage’. Throughout this research I therefore focus on the way in which individuals generate and utilise concepts of ‘heritage’ and ‘place’ in discussions of identity and belonging, rather than approaching these issues as pre-determined analytical categories.

The approach to place identities in this study therefore seeks to bridge the ‘parochial’ verses ‘cosmopolitanism’ divide through recognising the potential for place identities to produce fixed understandings of belonging while also acknowledging the benefits that a sense of place, on whatever scale, can bring to individuals. The next section identifies key issues regarding young people and place which have informed the approach of this research.

4.2 Young People, Place and Identity

Before examining the importance of place in the responses of the participants in this study, it is first necessary to consider specific concerns regarding young people and place—concerns which have been largely overlooked in the heritage studies literature. In doing so, I do not wish to conceptualise young people as some form of alien species whose views and concerns are vastly different from ‘the rest of us’. However, there are some features of adolescence, which although by no means universal, emerged as significant factors in this research.

In his book *Young People, Place and Identity*, Peter Hopkins (2010) argues that it is important to recognise the way in which young people’s experiences of place may be structured through interactions with peer groups, families and institutions such as schools. Referencing Horschelmann and Shafer (2005), Hopkins argues that while young people negotiate the global locally, young people are differentially positioned in local and/or global networks. This concurs with Massey’s concept of ‘power geometry’, which refers to the way in which ‘different social groups and different individuals are placed in very distinct ways in relation to flows and interconnections’ (1991: 25). Young people in particular may be more limited in terms of mobility than individuals from other age groups due to a lack of financial independence and the restrictions placed upon their movements by family, although (as we will see particularly in the responses of the young people from the Edinburgh Private School) this experience is by no means universal. Issues of class therefore also play a highly significant role in
limiting or expanding young people’s opportunities for experiencing places that are not ‘here’ and indeed shaping perceptions of ‘home’.

Age also plays a key role in shaping perceptions of place. The difference in responses between the younger and older participants in this study was significant, with the two older Edinburgh groups demonstrating a much more sophisticated and nuanced understanding of how their experiences related to other places in Scotland than the participants from Barra, the Scottish Borders and the younger Edinburgh State School group. This finding is supported by existing research on young people’s relational sense of place. Scourfield et al. (2006) suggest that children develop a more pronounced sense of ‘home’ and ‘away’ as they get older due to increased exposure to these concepts through immediate experience or public discourse about place. In their study of younger children, they observed that when talking about attachment to place, children were more likely to stress the importance of people in the place, e.g. their friends, than the place itself. They found that participants in their study had very little attachment to a particular place in terms of the physical environment, instead referring to the friends that they would miss if they were to leave. They therefore suggest that ‘inhabitants may reside in the same physical place but their salient points of self-identification are provided by their location within particular social, family and friendship contexts’ (2006:15). Consequently there may be considerable differences between the way in which individuals experience and think about the place and what it means to belong to that place.

The young people’s narratives analysed in this research show the very different experiences of ‘place’ attested to by individuals who not only live within relatively short distances from one another in global terms, but may even live in the same neighbourhood or street. Understanding these differences is vital if we are to comprehend the nuances in the responses discussed in the subsequent chapters, which build upon the initial analysis offered here. While some participants in this study had lived in multiple countries, had family members of various nationalities, holidayed abroad and spoke several languages, others had grown up in the same place as all their family members and had never travelled more than 50 miles from home. While the community on Barra was the most close-knit, with almost half the group related to one another, many of the young people from this group spoke to others from all over the world while playing computer games online and had a very broad spatial definition of
‘home’, encompassing vast distances between the island and Inverness, the nearest city. In contrast, the young people from Glasgow had a tendency to situate themselves within their immediate neighbourhood within the West End, viewing wider Glasgow as largely unfamiliar as it was beyond the area within which they themselves were permitted to visit unaccompanied. Edinburgh, meanwhile, was viewed by some members of this group as an ‘exotic’ land they had visited once on a school trip. Similarly, many of the students at the Edinburgh Private School had rarely left the grounds of the school unaccompanied and thus had little experience of Edinburgh or other areas in Scotland, moving between the school and family members’ homes overseas or in other parts of the UK during the holidays. Their experience of Edinburgh and indeed Scotland was vastly different from those at the Edinburgh State School, who lived in ethnically diverse neighbourhoods and frequently passed by the Edinburgh Central Mosque on their journeys into the city centre. As we will see, these differences in experiences were very influential in shaping how and why young people came to identify with, or indeed reject, their connection to particular places and the legitimacy of others’ claims to belong. The next section provides an overview of the responses given in the written identity exercise. It examines the importance of ‘being Scottish’ to young people by analysing the way in which young people identify with—or indeed distance themselves from—local, national and transnational identities and the situational nature of these forms of identification.

4.3 Overview of Self-ascribed Identities
Table 3 shows participants’ written responses to the questions ‘how would you describe yourself?’ and ‘what is your identity?’ These are reported here exactly as they were written down by participants, including any translations offered. Where young people referred to a place identity in response to the first question, this is indicated in bold.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Self-description</th>
<th>What is your identity?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scottish Borders</strong></td>
<td>Eilidh</td>
<td>Kind, friendly and crazy</td>
<td>Scottish!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sophie</td>
<td>English, over the top, chatty, kind</td>
<td>English and proud</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Amy</td>
<td>Quiet, lives in Innerleithen, friends matter a lot</td>
<td>Part Scottish part English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fiona</td>
<td>Funny, kind, quiet, easy to talk to, loyal, trustworthy</td>
<td>Scottish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lesley</td>
<td>Friendly, fun, quite shy, get on well with people</td>
<td>Scottish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beth</td>
<td>Like to laugh, try to get along with people, funny, happy</td>
<td>Scottish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lorna</td>
<td>Quite chatty, shy, like to hang out with friends</td>
<td>Scottish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kirsty</td>
<td>Quite quiet, friendly, enjoy meeting new people</td>
<td>I am very Scottish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paul</td>
<td>Fun, friendly, funny, 14 years old, Scottish</td>
<td>Scottish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sara</td>
<td>Crazy, funny, good sense of humour, help you if you are worried or upset</td>
<td>Scottish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Edinburgh Private School</strong></td>
<td>Ollie</td>
<td>Fun, likeable, friendly, caring, sporty, easy to talk to</td>
<td>English!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Crawford</td>
<td>Friendly, nice, chatty, shy, sporty</td>
<td>English with a little bit of Scottish in me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kieran</td>
<td>Lively, friendly, cheerful, tenacious, energetic, considerate, loud, argumentative, cocky, hard working</td>
<td>British primarily, but Scottish NOT English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Traits</td>
<td>Background</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlie</td>
<td>Generous, caring, meticulous, fun, disorganised, not always confident</td>
<td>British first/Scottish</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archie</td>
<td>Confident, fun but serious, hardworking, friendly, silly, outgoing, chatty, bad temper, helpful</td>
<td>Tricky, half Scottish, half English. London and Kent where English family from real home, but lived in Edinburgh so long</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fraser</td>
<td>Practical, realistic, intelligent, experienced</td>
<td>Scottish then British</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamie</td>
<td>Motivated to achieve success, sports, Scottish then Brandane</td>
<td>Scottish from Brandane</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sam</td>
<td>Fun, positive and impatient</td>
<td>English from Yorkshire</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ben</td>
<td>Relaxed, fun, smart, quite confident</td>
<td>Jersey Bean/English</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alistair</td>
<td>Relaxed, shy, sporty, caring, fun</td>
<td>A mixture of Belgian and Scottish/British</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claire</td>
<td>Enthusiastic, loud, fairly opinionated, easy to talk to</td>
<td>I am Northern Irish though I am also half English</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim</td>
<td>Nice, talkative, happy, friendly, shy</td>
<td>Irish but from Belfast</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Relaxed, positive, easy-going</td>
<td>English but feel 100% Scottish</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>Quiet, academic, mathematician, very British, very politically aware, solo</td>
<td>British from the Scottish Borders</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isla</td>
<td>Not too popular, but I like a good laugh and hanging around with my friends</td>
<td>A Scottish Islander or a Barrach (from Barra)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caitlin</td>
<td>Happy, friendly, funny, talkative</td>
<td>Barrach, Scottish</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donald</td>
<td>Active, enjoy sports, Scottish</td>
<td>Macleod, Elder, Scottish, Invernesian.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ewan</td>
<td>Nice person, like to mess around, like to have fun</td>
<td>Definitely a Scot, sort of Glaswegian gaidhlig Scot!?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Barra**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Likes/Talents</th>
<th>Nationality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ruairidh</td>
<td>Like making films, speak Gaidhlig</td>
<td>I am a gael, Tha mi than ghaeltachd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah</td>
<td>Love horses and want to be a vet</td>
<td>Scottish 50% English 50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erin</td>
<td>Shy, strange</td>
<td>Scottish Highlander</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>Like Art, PE and woodwork</td>
<td>English!!! And a little bit Scottish and Irish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tony</td>
<td>Scottish, live in Barra, like sports</td>
<td>Irish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simon</td>
<td>Quiet and I do not judge</td>
<td>Half French half Scottish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craig</td>
<td>Like sports</td>
<td>Scottish and proud</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finlay</td>
<td>Smart, kind, serious and funny</td>
<td>I’m Scottish and from Skye</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ross</td>
<td>Confident and outgoing</td>
<td>Scottish and proud</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fergus</td>
<td>Dedicated, musical, devoted, Gaelic</td>
<td>A Scottish Gael and a European</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stuart</td>
<td>Love sport, fairly shy, born and bred in Scotland and proud of it</td>
<td>100% Scottish even though my parents are English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jenna</td>
<td>Scottish, come from Edinburgh</td>
<td>Scottish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steven</td>
<td>Live in Edinburgh</td>
<td>Edinburgh born first, but for all intensive purposes I would say British</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandy</td>
<td>Quiet, positive</td>
<td>A Scottish Gael</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morag</td>
<td>Scottish, teenage girl, happy person and sociable</td>
<td>Generally describe myself as Scottish.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa</td>
<td>Kind, caring, hopefully fun to be around, loyal, trustworthy, sensible</td>
<td>Scottish/British in some circumstances, perhaps part Irish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexa</td>
<td>Very arty, fairly cheery, average intelligence, interested in politics, like animals, love reading</td>
<td>If someone asked I'd say Scottish but I feel more British</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Edinburgh State School 2 (13-14)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Chris</strong></td>
<td>Small, hilarious, young, Scottish, talkative, clever</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Abida</strong></td>
<td>Wanting the best, misunderstood, naïve, too trusting, sensitive, loving, good-hearted, loyal, Scottish, understanding</td>
<td>Scottish, Pakistani, Moroccan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hazel</strong></td>
<td>Weird, eccentric</td>
<td>I'm technically Scottish/Jersey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Calum</strong></td>
<td>Really like music and going to gigs, being with friends and family</td>
<td>Scottish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mariana</strong></td>
<td>Funny, intelligent, caring</td>
<td>Venezuelan living in Scotland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hannah</strong></td>
<td>Hilarious, funny, shy</td>
<td>I'd say my name not my nationality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Colm</strong></td>
<td>Your average person, Scottish, Irish</td>
<td>Half Irish half Scottish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rhona</strong></td>
<td>Friendly, laughs easily, slightly paranoid, a realist</td>
<td>Hebridean Ethiopian (crossed out Scottish)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kerry</strong></td>
<td>Truthful and artistic, Scottish, kind and funny</td>
<td>Scottish and a little bit Irish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Simone</strong></td>
<td>Musical, sporty, generous, dancer, funny understanding</td>
<td>Chinese but act more and born Scottish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Amit</strong></td>
<td>Chatty, bit fat, am Asian, am Muslim, I believe in God</td>
<td>Am Scottish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adam</strong></td>
<td>I find it difficult to describe myself</td>
<td>I don't feel I belong to anywhere, I would not say I belong to anywhere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chris</strong></td>
<td>Quite kind and caring, loud and outgoing</td>
<td>British, Scottish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>William</strong></td>
<td>From Edinburgh</td>
<td>Half South African but firstly Scottish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pria</strong></td>
<td>Shy, quiet, hardworking, English, talkative, honest, caring, friendly</td>
<td>British-English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Drew</strong></td>
<td>Sporty, tall, sense of humour</td>
<td>Scottish (city boy)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tony</strong></td>
<td>Mostly an optimist, enjoy doing things and keeping busy, friendly</td>
<td>Scottish with other heritage e.g. Irish and Scandinavian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Personality</td>
<td>Identity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gemma</td>
<td>Kind, friendly, sometimes shy</td>
<td>Scottish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rihanna</td>
<td>Confident, nice, respectful, welcoming,</td>
<td>Feel Scottish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>enthusiastic, sympathetic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kate</td>
<td>Intelligent, content, serious, active,</td>
<td>100% Scottish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scottish</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel</td>
<td>Alright sometimes, difficult, bit odd,</td>
<td>British</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>overly friendly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiona T</td>
<td>Quiet at first, but once you get to know</td>
<td>Scottish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>me I'm as loud as can be</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George</td>
<td>Cheerful, happy, down to earth,</td>
<td>I am Glaswegian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>understanding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>Loud and chatty, an open-minded person</td>
<td>I am Scottish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>British</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ian</td>
<td>Funny, lively, eccentric, loud</td>
<td>Glaswegian,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Scottish, British</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adele</td>
<td>Outgoing, loud, talk a lot, easy to</td>
<td>Scottish-British</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>get along with</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ryan</td>
<td>Confident, determined, easy to talk to,</td>
<td>Scottish first</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>good sense of humour</td>
<td>then British</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vicky</td>
<td>Friendly, fun, quite shy</td>
<td>Scottish and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Glaswegian</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As we can see, almost three quarters of participants chose to answer the first written question in terms of their personality, hobbies or interests, rather than describing themselves in terms of a national or other place identity. This finding concurs with Bechhofer and McCrone’s (2009) analysis of the Scottish Social Attitudes Survey 2001-2006, which found that, although being Scottish matters to individuals, other identities such as gender, class and personal relationships are ranked of higher importance in day-to-day life. While it might be tempting to assume in the current political climate that national identities are at the forefront of individuals’ minds, it is important to remember that identity is both relational and situated (Jenkins 2004). The salient aspects of our identity will therefore depend upon the context within which we find ourselves. As Reicher and Hopkins argue, ‘the use of national categories becomes viable and meaningful when it corresponds to and makes sense of the ways in which one’s
activities are structured and the way one is treated by others’ (2001:14). Although national identity did emerge as an important issue in the wider discussions and interviews, it is important to remember that other factors, such as a love of sport, were far more influential in young people’s daily lives than their nationality.

4.3.1 Place identities
The most frequent place identity participants used to describe themselves in the first written exercise was ‘Scottish’, which was used by eleven participants. Of these, four participants described themselves as Scottish in addition to another local or national identity. Three participants described themselves primarily in relation to the place that they lived, while two participants identified themselves as English. One participant identified himself as a Gaelic speaker, whilst one described himself as ‘very British’. Only one participant, Amit from the second Edinburgh State School group, chose to identify themselves in terms of an ethnic or religious identity, in this case as ‘an Asian and Muslim’. The lack of identification with religion was a recurrent theme throughout the research and is considered in later chapters.

Caution should be exercised when assessing the significance of the identities outlined in the above paragraph to the young people who used them. While it is tempting to suggest that these particular participants did consider their national, ethnic, religious or linguistic identity to be more important to their sense of self than other participants, it is important to remember that those who used place identity markers may simply have paid more attention to the description of the research and its focus on Scotland and responded accordingly.

4.4 Negotiating Place: National, Local and Transnational Identities
The fourth column in Table 2 shows the responses of the participants to the question ‘what is your identity?’ As Chapter 3 described, this question was asked after participants watched a film clip produced by the National Museum of Scotland showing other people describing their identity in national and local terms.

The responses to this question also concur with existing studies on identity in Scotland, with participants from ethnic minority backgrounds just as likely to identify as Scottish as those from white ethnic backgrounds (Bond, 2011; Hopkins, 2007; Hussain and Miller, 2006; Virdee et al., 2006; Saeed et al., 1999b). The vast majority of participants identified as ‘Scottish’ in response to this question, with thirteen young people
describing themselves as exclusively Scottish. Twelve described themselves as Scottish alongside their local identity and twenty-one described themselves as Scottish combined with another national identity, of which British was the most common answer (ten participants) followed by English (four participants). Four participants identified themselves as Gaels or Gaelic speakers, whilst three participants defined themselves as Scottish and Irish. Significantly, only one participant, Daniel from the second Edinburgh State School group, defined themselves solely in terms of a British identity, although a number of participants from the Edinburgh and Glasgow groups stressed the importance of their British identity in the discussions. This point will be revisited shortly. Similarly, only one participant identified with a European identity (Fergus from the first Edinburgh State School group) although a small minority made reference to a wider transnational identity in their narrative responses.

The second Edinburgh State School group showed the greatest variety in responses, with five participants identifying themselves in terms of nationalities from outside of Europe, including ‘Scottish, Pakistani, Moroccan’, 'Venezuelan living in Scotland’ and ‘Hebridean and Ethiopian’. The variety of responses in this group is not surprising given the demographic of the school catchment area described in the previous chapter, although it is interesting to note the difference in ethnic make-up between the two groups that participated from this school. It is also worth remembering that the teacher specifically requested that research should be carried out with this group due to what she described as the ‘high level of ethnic diversity’ in the class. Such variations even within the same school demonstrate the micro-differences of individuals’ experiences within places and help us to understand the variation in the young people’s responses.

4.4.1 Scottish identity

The frequency with which the young people in this study referred to themselves as Scottish confirms Becchofer and McCrone's assertion that being Scottish is highly important to people living in Scotland (2009:67). Significantly, given the issues raised at the start of this chapter, a quarter of participants saw ‘Scottish’ and ‘British’ as mutually exclusive categories and rejected any relationship between the two geopolitical entities. These responses stemmed primarily from the younger groups, with those from Barra and the Borders most likely to reject the British category.

Almost all members of the Barra group described themselves as Scottish to some extent in the discussions. The remoteness of the Western Isles may explain why participants from this group struggled to see the relevance of British identities. They frequently
discussed the mainland, by which they meant Scotland, as being very different to their way of life. The vocal minority of young people in this group found it difficult to imagine that people in England, and specifically London, had anything in common with them. This was a highly significant finding, given the assertions from some members of this group that issues of religious and ethnic diversity were not relevant to their way of life on the island, as we will see in later chapters.

The young people from the Scottish Borders were the most likely to define themselves solely as Scottish, with one participant describing themselves as ‘English’, and another as ‘English and Scottish’. Interestingly, none of this group identified with either a local or British identity. In contrast to other groups they attempted to reduce the ambiguity of their identity, preferring to define themselves in definitive categories. These findings are not surprising given the high number of pupils at the school who had English parents, and also the proximity of the town to the English Border. For these young people, the most significant ‘other’ when defining a place identity was England. Indeed, those who identified themselves as English migrants described having a heightened sense of Englishness since moving to Scotland. Interestingly, Wales and Northern Ireland were barely mentioned in the discussions of Britishness throughout this study. Britain was therefore largely synonymous with England for those that rejected the British label. The conflation of these two countries explains the responses of the young people from this group, as to choose a British identity was to identify with England, rather than assert their uniqueness and thus difference.

Issues of politics were very important in shaping young people’s national identifications. Although the research did not specifically set out to examine political identities, the intersection of place identities and politics emerged as a pertinent issue throughout the discussions and therefore form a key feature of the analysis. This may be attributed to the way in which political and social movements in Scotland currently overlap with discussions of national identity in the context of the independence debate; as Keily et al. observe ‘National identity is crucial to the ways much social and political action is organised’ (2001: 34). It is worth remembering that the fieldwork was conducted during 2011, the year of the both the Royal Wedding and the SNP’s landslide victory in the Scottish parliamentary elections. Questions of Britishness and the relevance of the current Royal Family to Scotland were frequently debated in the Scottish public sphere during this time. Based on the depth of the participants’ responses and their awareness of the complexity of the issues, I have no doubt that these
issues had been discussed by many of the participants prior to their participation in the fieldwork.

A large majority of those who identified as ‘Scottish’ were keen to stress that they felt that this was a ‘progressive’ rather than ‘exclusive’ identity choice. There was strong support among many who identified as Scottish for issues featured in the Yes Campaign, such as the dismantling of Trident and ending the involvement of Scottish soldiers in Afghanistan and Iraq, although this did not automatically mean that these young people supported independence. This is seen in the discussions of Rihanna, William and Rhona, 14 years old from the Edinburgh State School:

Rihanna: Well I want Scotland to be independent because Scotland does a lot for the UK but it seems like Westminster is getting all the credit. It’s not really fair and I think it would be better if Scotland was independent

William: Like Scotland, I don’t necessarily support independence, but it would be good if we were autonomous because if we had control of the military, we could declare wars but we could not go into wars. Then we wouldn’t go into all these stupid wars

Rhona: I’d probably prefer if we weren’t to become independent, but yeah, more powers would be good, but I don’t know, if we did become independent we’d probably lose out on a lot of stuff which we get from England, which we do

William: If we became independent we’d still have to share a lot of things with England

Rhona: Like the coastline

Rhona’s sharp interjections made the conversation with these young people very enjoyable and the reflections of this particular group are examined further in Chapter 7 and 8. Although Rhona’s comment was rather flippant, it points to awareness amongst these young people of the political constructions of divisions between people living in close geographical proximity. There was a strong sentiment amongst the Edinburgh State School groups in particular that whilst they were emphasising the differences between Scotland and the rest of the UK during the research, in practice the two countries had more commonalities than differences. This approach can also be seen in the responses of Isla, 14 years old, from Barra. Although related to an SNP MSP, she
was very sceptical of all politicians including First Minister Alex Salmond (See Figure 11)

Isla: I don’t get politics that much ’cause they just sort of argue and waste money. And David Cameron is, I think it was like most of England voted for Conservatives but one place in Scotland did, so it was kind of more England that choose it because, but because they had the majority of people

Kat: But then you also said you don’t like Alex Salmond, even though the SNP got lots of support at the last election?

Isla: It’s because he wants Scotland to be independent, and not everyone in Scotland really wants that, ‘cause then we’d kind of be all on our own and then we’d be like in trouble if anything happened

Figure 11 Alex Salmond. Copyright David Black. Accessed through SCrán (2011)
Not all participants shared this view, however, as we see here in the case of Jenna. Her response was more typical of those who chose to define themselves solely as Scottish throughout the research.

**Jenna, 16 years old, Edinburgh State School**

Jenna was an SNP supporter and indicated that she was likely to vote yes in the independence referendum. She placed a strong emphasis on her Scottish identity and like many of the young people from this group spoke a little Gaelic and played traditional music. Interestingly, she was most comfortable with expressing her identity at the national level, as she felt that this better reflected the fact that she had family from other areas in Scotland:

Kat: Why did you describe yourself as Scottish?

Jenna: Umm. Just am. [Laughs] I don’t know. Um, well I wouldn’t really say I’m British because I don’t, well I’m British technically, but I don’t like associating myself so much with that. I wouldn’t really say I’m like an Edinburgh person, well like, well I don’t really say it that much

Kat: What is it that makes you feel Scottish?

Jenna: My family is from Scotland, I was born in Scotland. I know it’s inside the UK, but it’s also inside Europe, so [shrugs]. I have to say the first time that I ever felt British was when I was watching the Royal Wedding

Jenna emphasised the active nature of choosing a national identity through her assertion that she did not like to associate herself with being British. When discussing the images of the Palace of Westminster and David Cameron (See Figure 12 and Figure 13) she explained that she felt that the politics of Westminster were very different from her own, particularly with regards to the Conservative\(^{11}\) government. This may explain her unease with ‘Britishness’ and her desire to position herself as holding different values to those living in England.

\(^{11}\) Participants referred to the Conservative-Liberal Democrat Coalition Government solely as the ‘Conservatives’ or ‘Tories’.
Figure 12 Palace of Westminster By Carlesmari (Own work) [CC-BY-3.0 (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/3.0)], via Wikimedia Commons

Figure 13 David Cameron Official Portrait 2010 Licensed for use under Open Government License v1.0
This negative view of ‘English’ politics at Westminster was a recurrent theme that was passionately discussed by all groups but was most clearly seen in the responses of the Edinburgh State School:

Tories are not Scottish. They have nothing to do with Scotland

(Sandy, Edinburgh State School, 16 years old)

I crossed David Cameron because he’s posh, so he’s not Scottish

(Calum, Edinburgh State School, 14 years old)

Well I put a cross on Westminster because it’s not really Scottish even though they do make some decisions, but it’s like in a difference place. It’s in England not Scotland

(Rihanna, Edinburgh State School, 14 years old)

I wouldn’t say Westminster was Scottish in the same way that I wouldn’t say that the European Parliament in Brussels is British

(William, Edinburgh State School, 14 years old)

Despite the strong rejection of a British political identity in this exercise, many young people still acknowledged that they felt British in certain circumstances, as the next section shows.

4.4.2 British identity

Although a large majority of participants stated that they felt Scottish, they did not automatically reject being ‘British’. In contrast to the responses above, approximately half of the young people stressed during the discussions that they did feel British in some way. These findings are in keeping with existing quantitative and qualitative research on national identity in Scotland since Devolution (SeeBechhofer and McCrone, 2010).

Participants from the Edinburgh Private School, the older Edinburgh State School group and Glasgow were more likely to define themselves as British than those from Barra or the Borders. The emphasis on British identities amongst the Glasgow group was surprising, as Braber’s (2009) study found that individuals from Glasgow living in both Scotland and England were unlikely to identify with Britain. However, given the small sample size in both Braber’s and this study, it is difficult to draw any firm conclusions as to the significance of this.
Amongst those who did define themselves as British, there was a recurrent emphasis on the distinction between being British and being English. Several participants added the caveat that, while they felt British, they were definitely not English. We see this in the example of Daniel, 14 years old from the Edinburgh State School:

Daniel: I wouldn’t describe myself as Scottish at all

Kat: Why do you think that is?

Daniel: I’m from Britain really aren’t I? I don’t feel very shocking overly Scottish, you know, not the whole, I don’t have the voice, the very strong Scot. I went on holiday in the summer, to Spain and people thought I was English [pulls face of horror], which is weird, ‘cause I’m not. And then I was like no, not really, I don’t. But I’m not very Scottish, but I don’t feel English, I just feel British

Throughout the discussions Daniel was keen to position himself as more ‘inclusive’ and outward-looking than some of his classmates. This position led him to be highly critical of many aspects of Scotland’s history and Scottish people’s attitudes towards themselves and others, a finding that is examined further in Chapter 8. A similar, although less derogatory response could be found in Steven’s contribution, who attended the same school as Daniel.

**Steven, 17 years old, Edinburgh State School**

Steven was 17 years old and attended the Edinburgh State School. He was studying Advanced Higher in Modern Studies and had a keen interest in politics and social issues. He described himself as being from Edinburgh in both of the written exercises, but added that he would also describe himself as ‘British’ where necessary.

Steven: Um I said well whenever someone asks me where I’m from my first answer would be Edinburgh, so I like to think of myself as from here, because it’s like, it’s something I like, so I like to associate myself with it. And then, I dunno, I’ve just always felt more British than Scottish, so I just put the two

Kat: And why do you think that is?

Steven: Um, I’m not really sure actually, ‘cause neither of my parents do I think, so, it’s interesting, why I put that, I don’t know why

Kat: What is that makes you not feel particularly Scottish?
Steven: Well I do feel, like, I’m from Scotland, but I just feel British more, because things like, the Royal Wedding or something was like a British thing, it wasn’t a single Scottish thing and that made me feel really proud of my country, things like that. So I’m just like, I’d always say that I do like it as a country as a whole, so it’s not like I, I think saying Scottish, makes me feel like I hate England or I hate Wales or stuff, and I don’t want to associate myself with stuff which is not true, so that’s why I say British

Steven’s response here was typical of the high level of self-awareness found particularly amongst the older participants regarding the implications of identifying themselves as Scottish or British. Despite the trend for individuals living in Scotland to identify as Scottish, a minority of participants were wary of the relationship between ‘Scottishness’, nationalism and ‘exclusive’ definitions of belonging. There are parallels in this study with Fenton’s (2007) work on national identity with young adults in England. He states that many individuals in his study expressed indifference or hostility towards a British or English national identity and suggests that this may reflect their desire to not appear nationalist, in the same way that individuals would strive to avoid being seen as racist. He identifies three different types of ‘indifference’ in the narratives of the young adults in his study: casual indifference; embarrassment, shame, and anti-nationalism; and rejection of nationalism/embracing the supra-national.

Feelings of indifference were seen most prominently amongst those from the Edinburgh Private School. This group were the most likely to emphasise their British identity in the group discussions and interviews. This can in part be attributed to the demographic profile of the group, as seen in their descriptions in Table 4. However, both politics and the wider school environment may also have influenced this identification, as there was a strong emphasis on British history in the English curriculum adopted by the school and, according to the teacher, a high level of support for the Conservative Party amongst pupils. In contrast to all the other participants, members of this group were more likely to directly identify with a political party: five participants identified themselves as supporters of the Conservative party. This is an important difference given the angry rejections of the party and its relevance to Scotland seen in the responses of the vast majority of the young people in this study. Perhaps unsurprisingly, given both the UK and Scottish Conservative Party’s position on independence, this group were very suspicious of the SNP. An example of this attitude can be seen in
Fraser’s explanation for why he felt it was important to say he was both Scottish and British:

Fraser: You do get people in Scotland who are like nationalists and they want to separate from the UK and I think they emphasise the difference in the language quite a bit but in reality hardly anyone speaks Gaelic. Like I’ve got some friends who are fanatical SNP supporters and I’m Conservative

Jamie: Yeah the same.

Fraser: And when you speak to them you can have a joke about the English, but then they put things on Facebook about how much they hate the English and that’s not really necessary. And I think some of that cultural identity is being abused and it produces a stereotype of Scots as being really anti-English.

This rejection of the SNP may be attributed to the political culture of the school; the teacher reported that the Headmaster was highly sceptical of the party and its agenda, and that this came across in his assembly speeches. Significantly, this group also expressed a high degree of scepticism of ‘lefty’ politics and made frequent reference to ‘political correctness’, an attitude that shaped many of the justifications for the responses discussed in Chapters 7 and 8.

It is interesting that, despite the social acceptability of discussions of nationalism in Scotland given the ‘progressive’ and ‘inclusive’ values of the SNP, there was still a feeling amongst some participants that political nationalism was discriminatory and that to identify as Scottish was to adhere to this mind-set. Similar concerns regarding the perceived ‘exclusive’ nature of particular place identities were also seen in the discussions of local identity, which are examined in the next section.

4.4.3 Local identities
Relatively few young people emphasised their local identity in the written exercise. In the group discussions and interviews, however, considerable value was attributed to local experience when conceptualising the nation. An example of this can be seen in Rhona’s explanation for why she described herself as ‘Hebridean and Ethiopian’, rather than Scottish:

Why did you choose to use the term ‘Hebridean’?

Rhona: I don’t know, because I felt Scottish was more a term for the mainland, whereas Hebridean is kind of, I couldn’t think of a
word for it and then I saw the video and someone said it, so it kind of made more sense

Kat: So you don’t see yourself as Scottish?

Rhona: I do but, I think Scottish culture is like British culture, ‘cause like most of the culture that’s like in Scotland, I don’t know, most of Ireland’s quite like Scotland, the things you do in Scotland you could probably do anywhere in Britain like. I don’t do anything specifically Scottish. Maybe I’m a failure as a Scot

Although Rhona lived in Edinburgh, she preferred to identify with both her mother’s home in the Western Isles and her father’s Ethiopian background, as these places were more ‘unique’ and thus distinctive than her experience of living in Edinburgh or the more general description of ‘Scottish’, which she felt was not distinct enough from ‘British’. Her local Hebridean identity was therefore a source of pride, particularly because it reflected her linguistic identity as a Gaelic speaker as well. This explanation was common amongst others in the research who identified as Gaelic speakers.

As might be expected given the remote location of the island, the young people from Barra were the most likely to stress a local identity rather than a national identity in the written exercise, although some identified with a regional rather than local identity by referring to the Highlands and/or Islands in their responses. Two members of this group identified themselves as Gaelic speakers in the written exercise and issues of language and identity dominated the discussion of this group, which is examined in the next chapter. Isla’s response was typical of the participants from this group. She placed a high emphasis on the importance of community and discussed her belief that other places in Scotland did not have the same sense of community because people did not know each other and were less friendly, a view that led her to view the mainland as ‘dangerous’:

Isla: I was born in Stornoway, but I stayed there for like two years when I was little and then we moved down to [Hor] and in a few months’ time I’m moving away to the mainland

Kat: Where on the mainland?

Isla: Inverness-shire. I’m a wee bit nervous ‘cause I’ve not like really moved schools before, so I won’t know anyone

Kat: How do you feel about where you’re from?
Isla: Yeah, I like it, ‘cause there’s enough people for like, it’s not too lonely, but like it’s not dangerous like the mainland is as well

The young people from this group attached a great deal of pride to both their local and national identity, a finding that was in keeping with the majority of participants’ responses across all the other groups.

Half of the participants from the Glasgow group used their local identity to describe themselves, although it should be noted that this focus group was significantly smaller than the others, making comparisons difficult. Other studies, however, such as Braber’s (2009) insightfully titled ‘I’m not a fanatic Scot but I love Glasgow’, suggest that individuals from Glasgow are more likely to emphasise their local identity when defining themselves. Significantly, the young people in this study were far more likely to talk about their immediate neighbourhood in the West of the city than about Glasgow as a whole. They became very animated when discussing the history of their local area; they had recently completed a local area study in history and were very keen to tell me about a barracks close to the school that had been demolished and replaced with a supermarket. Community was a very important feature of the narratives of this group and they were very proud of their area:

Dean: I love it. You have like a sense of community in the place that you live and you start feeling like part of it and it just gets you happy and you’re happier the longer you’re in it and it’s just like a big happy family I guess. They’re all nice people and they’ll say hello to you, especially round here

Ian: Everyone’s nice and friendly; a lot of people know each other

Ryan: People from really posh areas portray Glasgow as like this really neddy\(^\text{12}\) place, but it’s not that bad

(Dean, 13 years old, Ian 13 years old and Vicky 14 years old, Glasgow)

The importance of community was evident in many of the young people’s accounts in this study. Frequent references were made to the ‘community feel’ of Edinburgh from the young people from the Edinburgh State School, with several descriptions of the city as ‘feeling like a village’ where everyone knew everyone else.

\(^{12}\) The English equivalent for this term would be ‘chav’, a derogatory term used to refer to people from working class backgrounds
However, while the majority of young people saw community as an important feature of place, a minority of participants expressed concerns about the nature of that community and were troubled by their perception that the place that they were from was not very welcoming to outsiders. We see this in Charlie’s account:

I’ve moved around the UK a lot but I now live in this really small village near Inverness. It’s nice, and I like really enjoying spending time there but it’s quite isolated. It’s quite an innocent place, like it’s quite cut off from the rest of Britain. I really like the fact that it’s got this really strong sense of community, like people move there and they live their whole lives there and it’s a really nice place to visit, but it can be quite exclusive, like if you’re not from there

(Charlie, 16 years old, Edinburgh Private School)

For this reason, many of the young people from rural areas were keen to stress that they themselves did not share such views. However, as we will see in later chapters, a minority of participants used their local experience of rural places to dispute the value of ‘urban’ experiences in discussions of ‘Scottishness’.

Thus far we have seen that although many young people expressed a pride in a place identity, there were some concerns over how these identity claims could be perceived. The next section examines the responses of young people that could be categorised as a ‘cosmopolitan’ approach to issues of identity and belonging.

4.4.4 Transnationalism

A small minority of respondents rejected referring to themselves solely as ‘Scottish’ because they felt that to do so was reductionist; instead they preferred to locate their identity in terms of multiple scales of belonging. This is not to say that a strong sense of local attachment was perceived by these young people as negative, but rather an attachment to the local that failed to appreciate the interconnected and relational nature of local, national and global identities was seen as problematic. These findings were also in keeping with Fenton’s study discussed above, with participants embracing the ‘supra-national’ as a means of ‘proving’ their anti-nationalism. The most prominent example of this behaviour was seen in the case of Dean.

Dean, 13 years old, Glasgow State School

Dean was one of the most vocal young people interviewed during this research, and certainly the most animated and passionate in his responses. He described himself
primarily as ‘open-minded’ and he used both the focus group and interview scenarios as an opportunity to ‘perform’ this aspect of his identity in a very overt and unambiguous way, although there were some contradictions in his narrative that are explored in the following chapters. Dean’s statements were largely optimistic in nature and he criticised the negativity that some of his fellow classmates expressed about certain topics. He was keen to emphasise that he felt equally Scottish and British and saw this as a very positive aspect of his identity, which he described in nested terms:

I’m from Rookhill, Maryhill, Glasgow, Scotland, Europe. My dad’s family are Irish, like generations back and my mum’s grandfather was Italian. So my family’s from all over the place

Later in the interview he corrected my use of ‘Scottish’ when asking him about his feelings about the place he was from:

Kat: How do you feel about being from Scotland?

Dean: I’m proud of being British. It’s a nice place. Most people they don’t know where it is but it’s nice, everybody gets along, yeah there’s loads of gangs and that but who doesn’t have gangs. There’s no wars or anything here. But like we’ve got lots of history and lots of heritage, like Mary Queen of Scots. We’ve got lots of things, we’ve got good schools, good teachers, good pupils, we’ve got everything I can think of. We’ve got good technology, we’re ahead of our time kind of, we’re nearly heading for independence, we’re all a big, nice place. And we’ve got Irn Bru as well. I think it would take something with massive impact to happen for us to think that we’re not British, maybe like England starting a war against us or something. Or David Cameron saying he’d sell us. That would make us like angry at them and like then we’d get our own independence, but I don’t think there’s anything that they could really do anymore, like we’re all like, we all know each other now, we’re all like best friends, we’re all like British. Like we’ve got the Welsh, we’ve got the English, we’ve got the Scottish and we’ve got the Irish. I think we should try and get the other Irish back, the southern Irish, the Republic of Ireland. Then we can be an even bigger happier family

The contradictions in Dean’s narrative here between opposing separation from the UK and yet perceiving independence as inevitable and positive were typical of his responses throughout the research. While he was keen to position himself as ‘inclusive’ in attitude, in practice, as with many of the young people I spoke to during this research, he
struggled with applying these principles to everyday life. He frequently moved between ‘inclusive’ and ‘exclusive’ concepts of identity and belonging within the space of a sentence. This was a significant finding and it is important to keep in mind the shifting and contextual nature of young people’s responses to these issues throughout the discussion chapters.

4.5 Difficult Identities: Place and non-belonging

Although the majority of young people found the identity exercise straightforward and appeared puzzled when I asked if they had any problems describing themselves, a small minority found this exercise was very difficult, especially those who were born outside of Scotland or had a parent who was born elsewhere. Both Hannah and Adam from the younger Edinburgh State School group were unable to give a straightforward answer to the question ‘what is your identity?’, a question they interpreted as synonymous with ‘what is your nationality?’:

I don't feel I belong to anywhere, I would not say I belong to anywhere

(Adam 13 years old)

I'd say my name not my nationality

(Hannah, 14 years old)

Simone refused to answer my follow up questions on how she would describe herself beyond giving her name and was very hostile in the group discussions, interrupting both myself and her peers and whispering to her friends throughout the discussion. Unfortunately, none of these young people gave permission to be interviewed, so it was difficult to assess why they had difficulty answering the question. However, their responses were unusual, given the inventive and reflexive way in which others tried to reshape the question, or provide multiple answers in order to avoid being categorised in singular terms. Several participants stated that they felt Scottish, but appeared to feel that other people might view them differently:

Chinese but act more Scottish

(Simone, 14 years old, Edinburgh State School)

English but feel 100% Scottish

(Michael, 17 years old, Edinburgh Private School)
100% Scottish even though my parents are English

(Stuart, 16 years old, Edinburgh State School)

If someone asked I'd say Scottish but I feel more British

(Alexa, 16 years old, Edinburgh State School)

I'm technically Scottish/ Jersey

(Hazel, 13 years old, Edinburgh State School)

These young people’s responses highlight the importance of allowing participants to describe their identity in their own words, rather than forcing them to identify with pre-determined identity categories. Their responses highlight the apparent tension for these young people between ‘technical’ definitions, based on birth place or parentage, and the feelings of belonging they may have. This difficulty in negotiating between claimed and ascribed identities was seen in the case of Rihanna, who felt Scottish but also saw herself as Middle Eastern, African and European on different occasions.

**Rihanna, 14 years old, Edinburgh State School**

Rihanna’s response to the written exercise was ‘Feel Scottish’. In the interview she expanded on this, explaining why she felt she could not simply say ‘Scottish’:

Rihanna: Err well I don’t really know because I wouldn’t really introduce myself as being Middle Eastern or European. But I would say I’m African and I live in Scotland, ‘cause I’ve been here for quite a few years, I think I was here when I was like 3. So I’ve kind of grew up here and I’ve, my lifestyle is kind of based around Scotland and Edinburgh so, I wouldn’t really know what to say so it would be between the two

Kat: And is being Scottish something that’s important to you?

Rihanna: I think it kind of does, ‘cause it kind of makes you feel like, well I’m not saying that I’m not from other places, but it kind of feels good when you say I’m Scottish, because there’s a lot of good things about Scotland and you just kind of feel proud

Kat: So would you usually say you feel Scottish?

Rihanna: Um well its goes back to when I said I feel Scottish, well like that’s only like sometimes because if I ever say that, I don’t know why but I just kind of feel like once I’ve said it, why did I just say that? ‘Cause then it kinda, I kinda feel like I’m trying too
hard and then people might think I’m just like trying too hard to be Scottish

Kat: Really?

Rihanna: Yeah, I don’t know how to put it, I feel uncomfortable saying it most of the time when someone asks me where I’m from, I just say ‘oh I was like born here’. I don’t really say like ‘I’m Scottish’ or whatever. I don’t know, I just feel, I just feel like it won’t work with me

Kat: But is it something that you feel personally?

Rihanna: Yeah I feel Scottish but I think like, if I say it then people will look at me as if like you can’t be Scottish or whatever. So I kind of feel like uncomfortable about saying it

Kat: And to put this really bluntly, do you think that’s because of what you look like, that people will say that?

Rihanna: Yeah

Rhona: I agree, I think it’s ‘cause if you’re obviously like, like me and Rihanna are quite obviously mixed race, like you wouldn’t say it like, ‘Are you really from Scotland?’ ‘Yeah’, ‘but where are you actually from? I was like ‘From Scotland’, ‘No but you know what I mean like, where are you from?’ I was like, it gets kind of tiring sometimes, you know having to tell people that like ‘oh I’m from Scotland but like if they’re going to ask more questions then

Rihanna: So then you just kind of just say ‘oh I’m from everywhere’, you don’t really. Well that’s what I say ‘cause I still don’t know where I’m from, I say different things every day.

Rihanna’s assertion that she had lived in Scotland since she was 3 years old brings into sharp focus the significance of the age of the participants in this study. While as adults we may be less likely to openly challenge someone’s national identity if they had lived in a place virtually all their lives (although we may privately disagree, an issue examined in later chapters), for younger participants any time spent in a different place was a crucial marker of difference from those who were born in a country. For Rihanna, defining herself in terms of her experiences of place allowed her to define herself in straightforward terms, rather than address what appear to be difficult issues of ethnicity, birthplace or parentage. Her emphasis on her experience of place appears to offer her a sense of security in her identity claim.
The findings here echo Bond’s (Bond, 2006) research on ‘belonging and becoming’ in Scotland. His research centred on two ‘migrant’ groups: those born in England and those from ethnic minority backgrounds. Individuals from both groups were influenced by ‘externally imposed and self-imposed limitations’ on their claim to belong in Scotland (2006: 611). Bond stresses that while individuals may feel that their decision not to claim to be Scottish is a matter of personal choice and motivation, this decision is also the product of social structures whereby individuals do not feel able to claim an identity that they feel others may challenge. He observed that individuals from these groups had a tendency to mediate their claims to belong by stating that they had feelings of attachment to Scotland, rather than claim to be Scottish outright.

There are parallels here with Savage et al.’s (2005) research on ‘elected belonging’. They suggest that ‘people’s sense of being at home is related to reflexive processes in which they can satisfactorily account to themselves how they come to live where they do’ (Savage et al., 2005:29). While Rihanna is able to make sense of her feelings of belonging to Scotland and thus claim a Scottish identity, others were unable to reconcile their own ideas of what it meant to be Scottish with their experiences of ‘other’ places. While there was nothing to stop these young people from describing themselves in any way they liked on a piece of paper that only I would see, they still appeared to feel that their identity claims could be challenged. We thus see the tension between individual and collective identities, whereby personal feelings of belonging are mediated through the values of the wider group.

4.6 Conclusion
This chapter set out to provide an overview of how the young people in this study identified themselves in relation to place. We have seen that although very few participants responded to initial questions about their identity in terms of a place, the vast majority had very strong and clear feelings about belonging to a particular place when asked about this directly. The most common answer to the question of ‘what is your identity?’ was ‘Scottish’, a categorisation that was frequently accompanied by expressions of pride. The findings here therefore concur with existing studies on national identity in Scotland by demonstrating the salience of Scottish identity to participants. However, both the written answers and subsequent discussions in the focus groups and interviews showed the relational nature of place identity, with many young people stressing the importance of either their local or another identity alongside their
national identity. Significantly, in later chapters we will see that many young people shifted between different levels of place identification in order to justify their responses to questions of heritage and belonging, with many attempting to ‘fix’ certain cultural practices in particular places and thus reject their significance to the wider nation. These aspects will be discussed in Chapters 6 and 7.

Another important issue raised was the high level of awareness, especially amongst the older participants in both Edinburgh groups, of the potential of being accused of parochialism for stressing a strong local or indeed national identity. Many individuals in these groups were keen to stress the positive and inclusive nature of these feelings of place-attachment. This self-awareness and insecurity was interesting given the theoretical debates regarding ‘parochialism’ and ‘cosmopolitanism’ outlined at the beginning of this chapter. Unsurprisingly given the political debates surrounding independence in Scotland, issues of politics were highly influential in shaping young people’s responses to questions of place and belonging. A large proportion of participants expressed a strong Scottish identity as a means of positioning themselves in opposition to British political ideology, with the Conservative Party receiving passionate criticism from many of them. For these young people, claiming a Scottish identity allowed them to position themselves in relation to what they perceived to be the ‘progressive’ values of Scottish political parties, particularly the SNP. Similarly, although those who identified solely with a British identity were in the minority, many young people acknowledged that they did feel British in some way. Those who expressed this view were keen to avoid accusations of nationalism and saw identifying with a British—and indeed a wider European identity in a minority of cases—as a means of demonstrating their ‘inclusive’ and ‘cosmopolitan’ attitudes. The importance of maintaining an inclusive self-image was a very important finding in this research and the young people’s explanations of their own sense of place and belonging are pertinent for understanding their attempts to accommodate new perspectives on what it means to be Scottish, an issue that is addressed in both Chapter 5 and Chapter 7 specifically.

Finally, we also saw that for a minority of participants, claiming an identity based on place was problematic, as they felt that their assertions might be challenged by others. This tension between individual identification and group acceptance was a pertinent issue throughout this research, for as Appadurai astutely observes ‘while we can make our own identities, we cannot do exactly as we please’ (1996:170). While this chapter addressed how young people identified themselves in relation to place, the next chapter
therefore examines further the mechanics of why they came to those decisions. It then considers how these decisions influenced how they assessed the identity claims of others and examines the tensions in these responses.
Chapter 5. Defining Scottish Identity: Negotiating Place, Heritage and Ethnicity

Identity...is only unproblematic, a state of being and becoming, when it is not the subject of critical reflection, when it is lived and practised, rather than something consciously reflected upon. The identity crises of contemporary modernity result from the insecurities which arise from introspection’ (Tilly 2006:11).

This chapter examines the role of heritage and place in shaping perceptions of what it means to ‘belong’ in Scotland or claim to be ‘Scottish’. By analysing how individuals conceptualise their own identity and what ‘being Scottish’ means to them, I argue that it is possible to gain important critical insights into what circumstances or conditions lead young people to accept or reject plural definitions of national identity and heritage, which are examined further in later chapters. The analysis draws on the work of Giddens (1991) in order to understand how individuals use narrative to make sense of their own identity and Goffman (1959), whose theory of performance provides a useful framework for understanding the way in which individuals’ identity narratives are assessed according to their perceived ‘credibility’.

Significantly, for this study, the findings from both the focus groups and small group interviews found that when young people described their own identity they had a tendency to use ‘ethnic’ definitions based on parentage, ancestry or ‘heritage’. In contrast when assessing the legitimacy of other’s identity claims they preferred to base their criteria for inclusion or exclusion on what were perceived to be more neutral or ‘civic’ definitions based on place, commitment to place and feelings of belonging.

The discussion here aims to situate this study within existing studies on the issue of the ‘inclusive’ nature of Scottish identity. This chapter therefore firstly utilises existing research on the criteria or ‘markers’ of Scottish identity to analyse how young people constructed their own identity. In particular, it examines the importance of birthplace and ancestry and the way in which discussions of these topics draws upon concepts of heritage. It also analyses the role of language in shaping feelings of identity and belonging and assesses the way in which this was utilised in discussions of how particular places or cultural practices which were perceived to be ‘more Scottish’ than
others and thus supported a stronger claim to a Scottish identity. The second part of the chapter then compares the criteria that individuals used to describe their own identity with those that they would use to assess the identity claims of others. The final section considers the implication of these findings and identifies the key themes examined in later chapters.

5.1 Defining National Identity in Scotland

National identity in Scotland is frequently conceptualised by theorists as a ‘sense of place’ rather than a ‘sense of tribe’ (Smout, 1994:107). As we saw in Chapter 1, considerable emphasis has been placed on ‘civic’ or ‘territorial’ definitions of ‘Scottishness’ in the political sphere, whereby anyone who is resident in Scotland may claim to be Scottish, regardless of ethnic background. While Chapter 2 examined the problems with simple classifications based on ‘civic’ verses ‘ethnic’ definitions of national identity, this chapter examines this issue further by analysing the shifting importance of ‘civic’ definitions based on ‘place’ (birthplace, residency and upbringing) verses those based on ‘ethnic’ characteristics (common descent and ‘heritage’) in young people’s narratives. It therefore highlights the distinctions made between national identity as a form of citizenship, verses a more personal notion of nationality based on social and family relationships and feelings of place-attachment. Throughout this thesis I argue that this may lead to hierarchical understandings of belonging, which may result in individuals accepting migrant communities as legitimate members of the state, while simultaneously maintaining the boundary between ‘them’ and ‘us’, thus leaving the ‘core’ unchallenged.

Since devolution substantial research has been conducted on the characteristics or ‘markers’ of Scottish identity. Kiely et al. define identity markers as ‘any characteristics associated with an individual that they might choose to present to others’ (2001: 35-6). The most notable of these in individuals narratives’ of Scottish identity are ‘place of birth, ancestry, place of residence, length of residence, upbringing and education, name, accent, physical appearance, dress and commitment to place’ (2001: 36). Based on their findings, they divide these into ‘fixed’ and ‘fluid’ markers of identity, as outlined in Table 4.
Table 4 Typology of identity markers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Easilly accessible to others</th>
<th>Treated as fixed markers</th>
<th>Treated as fluid markers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Accent</td>
<td>Place of residence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Physical appearance</td>
<td>Commitment to place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Dress</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Less accessible to others</th>
<th>Place of birth</th>
<th>Length of Residence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ancestry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Place of upbringing or education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: (Kiely et al. 2001: 37)

Multiple studies on national identity in Scotland have found that the most significant markers of Scottish identity are residence, birth and ancestry (Bond, 2006; Kiely et al., 2001; Bechhofer et al., 1999; McCrone et al., 1998). Bond argues that those who are able to mobilise all of these markers of identity are ‘best viewed as one of the notional “majority” who evaluate claims to national identity which are potentially more problematic’ (2006:611). Kiely et al.’s (2001) research found that when describing their own identity, individuals perceived the strongest claims to be those based on place of birth, ancestral ties, upbringing and education and residence. Of these, place of birth was the strongest indicator of national identity when mobilised on its own, with ancestry and place and length of residence also regarded as a legitimate basis for claiming a Scottish identity in certain circumstances. Although not specifically referenced in this early work, Goffman’s focus on the way in which identity performances are both structured in response to and evaluated by their audiences is extremely relevant here, as acknowledged by McCrone and Bechhofer in the 2012 Goffman Memorial Lecture at Edinburgh University.

It is worth noting that in early research on this topic, the question of ‘appearance’ did not directly correspond to discussions of being ‘white’ as a prerequisite for Scottish identity, a finding that Kiely et al. attribute to the relatively low proportion of the Scottish population belonging to a non-white ethnic group at the time of the research (2001:53). Subsequent studies by researchers working within the same programme therefore set out to address this topic by examining the issue of ‘race’ and Scottish identity specifically. Rosie and Bond’s (2006) study compared majority attitudes towards English migrants and visible ethnic minorities. Using quantitative data from the
2003 Scottish and British Social Attitudes Survey, they examined the extent to which those perceived to be ‘outsiders’ can become Scottish. Although they concluded that ‘race’ was not a significant factor in determining Scottish identity, they found that there was reluctance amongst respondents to accept either individuals born in England or those from ‘visible’ minority ethnic groups as Scottish (2006: 157). In a similar study, McCrone and Bechhofer (2008) concluded that, theoretically speaking; to be born in Scotland allows an individual to claim they are Scottish, regardless of their skin colour, without fear that the person receiving this claim will reject it. However, they also argue that the importance of place of birth to the acceptance of identity claims and suggest that Scottish identity still has a strong ‘ethnic’ element, despite political arguments to the contrary (2008:1259). The movement between ‘civic’ and ‘ethnic’ elements in the accounts above is entirely in-keeping with existing sociological studies of national identity. As Weber (1968) has argued, although ethnicity does not provide an objective definition of the nation, there is still reliance upon a sense of common descent in the construction and maintenance of national identities. The enduring importance of ‘ethnic’ elements of national identity brings into question the degree to which it is ever possible to have a truly ‘civic’ conceptualisation of the nation and belonging. Having identified this tension between academic and political understandings of Scottish identity, the discussion now examines the tensions in many young people’s narratives between their own sense of what it means to be Scottish and the way in which they assess the identity claims of others.

5.2 Claiming a Scottish Identity
The next section considers the identity claims of the young people in this study in relation to existing research on identity markers in Scotland. It examines the way in which young people positioned themselves through identification with, and indeed rejection of Scottish identity specifically through references to place of birth, place of residence, upbringing or schooling and language. It also considers the shifting priorities given to these markers of identity. In doing so, it analyses the way in individuals use narrative to negotiate shifts in social context in order to maintain a coherent and stable sense of self (Giddens 1991).

5.2.1 Birthplace, upbringing and parentage
Place of birth, upbringing and the nationality of their parents were the most common markers initially referred to in the interviews and group discussions when young people
were asked to explain their identity descriptions, a finding that concurs with existing research on Scottish identity discussed above. George’s response here was typical of those who viewed their claim to a Scottish identity as straightforward and unproblematic:

Kat: What makes someone Scottish?

George: Your parents are Scottish and you were born in Scotland

(George, 14 years old, Glasgow School)

Across all the groups the experience of a particular place appeared to be the easiest means for young people to justify their identity claims, especially when other markers such as ancestry or accent complicated these definitions. Although political discussions of civic national identity in Scotland refer to concepts of belonging simply in terms of residency, ‘place’ in these discussions became synonymous with a shared understanding of what it means to live in Scotland, such as common values and appropriate ideals or forms of behaviour. An example of this can be seen in Magnus’ response here:

Kat: Could you tell me a bit about where you’re from?

Magnus: I was born in Edinburgh, raised in Edinburgh. I’ve got family from others places, but I’m just from here. My mum and dad are Scottish, but my other relatives like some were born in Nigeria, some were born in Singapore, Scandinavia, places like that so, lots of places. Like I would like sort of describe myself as Scottish, but like some of my family wouldn’t, so they’re kind of from other places. I’ve sort of mainly lived in Scotland and been raised in things that are Scottish, ‘cause like, well I have English cousins and like they don’t, they don’t celebrate like, you know like, is it Rabbie Burns?

(Magnus, 14 years old, Edinburgh State School)

Magnus’ need to justify his claim to be Scottish in terms of his experience of living in Edinburgh and doing ‘Scottish’ things was surprising given that he was both born and raised in Scotland and his parents were Scottish. Such a ‘strong’ identity claim would appear to be unproblematic and require no further explanation. However throughout the discussions he reflected on the diverse nature of his family and stressed the importance of this in his written response: ‘Scottish with other heritage e.g. Irish and Scandinavian’.
This emphasis on his ‘heritage’ is significant, indicating the intersection of place with concepts of ancestry, a common theme in the responses, as the next section shows.

5.2.2 Ancestry and heritage
The terms ‘heritage’ and ‘ancestry’ were often used interchangeably in the group discussions. The overlapping nature of these two terms highlights the gap between academic definitions of ‘heritage’ and the conceptualisation of the term in everyday use. Although there were no explicit references to ethnicity, many young people emphasised the importance of ‘family roots’ and a longstanding connection to place when explaining why they felt Scottish. Throughout their responses Daniel and Magnus from the Edinburgh State School shifted between defining heritage as either history or family connections to place:

Kat: Can you explain what you mean by heritage?

Daniel: Err, that’s, heritage is your parents isn’t it? Like inheritance. It’s just if your parents were Scottish, then you’ll get the Scottish heritage, I think. And the history, the history of Scotland and stuff like that

Kat: Is that what it means to you as well? Or does it mean something else

Magnus: Like heritage is sort like, to me it’s sort of like, the family, sort of thing. It’s like what they consider themselves, so it’s like, you say like my family is originally from Scotland, then you might say like they have, they consider themselves to have Scottish heritage

Daniel: Yeah, it’s like where you’re originally from, yeah uh huh, like way back, as far back as you can go back

Magnus: Or if you like move to a place and you like stay there and you started it up again

Kat: And when you were describing it about being the history, what would that be, if you were thinking about it in that way?

Daniel: That’s kind of what I meant, like you know, like going back and seeing all the families
A similar view can be seen here in the responses of Donald and Ewan from Barra:

Kat: What do you think of when you hear the word ‘heritage’?

Donald: Scottish heritage? Like your parents are like pure Scottish and like you’re from Scotland

Kat: What makes your parents ‘pure Scottish’?

Donald: To have been raised in Scotland

Ewan: Born and raised in Scotland

Donald: Yeah, born and raised in Scotland, so they’re pure Scottish

Donald’s description of someone with Scottish ‘heritage’ as being ‘pure Scottish’ is significant, as it implies that anyone who cannot make an identity claim on the basis of a longstanding family connection could never truly be considered Scottish. Consequently, we see that for many participants, ‘being Scottish’ carries significant ethnic connotations. An example of this emphasis on national identity as a product of ‘blood and soil’ can be found in Archie’s explanation below of his decision to identify with both Scotland and England.

**Archie, 16 years old, Edinburgh Private School**

Archie was polite and cheerful and appeared to enjoy the research experience, as it was an opportunity to reflect on his own feelings of belonging. In the initial written exercise he described himself as follows:

Tricky, half Scottish, half English. London and Kent where English family from real home, but lived in Edinburgh so long.

He described his parents as ‘half Scottish, half English’, as they both had a parent of from each country. Although he was very proud to be English, he still felt a strong connection to Scotland:

It's important to me knowing where your roots are. I’m very sentimental, I like my English roots and I’m very proud to be English. But I still see my Scottish side and if I was living in England I’d be very proud of my Scottish roots. Like my dad, he still does lots of Scottish stuff even though he's living in England. I miss England when I’m here. It’s where my roots are and where I feel most at home. I guess it’s because I associate it
with being a happy place, like I have the family connection there and my godparents and all the important people in my life live there.

Although he primarily emphasised his ancestral ties to Scotland when explaining why he felt half Scottish, he also explained that his feelings of belonging stemmed from the fact that he had lived in Scotland from a young age, attending both preparatory and secondary school in Scotland on a residential basis. He loved Edinburgh and was very proud to tell other people he lived there. This was partly because the city had an ancestral connection, as his grandfather had attended the same school. This was clearly an issue of great importance to him and the teacher explained that many students felt that their attendance at the school was an important feature of their family identity; a symbol of prestige and respect for tradition:

> For me your identity is less about where you live and more about family. My identity is ingrained because of things like my mother telling me about growing up in Fife. And my grandfather is very proud of being Scottish, he’s always telling it to me and he always tells me to remember I’m Scottish. So it’s something that I think comes from talking about it and passing it down.

Later in the conversation he returned to the theme:

> Family makes certain places important to me, like I said it’s knowing where your roots are. Edinburgh is important to me because my dad went to University here and I grew up here from the age of 4. We spent a lot of time in Fife, Perthshire and the West Coast on holidays. So I guess heritage is about memories that have been passed down I suppose.

He used the term ‘heritage’ repeatedly as a synonym for both ancestry and ethnicity, frequently referring to the idea that people in both England and Scotland were likely to have the heritage of the other country, by which he meant common ancestors and shared DNA. He described himself as:

> I’m a very young and naïve member of the Conservative Party. I’m a monarchist and at Christmas at my grandparents we all watch the Queen’s speech. Being very traditional I like embracing this country’s heritage, but Britain’s heritage is reflected in my blood.

For Archie, ‘heritage’ is not just something that is passively passed down through ‘blood’ connections but is also something that needs to be actively embraced and
engaged with. Archie’s emphasis here on the importance of actively reaffirming his connection with Scotland through showing an interest in heritage was echoed by many of the young people in this study. The comments of George and Ryan from the Glasgow group also fitted this definition:

George: Heritage is like your culture and background and all that. It’s like where your family’s from and where you were brought up

Ryan: It’s if you were born here

George: If you were born here and celebrate Scottish stuff and that. It’s about things like Robert Burns Day and that

George’s emphasis not just on being born somewhere but ‘performing’ this identity through activities such as celebrating Burns Night is significant. Like Magnus above, he emphasises the need to sustain his Scottish identity through engagement in practices that are recognised by others as Scottish.

This finding was highly significant given the issues raised at the outset of this thesis regarding Hardeep’s desire to ‘live out’ a form of ‘Scottishness’ in order to legitimate his claim to a Scottish identity. However, these ‘performances’ were still not enough to convince some participants of the legitimacy of the identity claims of those from ethnic minority backgrounds, as we will see in later in the discussion here and subsequent chapters. These findings demonstrate the performative nature of identity (Goffman 1959; Butler 1990), whereby identity claims must be comprehensible to both the ‘actor’ and the ‘audience’ in order to be accepted.

The emphasis on the need to ‘perform’ in a manner that was recognisably Scottish and to take pride in this identity emerged as a recurrent theme throughout the research. This was seen particularly with regards to issues of heritage, language and the experience of and commitment to place, as the next section now examines.

5.3 Language and the Performance of Identity
Although not a central feature of the research, issues of language were a very prominent feature of the discussions across all of the groups and intersected with concepts of heritage and place. As identified in Chapter 3, accent played a key role throughout this study in making ‘visible’, or rather ‘audible’, certain aspects of identity, while also ‘masking’—whether intentionally or unintentionally—other facets of identity. Thus the
conscious or unconscious adoption of a Scottish accent may ‘hide’ issues relating to birthplace, or parentage (although issues of appearance may of course limit the degree to which such aspects remain ‘backstage’, to use Goffman’s term, an issue that is examined in later chapters). Giddens’ work on ontological security and anxiety is also useful here for understanding the responses of participants who, while sounding Scottish, felt that their performances were ‘false’, while others who sounded English felt that to actively adopt a Scottish accent would undermine their ability to behave in ‘authentic’ manner. These issues are examined throughout this section.

The Gaelic Language (Scotland) Act was passed in 2005 as a result of increased public interest in both Gaelic and Scots languages since devolution and issues regarding the role of the language have become increasingly pertinent in public debates and academic research in Scotland (See Oliver, 2005; Oliver, 2002; McLeod, 1998; Macdonald, 1997). The importance placed on issues of language by the majority of young people in this study may in part be attributed to participant’s awareness of the questions asked during the 2011 Census, which featured a question asking whether respondents could speak, read or understand English, Gaelic and Scots. Several of the older participants from both the Edinburgh Schools referenced the census unprompted, while others expressed an awareness of the language questions when asked directly how they (or rather their parents) had responded to the census. Language and specifically accent, for the majority of participants was a signifier of place of birth, place of residence and upbringing. As such, young people were able to assert both ‘civic’ and ‘ethnic’ aspects of national identity through discussions of the importance of language to their own sense of identity.

5.3.1 Accent and the performance of ‘Scottishness’
Accent was the most common identity marker utilised by young people when attempting to explain their own sense of Scottish identity, as we see in the following examples:

Kat: What makes you feel Scottish?

George: Accents

Ryan: Yeah ‘cause most people don’t understand Scottish accents so like the English won’t understand it, like they have their own separate language like your [interviewer] language.
You can say words when like you’re abroad that no one will understand at all, so they get quite confused and that
(George and Ryan, 14 years old, Glasgow)

A similar response was seen in Magnus’ response:

Kat: Why is the voice so important?

Magnus: It’s representation of Scotland, like your accent. You get Scottish accents, like you get Irish accents

(Magnus, 14 years old, Edinburgh State School)

Accent was thus not only a means of differentiating Scottish identity from other parts of the UK, but also a relatively simple means of expressing a sense of belonging that avoided some of the connotations of ethnicity and thus more ‘exclusive’ definitions of identity seen in the previous section. Interestingly however, certain accents were seen as being ‘more Scottish’ than others, as the next section examines.

5.3.2 Hierarchical concepts of Place: Accent and ‘un-Scottish places’
The way in which young people encoded places with meaning without necessarily experiencing them is fundamental to understanding many of the narratives of identity and belonging seen in the responses of the young people in this study, as we will see throughout the remaining chapters. A common theme in many of the responses from the young people from the Edinburgh Private School was that they felt that their accents sounded too English for them to be considered Scottish. Interestingly, this view was challenged however by those from the Edinburgh State School, a finding that can perhaps be attributed to the differences between those who grew up in the city and those at the Edinburgh Private School who had lived in multiple places. These participants felt that others in Scotland might challenge their identity claims because of their ‘anglicised’ accents. These discussions mapped onto concepts of place, with frequent references made to places ‘up North’ being ‘more Scottish’ than cities. An example of this can be seen in Grant’s explanation of his discomfort with stating that he was Scottish:

Grant, Edinburgh Private School

Grant preferred to identify himself in terms of attachment to place, rather than through specific identity categories, although he did describe himself as ‘very British’ in the
written exercise. He stated that he formed bonds with places easily and described himself as having ‘strong associations with a real mix of places’, although interestingly he would not necessarily claim to be ‘from’ those places. When he was younger he lived in Hampshire, with summers spent in rural France. He had recently moved to his family’s ancestral home; an estate in the Scottish Borders. Although he described himself as British he explained that he felt much more comfortable expressing a national identity when he was in France. He explained that when he was in Scotland he was uncomfortable with self-identifying as Scottish:

I can’t really get away with pretending to be Scottish, it doesn’t work. I come from the South of Scotland. I’ve got a pretty English accent. My little brother can get away with it though actually, because when we spent time with my Nanny when we were young he was that little bit younger. So he actually learnt to speak Scots. He can switch between the two simultaneously, it’s really weird.

He later explained that the only time he would describe himself as Scottish is if he was going for a job in America, as he felt that Americans would be more receptive to a Scottish person than an English person. He was keen to stress that he did not have a great association with Scotland, as he felt that his experience was limited to the Borders, which he perceived to be separate from the rest of Scotland. Interestingly, he described the Lowlands as being ‘more like England’, whereas he felt the Highlands were the ‘real Scotland’, particularly because of the use of Gaelic:

I don’t know, it makes me feel kind of alienated, because I’m like a Southern Scottish person, and it makes me feel like, oh that’s real Scotland up there and I’m not part of the real Scotland. It’s just like the North of England here

Grant’s view of the North of Scotland as the ‘real’ Scotland highlights a pertinent issue for this study, showing the way in which young people from Glasgow and Edinburgh had a tendency to downplay the legitimacy of their experience when discussing wider Scotland. Goffman’s (1959) emphasis on the way in which our identity performances are assessed as ‘convincing’ or unconvincing’ by our audience is useful for understanding this phenomenon. If we feel that we are unable to play a role effectively in a particular social context, we may adopt an alternative role instead in order to convince the audience of our authenticity. Rather than attempt to ‘play’ the role of being ‘Scottish’, Grant focuses on a role in which he feels he is more convincing, in this case
his ‘British’ identity. A similar attitude towards Edinburgh as an ‘un-Scottish place’ was found in Michael’s account of his identity:

**Michael, 17 years old, Edinburgh Private School**

In the initial written exercise Michael described himself as ‘English but feel 100% Scottish’, which he attributed to his dad being partly Scottish but his mum being ‘fully English’. However, during the discussions, he shifted between statements such as:

- I consider myself fully Scottish. I call myself a Scot, I don’t know why.
- I’m not really Scottish, I just say I am.
- I’m so ridiculously un-Scottish. For me my identity is more about the family and social community I’m part of and what’s important is that you always can have somewhere that you can sort of identify with.

His assertion that he was ‘ridiculously un-Scottish’ was curious, given his previous responses. However, within the wider context of the interview it became apparent that although he would see himself as Scottish he did not feel he did anything or had any characteristics that could be considered particularly Scottish by others. This shift in positions, from being ‘fully’ to ‘un-Scottish’, hints at the insecurity Giddens describes in his discussion of the way in which individuals manage challenges to their sense of self brought about by shifts in social context. Giddens describes what he terms ‘late modernity’ as period that poses distinctive tensions and difficulties for the self. ‘Living in the world’ requires the individual to resolve these dilemmas ‘in order to preserve a coherent narrative of self-identity.’ (1991:188). Michael was aware of these tensions in his narrative and thus attempted to reconcile them in order to create a sense of order and control over his identity. Michael’s emphasis on social relationships, rather than a connection to a particular place provided him with a way of addressing this. While he felt that his Scottish identity could be contested, he preferred to identify with other communities, such as his school, as he felt these were more welcoming and thus his claim to ‘belong’ was more likely to be accepted. Despite this wariness of being unaccepted himself, he placed a strong emphasis on the importance of incomers making an effort to join the ‘social community’, rather than simply reside in the same place, an issue that resonates with the discussions of social cohesion in Chapter 2. The
importance of ‘joining’ the nation was a recurrent theme throughout the discussions and is returned to in Chapter 7.

Significantly, Michael attributed his views to his experience of living to Edinburgh, a place that he did not consider particularly Scottish due to the high number of incomers. Like Grant, he felt those who lived in the North of Scotland had a stronger claim to a Scottish identity than he did. He attributed this feeling to his experience of visiting his grandparents in Inverness, where he felt there was a much stronger sense of community. He described his grandparent’s experiences of attending social events such as ceilidhs and the importance of events such as clan gatherings, which he felt established a sense of loyalty and kinship which could not be found in Edinburgh. Significantly, he also discussed the importance of Gaelic as a means of both expressing this sense of community and establishing a link with the past. This was a common theme in young people’s narratives, as we see now in the next section.

5.3.3 Being a ‘proper Scot’: Gaelic, heritage and place
The importance of Gaelic as a marker of Scottish identity was a highly contentious topic in the research, with strong opinions voiced by young people in both the Glasgow and Edinburgh Private School groups regarding the perceived spread of the language and threats to English as Scotland’s official language, as we see here:

Sam: People speaking Gaelic, it freaks me out. If someone’s speaking a different language around you then you know, they could be insulting you. You don’t know. So in a way I guess it’s rude

Kat: So some of you don’t like the fact that they’re speaking Gaelic, you think it’s being put on. Do any of you disagree with that?

Alistair: It’s part of their culture, so they should be allowed to speak it. It’s Scotland’s original language so it’s kind of false to say that when they’re in Edinburgh they should really make an effort to learn to speak English. It’s their language; they should be allowed to speak it

Sam: Socially it’s not studied here anymore, in places like this, in places such as Edinburgh and I don’t think you can expect if you do speak Gaelic I don’t think you can expect to come to Edinburgh and be able to speak it in shops and places like that
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This fear was shared by Dean from the Glasgow group, who worried that Gaelic might become the official language in an Independent Scotland:

Dean: I think we live in Britain, why do people want to do the Gaelic thing? We all live in Britain. I think it’s a waste of time. See if we got like mair Independent, I, see if they said oh we’re Independent we have to learn Gaelic now we’re not going to speak English, I’d refuse.

Ian: I don’t think there’s anyone at this school who knows it apart from teachers, and even then, it doesn’t matter anyway

Kat: There is a Gaelic High school in Glasgow isn’t there

Vicky: Yeah

Kat: What do you think about that being in Glasgow?

Dean: It’s spreading. It’s like a disease that’s spreading

Vicky: I dunno, if people want to learn it then they can but I don’t think we should be forced to learn it, like if you want to learn something then I think but, I don’t think you should be forced into learning Gaelic if you don’t want to, like Liam he doesn’t want to learn it but, I don’t think he should be forced to

However, for others, Gaelic was an important marker of Scotland’s difference from England. While the young people from the Scottish Borders group felt that it was very old and therefore important to Scottish identity, they were somewhat confused as to how the language related to Scots:

Kat: Was there anything that surprised you in the film I showed you?

Sara: Some of them were speaking Gaelic

Paul: Yeah. That’s like really Scottish

Amy: If you tried to talk to them you wouldn’t understand

Paul: I think Gaelic is really Scottish

Eilidh: It’s like really Scottish, old Scottish, proper Scottish

Paul: Like Robert Burns, he wrote his poems in Scottish. Proper Scottish.

Kat: That’s interesting because before you were saying that Gaelic was proper Scottish
Paul: I think that’s the really

Lorna: Old-fashioned

Paul: Yeah like really old fashioned Scottish whereas what we speak is more or less English

Sara: Some people don’t understand Gaelic so

Fiona: When you think of Gaelic you think of the Highlands

For these participations, the identity performances of those speaking Gaelic in the film were deemed to ‘credible’ because of the perceived ‘authenticity’ of Gaelic. Interestingly, despite labelling Gaelic as ‘really’ and ‘proper’ Scottish, these participants did not view their own ‘performances’ as less ‘credible’, although they may have been challenged by the Gaelic speakers in other groups.

Both the Edinburgh State School and Barra groups had a number of Gaelic speakers in the class and Gaelic classes were part of the curriculum, resulting in a significant interest in these topics amongst these groups. The young people in the Barra group in particular placed a strong emphasis on Gaelic, with several participants asserting the view that people on the mainland should speak it instead of Spanish or French. Paradoxically, while the discussions of this group frequently conceptualised mainland Scotland and Scottish people as ‘other’, many viewed themselves as more Scottish than those on the mainland because they spoke Gaelic. For these young people, their knowledge of Gaelic made their performances more ‘credible’ than those who spoke English. What was interesting, however, was that despite this many claimed not to recognise what was being said by the Gaelic speakers in the film (even though the same dialect was used on the island) and said that they rarely used Gaelic outside of their formal language classes. These apparent contradictions led to moments where these individuals appeared to feel that their identity claims were weakened, which in appeared to result in insecurities, with some participants becoming very quiet and behaving awkwardly. Others however were capable of easily dismissing these tensions through narratives that focused on the failings of those on the ‘mainland’, thus deflecting attention away from themselves. This provided them with a means of maintaining their credibility and thus existing sense of self. Such strategies fit with Giddens’ (1991) argument that the ‘authentic’ individual is one who is capable of resolving dilemmas that may undermine their identity by shifting their narrative in order to mediate tensions.
A different picture emerged amongst the young people who had attended the Gaelic Primary School in Edinburgh, as we see in the example of Sandy below.

**Sandy, 17 years old, Edinburgh State School**

Sandy described himself as a ‘Scottish Gael’. He attributed his sense of identity to his family ‘roots’, particularly his family in the Highlands:

> I was born in Edinburgh, I’ve lived here all my life as well and both my parents are from Edinburgh, even though my mum was born in Germany, but she was born on British soil in Germany, and all my family are in the Highlands, so I have Highland roots.

For Sandy, identity was about ‘where your family have been from’, which he linked strongly to place. His clarification about his mother being born on ‘British soil’ in Germany was interesting, as it shows that whilst he viewed place as significant—particularly place of birth—its importance in defining identity for him came from the feelings of attachment, or indeed non-attachment to that place. Later in the discussions he made distinctions between identity in a technical sense, and feelings of belonging to a particular area, based on the experience of that place. Although he has not lived in the Highlands, his experience of visiting on a frequent basis, combined with his family ‘roots’ there, played an important part in his sense of self. This connection to place was maintained through his use of Gaelic, a language traditionally spoken in the Highlands and Western Isles of Scotland. Sandy was a native Gaelic speaker, having attended the local Gaelic medium primary school, although it is not clear whether his family in the Highlands spoke Gaelic or he used Gaelic at home.

Kat: What makes you feel Scottish?

Sandy: Um I think, I think because I speak Gaelic as well, it’s an old language that many Scots used to speak and it’s it kind of makes me feel a wee bit more Scottish, a wee bit. Apparently I’ve got, apparently also because I’ve got an accent, you go abroad and then they’ll say ‘Oh you’re Scottish’ and you’re like ‘Oh I didn’t think I had an accent’ but yeah, apparently, apparently I do.

Although he saw Gaelic as a connection both to the past and to place and something that made him feel more Scottish, it is important to stress that his later responses did not indicate that he feels he is more ‘more Scottish’ than others who do not speak the language. Throughout the discussion he drew upon his own appreciation for the
importance of language and the sense of community that it gave him when discussing his experiences of others, particularly in terms of differing cultural practices in Scotland. This is an important finding, especially when compared with some of the attitudes towards any minority group, including Gaels, as we saw above.

Issues of language were therefore vitally important to the majority of young people when assessing their own feelings of belonging, and indeed, ‘non-belonging’. These distinctions between particular places as ‘more Scottish’ than others demonstrates the value placed on certain types of Scottish experience, a finding that explains many young people’s reluctance to accept the identity claims of those whose life experiences did not match their own, as the next section begins to examine.

5.4 Reconciling ‘Civic’ and ‘Ethnic’ National Identities
Thus far we have seen that when discussing their own identity and feelings of belonging, many young people drew upon what can be termed ‘ethnic’ elements, such as ancestry. However, when assessing the legitimacy of the identity claims of others the majority of young people placed a strong emphasis on the importance of ‘civic’ definitions of national identity, with the majority willing to accept any evidence of an experience of living in Scotland for a significant period of time as a legitimate basis for claiming a Scottish identity. Of these, accent was the most straightforward indicator of this experience, as discussed below.

5.4.1 Accent
As we have already seen, issues of language were very important to many young people’s sense of being Scottish. Unsurprisingly then, accent was the most common identity marker referred to when individuals discussed how they would assess the claims of others. However, it is important to note that accent here was a strong indicator of belonging to place, providing evidence of not only where someone grew up, but perhaps their parents as well. The comments below were all in response to the question of how they would work out whether someone was Scottish:

Accent first, would be what kind of ‘alright mate’ kind of strong accent and then, yeah. Ask them where they were born, and then where their parents come from

(Daniel, 14 years old, Edinburgh State School)
I’d listen for their accent. Because the accent is quite similar all over Scotland, except maybe Inverness
(Ryan, 14 years old, Glasgow)

Ewan: Probably the way they would talk actually, like not their accent, but like how they were talking, like if they said ‘aye’ or ‘wit’ or something like that every so often

Donald: Aye

Ewan: Then I would say, like see he just did it there [laughs] I would say that they were Scottish so
(Donald and Ewan, 14 years old, Barra)

For a minority of young people, accent was not something that merely ‘happened’ as a result of living in a place, but was something that showed a commitment to the country and a willingness to adapt, as we see here in the case of Stuart.

**Stuart, 16 years old, Edinburgh State School**

Stuart described himself as ‘born and bred in Scotland and proud of it’ and ‘100% Scottish even though my parents are English’. Stuart prioritised his own experience of living in Edinburgh and Scotland, which he explained was different to that of the rest of this family:

Well I was born in Edinburgh and I’ve lived here my whole life. My parents were…well my dad was born in England but then moved here when he was like six months old up to Edinburgh. My mum was born in like Birmingham and just moved to like live here and stuff.

While most of his relatives lived in England, he felt that he did not share the same experiences as them, so did not feel English. He was keen to stress that some of his family did come from Scotland, but did not appear to see this as legitimating his claim to being Scottish. Rather, his national identity was a personal choice based on his own experience and ‘where I know best really’. His statement that he felt ‘100% Scottish’, appears to acknowledge that other people might challenge his claim on the basis that he has English parents. Rather than simply state outright that he was ‘Scottish’, he therefore felt the need to acknowledge this, suggesting that he felt somewhat insecure in his claim. This was a common sentiment amongst those participants with English family. Significantly, Stuart viewed accent as an important way of legitimising his identity claim, as it provided evidence of his own commitment to being Scottish.
Consequently, he was very judgemental of those who did not speak with a Scottish accent even though they had grown up in Scotland:

Well I think like there’s people in this school who have quite like a strong English accent and you kinda ask them were you actually born here, why have you got such a different, not different, but like such a strong English accent when you live in Scotland

Stuart therefore felt that accent was a personal choice. To fail to adopt a Scottish accent was therefore a sign of a lack of commitment to Scotland and showed unwillingness on the part of English migrants to ‘join the nation’. The issues raised in Chapter 2 regarding the degree to which individuals are conscious of their performance are evident here. Stuart’s accusation suggests that he feels that individuals should actively adapt their ‘performance’ in order to be judged as credible. For Stuart, the issue at hand is not a question of whether or not those individuals are ‘authentically’ Scottish or English, but rather their commitment to the role of a ‘Scottish person’, a distinction that adheres to the definition of identity is an act of becoming rather than being (Goffman 1956). This issue of conformity and questions of commitment and willingness was a very important theme in many young people’s responses and is returned to in Chapter 7.

It is worth noting that Stuart’s criticism is only levied at those with English accents, rather than those from other countries, a sentiment that can perhaps be explained by his own experience of consciously choosing to adopt a Scottish identity and speaking in a Scottish accent. Based on my broader conversations with Stuart I am doubtful that he would ask the question ‘were you actually born here?’ to those who spoke in other accents i.e. migrants from countries outside the UK. However, this attitude does show the importance of the intersection of accent and place of birth as evidence of ‘belonging’.

While Stuart stressed the importance of adopting the accent as a means of demonstrating a commitment to Scotland, not everyone agreed that adopting the accent was sufficient evidence of an individual’s Scottish identity, as this discussion from the Scottish Borders group shows:

Kat: How would you feel if you saw these Sikh men talking in a Scottish accent?

Eilidh: I’d think they were Scottish
Sara: It would look weird

Paul: Like when you got to Edinburgh and you’ve got all these like, you know the shops with all the sort of like Scottish stuff and that

Amy: You get lots of Asian people in Edinburgh

Paul: Yeah, but you get like this Indian guy and he went up to my mum and he was like ‘alright lass’ and that and it just doesn’t

Amy: It’s not...

Paul: It looks like he’s putting it on

Amy: In Glasgow you get a lot of people who are like, I don’t know, like Caribbean

For these participants, the ‘performance’ of Scots Asians is unconvincing, as they are unable to focus their attention on the role being performed and instead concentrate on what they perceive to be the ‘true self’ that they feel is being ‘masked’ by the performance. As such, they challenge the authenticity of the use of Scots words by those that they perceive to be ‘other’.

In this discussion we again see the way in which the experience of those living in Edinburgh and Glasgow was perceived to be different from other areas of Scotland, with the participants from the Borders viewing the presence of people of Asian and Caribbean origin in these cities as strange and very different from their own experience of daily life. The young people from this group also had a tendency to define identity in finite terms, with a strong emphasis on place of birth and ancestry as the most significant factors in determining identity, as we see in the next section.

5.4.2 Birthplace and ancestry
Unsurprisingly, given the emphasis in the responses above, many of those who stressed the importance of accent also felt that birthplace and ancestry were very important, as we see here in the case of Fiona from the Scottish Borders:

Fiona: I think it’s if you were born in Scotland. Like where you were born is like what nationality you are. So kinda like, I know someone who was born in New Zealand but she’s like lived here
all her life. I sort of say she’s a Kiwi but she doesn’t really talk like that but she was born there so that’s her nationality

Kat: Is she quite proud of it?

Fiona: I don’t know, I don’t think she really talks about it much. But yeah, I think it is where you were born is what your nationality is

Kat: So say Sophie moved here and she suddenly decided that she did feel quite Scottish. Is that something that you would accept as being Scottish?

Fiona: I would still see her as English. Not in a bad way, I wouldn’t not like her because of it

It is important to note that Fiona was keen to stress that someone being born in another country and thus having another nationality was not an issue in terms of accepting her right to ‘belong’. This is a useful example of the distinction between ‘national identity’ and ‘citizenship’, whereby someone can possess another nationality, but still be accepted as belonging in the state in which they reside, as Chapter 2 explained. Many young people appeared to be confused by this distinction, as we see here in the discussion of Daniel and Magnus from the Edinburgh state school:

Kat: What makes someone Scottish?

Daniel: Well, if, I’d say if you’re born in Scotland and your family, at least on generation are Scottish and yeah

Magnus: I know somebody that’s like never, that’s been to Japan and her parents are Japanese, so they call themselves Japanese, but they were born in Scotland and raised in Scotland. So it’s only like a decision

Daniel: But they would have been brought up in a Japanese kind of way not like

Magnus: Their dad’s American

Daniel: Aye it gets confusing when you bring in other places and stuff ‘cause then it all gets muddled

Daniel’s realisation that his original definition could not be universally applied was a typical example of the way in which many young people struggled to reconcile the tensions in these responses, becoming self-conscious and uncomfortable when they felt
that their comments might be misunderstood. The most prominent example of this experience was seen in the responses of Paul, from the Scottish Borders.

**Paul, 14 years old, Scottish Borders**

Paul was one of the most opinionated participants I spoke to during the research, although he also appeared very self-conscious due to his position as the only male in the focus group discussion. He described himself as ‘Scottish’ in the initial exercise and joked about his stereotypically Scottish appearance of red hair and freckles, as well as his strong accent and love of Irn Bru. He was adopted and his complex feelings regarding where he was from appeared to have a significant impact on his approaches to issues of identity.

Paul was far more likely to reject the idea that individuals from ethnic minority backgrounds could be Scottish than almost all other participants in this study. This was an interesting finding given his family background. Throughout the discussions it emerged that he had lived in Spain when he was younger and that his Great Grandfather was Lithuanian. His responses surprised the teacher when we discussed the research, as although Paul was an outspoken pupil, he had never once made reference to his Lithuanian ancestry. While we might expect that his experience of living abroad and his familiarity with issues of migration would lead him to adopt a sympathetic position towards migrants who want to ‘belong’ in their new home, Paul’s reflections on the complexities of his own identity did not appear to bring about a more ‘inclusive’ understanding of national identity. Instead, he struggled against the indeterminacy that he felt weakened his own claim to belong.

Paul rejected the idea that someone could be considered Scottish just because they felt a sense of belonging. While he recognised that Scotland was a diverse place he was not prepared to automatically recognise everyone who lived there as Scottish. Paul did not share the view expressed by others in his class that nationality was simply a matter of birthplace. Instead he emphasised the importance of ancestry and the experience of living in Scotland as the most important markers of ‘Scottishness’. He felt it was important to not only be born in Scotland and grow up there, but also to ‘live a Scottish life’ in order to claim to be Scottish:

Paul: I think it’s the parents. Like if you, I think if their parents come here I wouldn’t class them as, but if they were like born in
Scotland and sort of like lived a Scottish life if you know what I mean, then I think she’d be classed as Scottish

Kat: I’m interested in what you mean by a Scottish life?

Paul: Like well, if like someone who was from India or one of those places then like women aren’t treated as like what they’d be treated here. Well maybe not Indian, but those sorts of places. Whereas here they’re treated good and that. So like her parents, her mother and father are from like a different country so she might think Scotland’s great, because she doesn’t get treated differently like what she would in her own country

While he felt that although people could come to Scotland and adopt the lifestyle, his comments here still suggest that in his view their experience of living in other places meant that they still had fundamentally different values to those who were born in Scotland. As such, they were still perceived as ‘other’. However, this ‘rule’ created problems for describing his own identity, as we see here in his discussion of the image of the Sikh men in kilts:

Kat: Why are they not Scottish in your opinion?

Paul: Because they’re from a different country and that. Their families originally came from somewhere else, so that doesn’t make them

Kat: It’s ok say what you’re trying to say

Paul: It’s like me, because I’m originally Lithuanian, so I wouldn’t, I feel like I’m Scottish but I amn’t really entirely Scottish. I’m like a very small percentage Scottish

Kat: So would you feel comfortable wearing a kilt?

Paul: Yeah, but that’s cause I like, like this guys here, if he had the experience of living in Asia, and he would like, more than what he does here, but like I don’t know a lot about Lithuania, so I sort I like just put that to the side. Because I know everything there is to know about Scotland, all its history and that and I just pick Scotland because it’s like my country

Both Giddens and Goffman are useful for understanding Paul’s comments here. Through critically reflecting on his identity Paul appeared to feel that the validity of his identity claim was being challenged, as his background and experiences did not match his own criteria for national identity. In order to resolve this issue and maintain a coherent sense of self he therefore shifted the focus of his narrative away from his
originally discussion of birthplace as a key factor of identity, towards the importance of ‘performing’ his Scottishness through discussing his knowledge of Scottish history. By doing so, he was able to satisfy himself as to the credibility of his identity claim. This finding raises challenges for approaches to identity in museums that attempt to encourage individuals to think critically about their own sense of self and belonging in order to produce a greater understanding of the plural nature of national identity. Had Paul been unable to successfully resolve this issue he may have been forced to re-evaluate the original conditions he outlined for Scottish identity. Instead, he was able to reconcile these tensions and thus avoid altering his views.

Paul’s response here was one of the few examples of allusions to issues of ‘race’ and belonging in the research, the evidence for which was seen in his discomfort in expressing such views. Rather than discussing ‘race’ directly, he focused on the experience of place as a more neutral way of addressing these issues. This was a common strategy in young people’s attempts to negotiate their own sense of belonging with what they felt was the socially acceptable or more ‘inclusive’ position on issues of belonging, as the next section illustrates.

5.4.3 Residency and belonging
While the majority of young people situated their identity primarily in terms of their place of birth and the identity of their parents, when discussing the identity claims of others, a number of participants downplayed the importance of birth and parentage in favour of residency or ‘territorial’ definitions of citizenship. This is in-keeping with existing research on national identity in Scotland, which suggests that residency and birthplace were more significant factors than ethnicity in influencing whether or not the identity claims of English migrants and those from non-white ethnic backgrounds were accepted or rejected.

The emphasis on the experience of, or commitment to place was seen in the responses of the young people in this study and allowed them to bypass the tricky issue of ‘ethnicity’ in favour of more ‘neutral’ definitions based on birthplace and residency. However, as McCrone and Bechhofer (2008) in their analysis of the 2005 Scottish Social Attitudes Survey data observe, identity claims based solely on residence are less likely to be accepted than those that combine other identity markers. The conversations at the Scottish Borders and Barra groups therefore centred on what additional evidence these young people would need in order to accept an individual’s claim to ‘belong’ based on residency. Although this could be seen as an attempt to generate additional
rules so that individuals could easily reject such claims, instead it appears that many participants were simply trying to understand why the claims were being made and whether they needed to adjust their narratives in order to accommodate this new information. Donald, Ewan and Ruairidh’s reluctance to accept identity claims on the basis of residency alone concurs with existing studies and their reflections were similar to many of the young people in this study.

**Donald, Ewan and Ruairidh 14 years old, Barra**

Donald, Ewan and Ruairidh all attended school in Barra and all three were related. They were all Gaelic speakers and were strongly in favour of independence. Ruairidh defined himself as ‘Gael’ although he explained that he probably would have just said Scottish if he had not seen people describing themselves using this term in the ‘One Nation, Five Million Voices’ film shown at the start of the research. His dad was from Barra and his mum was from Vatersay, a smaller island next to Barra accessible by bridge. Although a small difference geographically, he was keen to emphasise this distinction, and his sensitivity to these micro differences appeared to play an important part in his perceptions of others. He rarely left the island, travelling only as far as Oban when he did, although explained that he used to go to Glasgow quite often before his siblings were born. Like Ruairidh, Donald also stressed the importance of local differences, explaining that his mother had previously lived in Fort William before moving to Barra to live on his grandfather’s croft. He had recently moved from the croft to a house on the other side of the island, a move that was very significant to him as he was now further away from his friends. Ewan was the only one who had not lived his whole life on Barra. He moved to Glasgow at a young age, and his dad still lived there, although both his mum and grandparents were from Barra. He resented growing up in Glasgow and wished that he had been raised in Barra like his cousins. He felt that he did not belong in Glasgow as he could not understand the accent, although he was keen to correct the others’ perceptions of life on the mainland, particularly their idea that no one on the mainland spoke or appreciated Gaelic. All three drew upon their own experiences of place when attempting to understand and assess the identity claims of others.

As someone who might fit a territorial definition of Scottish identity, I frequently drew upon my own ‘otherness’ during the research in order to analyse this assertion that someone could become Scottish through residency. In doing so, I aimed to provide a more concrete example for the groups to consider and thus gain a greater understanding.
of how their definitions of ‘Scottishness’ from the focus group activity related to ‘real-world’ scenarios. Here Donald, Ewan and Ruairaidh assessed the legitimacy of my claim:

Kat: How would you know they were from Scotland? Do they have to be born here?

Donald: No, they just have to have lived here for 5 years

Ewan: [Shakes head and laughs]

Kat: 5 years?

Donald: Yeah 5 years

Kat: Ok, that’s interesting, so I’m from the North of England and I’ve lived in Scotland for 8 years

Donald: You’re Scottish then

Kat: So I’m Scottish now am I? Am I allowed to say that?

Donald: [puts hands together and bows] God bless you for being Scottish

Kat: Awesome

Ewan: I would have said that you would have to grow up in Scotland to be truly Scottish, because you wouldn’t have a, lots of things happen when you’re younger, so it’s more if you’ve grown up somewhere

Donald: Yeah

Ewan: If you’re from that place, so like, I think we are all Scottish, and like most of the people in there [indicates to rest of class next door] but I don’t think that John would be

Donald: I don’t think he’d be Scottish yet

Ewan: He just moved here last year

Ruairaidh: But wait but when he’s like older are we gonna call him Scottish?

Donald: No

Ewan: I don’t think so ‘cause he hasn’t spent a lot of his childhood here
Donald: And he doesn’t like Scotland, he’d be more like rooting for England [in sports] so he’s not Scottish

Ewan: Or like I would say that if you grew up in Scotland you would be Scottish, but like if you grew up in England than you’re English, so, that’s how I see it

Kat: So how does someone prove that they’re Scottish to you? What do you need to know about them?

Donald: They have to have a Young Scot card

Kat: A Young Scot card?¹³

Donald: Yeah I lost mine

Kat: So you have to physically be able to prove it? What if they didn’t have a Young Scot card or

Donald: Then I’d call them part Scottish, they’re not like 100% pure Scottish, they’d have to like be part [laughs]

Donald delighted in legitimating my hypothetical claim to a Scottish identity and appeared proud of his ‘inclusive’ stance. However, his view was challenged by Ewan, who emphasised the importance of socialisation at an early age in order to have the same common experiences as other people in Scotland. He justified this by highlighting the example of their classmate John—someone who could meet his criteria in the future.

John had proudly asserted his English identity in the group discussion and showed no particular desire to modify this identity to ‘fit in’ with his peers. After conceding that John would never be considered Scottish in their view, Donald appeared to become uncomfortable, as he realised that he had contradicted his previous statement. It is important to state that this apparent contradiction did not make Donald’s original statement ‘false’. Rather, the change in question had presented him with a different set of conditions that required a different response. He was quick to explain that this decision was based on his perception that John did not appear to like Scotland or want to be Scottish. As such, he presented John as an anomaly to his theory. Again, here we seek evidence of the way in which individuals use narrative strategies in order to avoid addressing issues of cognitive dissonance brought about through encountering new

¹³ A Young Scot Card is issued to young people under the age of 16 in Scotland and offers deals such as discounted bus travel
situations or information. Such strategies allow individuals to refuse to seriously ‘entertain views and ideas divergent from those an individual already holds…[the] avoidance of dissonance forms part of a protective cocoon which helps to maintain ontological security’ (Giddens 1991: 188).

Donald’s realisation that he may have contradicted his previous definition of Scottish identity led him to move onto a less subjective and therefore arguably unproblematic definition of national identity. He swiftly returned to his ‘territorial’ definition of Scottish identity, emphasising the importance of the ‘Young Scot card’, an equivalent legal marker of identity to that of the passport used to define citizenship status. Donald’s reversion to a ‘legal’ definition of Scottish identity can be seen as an attempt to ‘manage’ this discrepancy. Officially sanctioned definitions appeared to be ‘safer’ topics of discussion for many participants, providing a level of abstraction that allowed them to avoid expressing personal opinions on whether or not they accepted an identity claim. Although he was partly joking, Donald also provided himself with a ‘get-out clause’ that allowed him to distance himself from making difficult decisions, whilst also providing justification for any further changes to his original position. Through referring to pre-existing ‘rules’ beyond his control, Donald was able to negotiate a potential challenge to his identity and thus maintain a positive self-image. Although he ‘experimented’ with different definitions of Scottish identity at an abstract level, ultimately these definitions did not match his existing experience and could thus be safely discarded when appropriate. This concurs with Rounds’ (2006) suggestion that museum visitors may ‘try out’ different ideas and perspectives without necessarily changing their own.

There are echoes here of Norman Tebbit’s infamous ‘cricket test’ in Donald’s justification for excluding John, on the basis that he would support English, rather than Scottish teams in sporting activities. Ewan explained that his rejection of John as Scottish was not due to him being born in England, but rather to ‘growing up’ there. The implication of this appears to be that if John had grown up in the same place as them, they could consider him to be Scottish, regardless of where his parents were from. The question remains however as to what constitutes ‘growing up’. Given the relative youth of these respondents, each additional year not spent in Scotland appeared to increase the likelihood of an identity claim being rejected. There is also a suggestion here that if John made more of an effort to behave in a similar way to those around him,
by supporting the same teams or expressing a love of Scotland, then any claim to a Scottish identity might be more likely to be accepted. This raises another significant issue for this study: requirement that individuals must demonstrate their pride and commitment to Scotland in order to have their identity claims accepted.

5.4.4 Pride and commitment
A defining feature in young people’s narratives was a pride in being from Scotland. For a larger proportion of young people, evidence of a shared sense of pride and commitment to the country was enough to be accepted as Scottish, a finding that is returned to in the discussion of the adoption of Scottish cultural practices by migrants in Chapter 7. The responses here fit with Keily et al.’s findings that individuals will accept identity claims based on ‘demonstrable forms of commitment and contribution to the country’ (2005:153). They explain that these definitions presuppose that the claim centres on residence, as a result of which the individual would engage in ‘cultural aspects’ and develop ‘feelings of attachment and commitment to Scotland’ (ibid).

The negotiation between ‘civic’ ideas of belonging, based on a commitment to ‘adapting’ to civic life, versus a ‘cultural’ notion of commitment can be seen in the debate between Amy and Paul here:

Amy, 14 years old, Scottish Borders

Amy described herself as Scottish, although she later stated that she saw herself as British as well. Her dad was from Essex, while her mum was born in Glasgow. Both met studying Archaeology at Edinburgh and they both worked for a large Scottish heritage organisation. Amy felt that it was more important to recognise the differences in modern Scotland than focus on the past when trying to define national identity and rejected Paul’s ideas that people who moved to Scotland had to learn about its heritage:

Kat: What is it that makes someone Scottish?
Amy: To have lived there
Paul: To have lived here and like, I don’t know the word...Scotland’s got symbols that you have to have used, like haggis and that, kilts I think that you have to have sort of used or, I don’t know, I don’t remember
Amy: I think to have lived there for more than just a holiday and to have made friends there and to like have understood the culture
Kat: What about the culture?

Amy: Like not come in and not understand what’s going on. To be able to get along with and like live comfortably and like be ok with different situations

Kat: So what sort of things would I need to know about if I was going to move?

Amy: Like you’d need to know about the schooling and like if you had a job you’d need to know about the taxes

Paul: I’d say you have to know more about the history, about what Scotland stands for and what its role is

Amy: They shouldn’t have to know all the history ‘cause I don’t really know that

Paul: I wouldn’t say all the history, but like the main stuff. Like William Wallace and Robert, um, Robert something, and like the battle of Culloden, like why that happened. Like I don’t think it’s got anything to do with school or taxes, because like you pick that up if you move to another country

Paul challenged Amy’s ‘civic’ definitions of Scottish identity, as he felt that it implied that anyone could live in the country and therefore be accepted as Scottish. His realisation that he could not remember the name of Robert the Bruce was quickly glossed over, although he was visibly embarrassed and appeared worried that he had undermined his argument and therefore the legitimacy of his own identity claim. For Paul, living in Scotland was not the same as belonging in Scotland, which required an active commitment through engaging with heritage. Amy was visibly uncomfortable with Paul’s responses and in retrospect they probably should not have been interviewed together. However, the tension between their positions produced interesting discussions, with both actively refuting the others assertions. Amy’s suggestion that people need to ‘understand the culture’ initially appears to be in-line with Paul’s assertion that individuals need to ‘use’ Scotland’s symbols. However, her definition of ‘culture’ is instead closely aligned with civic definitions of national identity. Indeed, her preference for incomers learning about the tax and school system is significant given the recent changes in the UK citizenship test from questions on the practical mechanics of daily life to a strong focus on heritage, as we saw in Chapter 2. Amy was not uncritical in her assertion that anyone could be Scottish; she felt that it was important to migrants to
‘join’ the community, however the conditions that she set out are straightforward and seemingly achievable for anyone who lives in Scotland.

An ‘open’ and pragmatic response to the issue of ‘commitment’ can also be clearly seen in Dean’s response:

Dean: You can just say you’re Scottish, put a flag outside your house, you can do anything really that helps you become Scottish. Some people might think it’s eating haggis, some people might just think it’s watching Scottish football. Just anything really that makes you feel like you’re part of this community, our big happy, race, well not race, but you know.

A similar explanation can be found in the attempts of Donald and Ewan from Barra to make sense of why one of the individuals featured in the One Nation film, said he felt Scottish, even though he did not claim to be Scottish:

Donald: Well he’s moved to Scotland because he wants to be part of us because we’re the best.

Ewan: If he’s English how does he know what being Scottish feels like?

Donald: If you see a Saltire and you feel proud then you’re Scottish.

Ewan: It depends what his opinion of Scotland was, because if he didn’t like Scotland I wouldn’t like him. But if he liked Scotland then I wouldn’t mind it.

Other members of this group also stressed the importance of pride:

Kat: Ok, so this next question is what do you think makes someone Scottish?

Isla: Well like living here for like a few years of their life and like being proud to have lived here or be from here.

Sophie: Yeah, probably being from here. But on that film [One Nation Five Million Voices] there was people saying they feel proud even though they’re not from here. They feel Scottish, I think, I don’t know, if they feel that way, then …

Sophie’s definition of ‘being from here’ alludes to both birth and residency. It is important to note that she does not wholeheartedly embrace the idea that pride in an identity automatically allows someone to be accepted as Scottish; she does not dispute
the individual’s feelings of belonging. This emphasis on allowing individuals to
determine their own identity, as a means of avoiding discriminating against others, was
witnessed particularly amongst those who were keen to stress the positive feelings of
belonging that they felt by claiming to be Scottish, as the responses below show.

5.4.5 Feeling Scottish
A small minority of young people downplayed ‘fixed’ markers of identity and stressed
the importance of open definitions of national identity, whereby anyone who wanted to
‘join the nation’ was accepted.

Kat: How would someone show that they’re Scottish?

Dean: They don’t have to. If you really want to be Scottish you
wouldn’t try that hard. Yeah like you really want to be Scottish, I
don’t know. It depends who you are. You might be quite a lazy
person, you might say [puts fist in the air] ‘yep I’m Scottish’ and
you just say that to yourself if it keeps you comfortable. Other
people might want to know about the history of Scotland, the
history about where they want to live. They might want to live
there, adapt the mannerisms, the dress code, the accent, they
might try and copy that as well, it just depends on what sort of
person you are.

Reflecting on their own sense of identity, a small proportion of young people stressed
the importance of focusing on how individuals described themselves, rather than
attempting to ascribe an identity through the use of pre-determined identity markers.
Participants such as William from the younger Edinburgh State School group refused to
define someone else’s identity in simple terms such as birth, parentage or residency
alone:

I think if someone believes that they’re Scottish, or if they
identify themselves as Scottish, then they’re probably Scottish.
Although that’s very hard to test on like an immigration form

This emphasis on avoiding external categorisation allowed William to circumnavigate
the issue of generating fixed rules as to who may or may not be considered Scottish,
allowing his inclusive definition of who can be Scottish to remain unchallenged.
William was visibly frustrated that his open definition would not be easily
accommodated in official definitions and acknowledged that this definition was not
always possible in wider society, due to the pragmatic need to generate rules for state
purposes.
Both Steven and Jenna used the phrase ‘technically Scottish’ to allude to what could be
categorised as citizenship based definitions of national identity, which they characterise
here as relating to place of birth or residency. However, they seemed to find such
straightforward definitions problematic, recognising that these categorisations do not
take into account how an individual may identify themselves, or how they may ‘feel’:

Kat: Coming back to your statement about them being technically
Scottish, what would that be for you?

Jenna: Oh, um, either if they were like, if they’ve lived most of their
life in Scotland probably. Like if they were born here then moved
away then they’re kind of Scottish

Steven: But it would depend on what they felt

Jenna: Yeah. I mean if they’ve lived here most of their life then they’re
Scottish

Kat: How would you feel if there was someone who didn’t kind
of meet that criteria of being Scottish, they hadn’t like lived in
Scotland a long time, maybe didn’t have Scottish parents, but
they still did what you describe as Scottish things, how would
you explain that?

Jenna: It’s like American people, they love Scottishness now

Steven: I just think it’s up to a person to decide what they feel,
so I wouldn’t really question it to be honest

Jenna: Yeah, they’re just looking for their heritage

Steven: Maybe they just want to be Scottish

Jenna: Yeah I suppose if they want to

Steven: Yes

Jenna: Yeah come and join us

(Steven, 18 year old, Jenna 17 years old, Edinburgh State
School)

It is interesting to note that Jenna viewed someone who was born in Scotland as ‘kind
of’ Scottish, whereas the identity claims of someone who has lived most of their life in
Scotland, regardless of birth or parentage, are much less problematic. For Jenna, being
Scottish is not simply a matter of birth and parentage, but lived experience and feelings
of belonging. For this reason, many young people were very positive about those from
migrant and ethnic minority background’s attempts to join the nation through embracing Scotland’s heritage. However, the degree to which the experiences of such groups were accepted as part of Scotland’s heritage in their own right was a matter of contention, as we will see in the next chapter.

5.5 Conclusion
As we have seen, the majority of young people were comfortable with the principles of ‘civic’ national identity, although there were some contradictions and points of tension in their responses when they attempted to generate and apply the ‘rules’ of identity in real life scenarios. While ‘civic’ markers of identity such as place of birth were relatively ‘safe’ and straightforward topics that allowed young people to assess the legitimacy of others identity claims without threatening their ‘inclusive’ self-image, discussions of ‘ethnic’ markers such as ‘heritage’ appeared to challenge the ‘civic’ definitions of ‘Scottishness’ by encouraging young people to focus on issues of cultural differences, specifically those of ethnicity and religion. The confusion in the responses of the young people in this section shows an awareness of the tensions between their desire to hold inclusive attitudes and their own feelings of belonging to Scotland. The way in which these participants addressed this tension is examined later in the discussion chapters.

Significantly, we have also seen that for some young people, any attempt to critically reflect on their own identity led to feelings of instability and insecurity about their own feelings of belonging. This resulted in attempts to position themselves as ‘more Scottish’ than those whose claims were perceived to be weaker than their own, rather than sympathise with individual’s desire to belong. This finding was unexpected and brings into question the theoretical discussions of the way in which museums might foster more ‘inclusive’ attitudes towards national identity, as outlined in Chapter 2. This resistance to attempts to broaden definitions of belonging as a means of preserving individual’s own sense of the unique nature of ‘being Scottish’ is examined further in the next chapter, which seeks to understand why individuals may be invested in the concept of a pre-determined and ‘fixed’ collective identity as a means of securing a ‘guaranteed’ identity.
Chapter 6. Constructing the ‘Core’: Negotiating Individual Preference and Group Consensus in Collective Narratives of Heritage and Identity

In emphasising sameness, group membership provides the basis for supportive interaction, coherence and consensus. As identity is expressed and experienced through communal membership, awareness will develop of the Other—identities and groups with competing and often conflicting beliefs, values and aspirations. Recognition of Otherness will help reinforce self-identity, but may also lead to distrust, avoidance, exclusion and distancing from other groups so defined (Douglas 1997:151-2).

A key argument identified in the literature review was the need for museums and other heritage organisations to re-imagine the relationship between the margins and the core in order to produce plural understandings of national identity. This chapter identifies the challenges facing this approach by investigating why young people might be invested in the conceptualisation of a singular, distinctive ‘core’ definition of ‘Scottishness’ and thus be resistant to attempts to re-imagine Scotland in plural terms in certain contexts. Throughout this chapter we see the importance of consensus in young people’s attempts to establish and maintain a ‘core’ definition of Scotland through the construction of heritage. While the majority of participants acknowledged that many external representations of Scotland’s heritage were stereotypes, they also described the feelings of pride they gained from knowing that Scotland’s rich cultural iconography was instantly recognisable in global terms. They therefore emphasised the importance of maintaining established definitions of Scottish heritage in order to sustain distinctions between other places. This was achieved through emphasising Scotland’s historical differences to ‘other’ places, downplaying the differences within the nation and challenging the legitimacy of others who attempted to incorporate contemporary ethnic and religious differences within definitions of the nation. I therefore argue that both heritage and place offer a sense of stability and thus ontological security for individual’s identity claims. The degree to which individuals are inclined to accept a heterogeneous representation of the nation is therefore largely dependent upon what they perceive to be ‘at stake’. In other words, is an individual’s sense of self invested in existing discourses of the nation? And what risks to individual’s sense of self are brought about by deconstructing and de-stabilising these discourses? I also examine the question of
whether recognition of the geographical differences within Scotland facilitates a broader understanding of the plural nature of national identity, or if these differences in fact provide justification for the rejection of migrant communities as part of the national story, due to the differences in population distribution between rural areas and urban centres.

While the previous chapters examined how young people viewed themselves, this chapter focuses specifically on how young people conceptualised the nation. The findings examined in this chapter are based on the image selection exercise and subsequent group discussions on how participants made their decisions regarding which images they accepted or rejected as representative of Scotland. It identifies the key trends in image selection, before examining the specific reasoning behind participant’s decisions, which centred on concepts of pride and place distinction. It also analyses the tensions between individual and collective identities. In doing so, it provides insights into the way in which national heritage is constructed through the negotiation of personal preference and group consensus.

The analysis in this chapter draws on Goffman’s concept of performance by analysing the way in which the image selection exercise served as an opportunity to ‘perform’ their Scottish identity in a manner that was deemed credible to others. It also utilises Giddens’ work in order to understand how young people mediated tensions in their narratives in order to maintain a coherent, stable sense of self.

6.1 Constructing the Core
Existing research on national identity in Scotland suggests that ‘cultural matters’ play a bigger role than issues of politics and governance in shaping individuals sense of being Scottish (Bechhofer and McCrone 2009:75). Indeed, Bechhofer and McCrone suggest that individuals’ strong sense of being Scottish may in part be attributed to Scotland’s ‘all too apparent set of cultural icons’ such as ‘ruined castles, tartan, kilts, haggis and shortbread, geared but not exclusively to the tourist industry’ (2009: 64). Although the importance of culture and heritage in the formation of Scottish identity cannot be denied, Bechhofer and McCrone acknowledge that some see the ‘omnipresent’ nature of Scottish culture and heritage within everyday social life as ‘detrimental to a ‘proper’ sense of Scottish identity’ (2009: 65). The most vocal critic of cultural constructions of Scottish national identity is Tom Nairn. In The Break-Up of Britain, first published in
1977, he states: ‘Cramped, stagnant, backward-looking, parochial—all of these and others are epithets traditionally and rightly ascribed to modern Scottishness…But deformed as they are, these constitute nonetheless a strong, institutionally guaranteed identity’ (2003:119).

Nairn’s criticism focuses on the way that certain perceptions of Scottish culture and heritage have been promoted and over-represented, at the expense of what he presumably views to be more valid forms of cultural expression. He argues that: the ‘popular consciousness of separate identity, uncultivated by the “national” experience or culture in the usual sense, has become curiously fixed or fossilised…to the point of forming a huge, virtually self-contained universe of Kitsch’ (Nairn 2003:150). His condemnation is focused upon what has been termed ‘tartanry’. McCrone et al. argue that the term ‘has come to stand for a superficial and sentimental attachment by lowland Scots to an emblem which historically they have no right’ (1999:50). They note that ‘a number of writers have argued that the [tartan] Monster has distorted Scottish culture by requiring that all things Scottish have to be tartan, and moreover that tartan stands for the trivial, the commercial, the deformation of a nation that has lost its way politically’ (1999:56). This theme is elaborated upon throughout their book length study Scotland the Brand, which examines the role of what Hewison (1987) has termed the ‘heritage industry’ on representations of Scottish culture and heritage and the impact this has on what it means to be Scottish.

Academic discussions of the role that heritage plays in the construction of national identity in Scotland have therefore tended to be somewhat pessimistic, viewing the complicated relationship between heritage, identity and tourism as producing a ‘false’ understanding of what it means to be Scottish. At the outset of this research it was anticipated that the young people in this study would share this pessimism and seek to contest or reject such ‘stereotypical’ depictions of Scotland in favour of alternative histories or a focus on modern, everyday life. Surprisingly, this was not the case. While I do not share Nairn’s scathing critique of Scottish identity, his argument that such representations offer a ‘guaranteed identity’ is vital to understanding this finding. As we will see in the next section, although the majority of the young people recognised that images of ‘tartanry’ were stereotypes that did not necessarily reflect contemporary life, they identified strongly with such images as a means of celebrating the distinctive nature of Scottish identity and were reluctant to challenge their validity or offer alternative representations, as the findings below demonstrate.
6.2 Image Selections: Overview of Participant Responses

As Chapter 3 outlined, the key focus of this thesis is upon the narratives surrounding the inclusion or exclusion of certain images. The approach of this study concurs with Scourfield et al’s (2006) assertion that the ‘quasi-quantification’ of the images selected offers limited possibilities for analysis. The frequency with which certain images were chosen, rejected or indeed overlooked was of less interest than the conversations and indeed ‘silences’ that arose during this activity. However, it is useful to provide an overview here of the results from the image choice exercise, as this provides a useful framework for understanding why certain topics came to dominate the discussions, while others that may have been more significant to the research, such as questions focusing on ethnicity, were less prominent than might be expected. While the results across all the groups were surprisingly similar, by representing the image choices graphically it is also possible to observe some interesting differences, not least between groups of different sizes.

It is important to highlight the choice of language when referring to the images used in this study. I fully acknowledge that the labels, such as ‘black Bagpiper’ and ‘Asian Man in Kilt’ are crude and essentialist. However, during the research it became necessary to use such straightforward terms when discussing the images with participants for reasons of speed and clarity and for this same reason these labels are used throughout the discussion chapters. With the above caveats in mind, the next section examines the key trends identified in the selection and exclusion of the images presented and the variations and similarities between the responses of the young people in this study.

6.2.1 Images accepted as Scottish

Surprisingly, almost all the images were selected by at least one participant for inclusion in their top 10. The most popular images were an interesting mix of cultural icons, historical figures and the ‘everyday’. This mixture of responses supports Edensor’s assertion that national identity is:

partly sustained through the circulation of representations of spectacular and mundane cultural elements…the landscapes, everyday places and objects, famous events and mundane rituals, gestures and habits, and examples of tradition and modernity which are held in common by large numbers of people (Edensor, 2002:139).
As Figure 14 shows, the most common images chosen across all groups were the Saltire, Irn Bru, a thistle, Rangers and Celtic/Football, Robert Burns and Braveheart/William Wallace. These images were all selected by at least half of the participants. There was a significant drop in popularity between these and the next cluster, which included the Edinburgh Military Tattoo, Ben Nevis, haggis, fish and chips, rugby, a pipeband, Culloden, Highland Games, Hogmanay fireworks and the Forth Rail Bridge, chosen by between twenty-two and seventeen participants. At the other end of the scale, the only images not selected during this exercise were the images of Indian dancers, Sikh men wearing kilts and, surprisingly, George Square in Glasgow. Also unpopular were the images of a Pakistani Grocer, Scottish Travellers, the Italian Chapel on Orkney, an Asian man in a kilt, a Chinese Dragon and curry, each of which were only chosen by one participant. What is striking is that when we compare Figures 15 to 20 is that this pattern is very similar across all groups, a phenomenon that changes significantly when we examine the responses to the subsequent questions. The emphasis here on commonality and consensus is vital to understanding the responses of the young people in this study, as we see later in this chapter.
Figure 14 Images included in ‘top ten’ across all groups
Figure 15 Images included by participants in Scottish Borders group
Figure 16 Images included by participants in Barra group
Figure 17 Images included by participants in Edinburgh State School group 1
Figure 18 Images included by participants in Edinburgh State School group 2
Figure 19 Images included by participants in Edinburgh Private School group
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Image Description</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alex Salmond</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westminster</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clyde Bridge</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaelic Road Sign</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Braveheart</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honours of Scotland</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scots Language</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forth Road Bridge</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Highland Games Athlete</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thistle</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highland Dancing</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangers and Celtic</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian Dancing</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tattoo/Castle</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottish Parliament</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sikhs in Kilt</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pope</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hogmanay</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pipeband</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ice-cream</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black piper</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistani Grocer</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wedding/Cellidh</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Burns</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hijab/Islam</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SECC</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crisps</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highland Games</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange March</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottish Travellers</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonnie Prince Charlie</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish and Chips</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irn Bru</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Square Glasgow</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Hoy</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rugby</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian Chapel</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian man in kilt</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Andrews/ Golf</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Flag</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mosque</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese Dragon</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queen</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU flag, Union Jack, Saltire</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haggis</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culloden</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saltire</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royal Family in kilts</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ben Nevis</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curry</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polish Shop</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional Music</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wallace Monument</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Queen of Scots</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melrose Abbey</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese Restaurant</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loch and mountain</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Cameron</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andy Murray</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.2.2 Images conditionally accepted as Scottish

Figure 21 shows the images chosen in the second image selection exercise across all groups, arranged in order of popularity. There were far fewer responses to this exercise than the previous exercise, a finding that can be attributed to the fact that there was no requirement to select a certain amount of images at this stage. As we can see when we compare this with Figure 14, in contrast to the first exercise where image choices clustered around six images, the distribution of image choices in this exercise was more widely spread, almost all the images were chosen by at least one participant for inclusion under certain circumstances. The most popular images included at this stage were the Queen (sixteen participants), Andy Murray, curry (twelve participants), David Cameron, an image of an Asian man in a kilt, a girl wearing a hijab, a black Bagpiper, the Honours of Scotland and Westminster, all chosen by ten participants.

The circumstances under which young people would consider including these images were identified as relating to three distinct categories: if the person they were talking to was either from Scotland or possessed a considerable degree of knowledge about the country already; if they were specifically discussing Scotland’s relationship with the UK; if they were describing a particular place in Scotland; or if they were trying to describe modern Scotland. These final two points were very important distinctions and are explored in depth in Chapter 7.

When we compare Figures 22 to 27 we can see that the Edinburgh Private School group were the most likely to label images as conditionally Scottish, with almost all images selected, whereas the Glasgow State School group were the least likely to accept these images as Scottish in certain circumstances. While this finding could be interpreted as evidence that the Edinburgh Private School group were more prepared to accept certain images if different caveats were applied, we should also recognise that this difference may potentially be attributed to the differing cognitive abilities of the group, with those in the Edinburgh group having a greater appreciation of the task than the younger participants in the Glasgow group. Some participants appeared to use this exercise as a means of expanding the original list of images from the first exercise to include those they had previously overlooked or not had the opportunity to include due to the restrictions imposed, rather than identify ‘contested’ images. There also appeared to be increased awareness of the aims of the research in this activity, particularly amongst the older participants, with a number of young people using the exercise as a means of
‘correcting’ what they perceived to be a stereotypical image of Scotland presented in the first round of pictures.

There are some interesting differences between the groups when we look at which images were the most popular in this second activity. The most popular choices for the Scottish Border group were the images of Bonnie Prince Charlie and the Scottish Travellers, each chosen by five participants. Several members of this group asked me to identify the first of these images during this second activity, indicating that they had not initially recognised the image at first but on second look felt it might be significant and potentially worth selecting. The image of the Travellers was popular with a group of girls who, upon enquiring as to what the image represented, discussed the Channel 4 programme *My Big Fat Gypsy Wedding* and encouraged each other to select this image in order to reflect the Traveller community. The most common images chosen by Barra group in this exercise were the image of the hijab and curry, each chosen by four participants. The latter was also popular with the Edinburgh Private School group, with five participants including it at this stage. This finding is potentially the result of an extended conversation about the origins of curry and the presence of the Asian community in Scotland with both of these groups in the first discussion. Following on from this, the most popular image selected at this stage by participants in the Edinburgh Private School group was the image of an Asian man wearing a kilt, a decision that may have been influenced by a discussion about the requirements of pupils at this school to wear kilts to chapel. Despite the fact that almost half of this group provisionally accepted this image it remained contentious and the debate over its inclusion is examined in detail in Chapter 7. The most popular images for the second Edinburgh State School group were the images of the black bagpiper, which was chosen by five participants and the Edinburgh Central Mosque, which was chosen by four participants, choices that may have reflected the ethnic and religious diversity of this class, although we might expect that the numbers of individuals choosing these images would have been higher as a result of this, a finding that is considered in detail in Chapter 8. In contrast, their older peers in the first Edinburgh State School group focused on images that reflected the relational nature of Scottish and British identities, with the Queen selected by five participants and Westminster and Andy Murray receiving four nominations. Interestingly, the only religious image that received strong support amongst this group was the image of the Pope.
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Figure 24 Images conditionally accepted by Edinburgh State School group 1
Figure 25 Images conditionally accepted by Edinburgh State School group 2
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6.2.3 Images excluded from being Scottish

Participants were verbally reminded at the outset of this exercise that all the images placed on the table had something to do with Scotland and could be considered Scottish by some people. That the vast majority of participants chose to exclude at least one or two images is an important finding. What is interesting is that when we compare the results of Figure 28 with those from Figure 21 we find that a much higher number of participants chose to exclude images outright than accept them conditionally.

The wording of the question should be remembered here, as the rejection of these images does not necessarily mean that participants would not accept the images as accurate reflections of daily life in Scotland, although as Chapter 7 examines this was the case in a small minority of the arguments put forward. Interestingly, there was a tendency amongst all groups with the exception of the older Edinburgh State School group to exclude images outright rather than accept them as conditionally Scottish, a finding that I suggest shows a preference for clear cut decisions, rather than ambiguity amongst this age group.

Figure 28 shows the results across all groups for third image selection exercise. Significantly, the most commonly excluded images were images perceived to represent England or Britain and those that were associated with ethnic and religious minorities. Very few images were escaped exclusion by at least one participant, with only the images representing the Scots language, Thistle, a Pipe band, Robert Burns, Haggis (and Haggis Crisps), Highland Games, Rugby, Inr Bru and Melrose Abbey escaping exclusion by at least one participant. There were some surprising results, with First Minister Alex Salmond, historical figures such as Mary Queen of Scots and Bonnie Prince Charlie, famous landmarks including the Forth Road Bridge and sporting figures Chris Hoy and Andy Murray all excluded by a small minority of participants.

An interesting picture emerges however when we compare the differences between the groups (see Figures 29-34). In the two smallest groups, the first Edinburgh State School group and the Glasgow group, the range of images excluded is much smaller, a finding that can be contributed to both a smaller number of participants, but may also be result of these young people feeling more ‘exposed’ than those in larger groups. In other words, participants in larger groups of the second Edinburgh State School and the Edinburgh private school may have felt that the large size of this group gave them a feeling of both ‘safety in numbers’ and anonymity. The research process in both these groups was chaotic and the sheer size of both the groups meant that individuals were
able to select images without worrying that I was standing over their shoulder. While it might be tempting to state that individuals from these groups were more likely to exclude certain images because they held different beliefs to others, it is important to remember the way in which group dynamics of this nature can create a ‘pack’ mentality, an issue that many young people identified when explaining their choices in the subsequent discussions.

Participants in the Edinburgh Private School group excluded a much wider range of images than those from other groups, with a greater proportion of the group rejecting images relating Islam—the hijab and Edinburgh Central Mosque—than other groups. This finding is in stark contrast to the responses of their peers in the first Edinburgh State School group, where only one participant excluded these images. This group were also the least likely to reject images relating to Britain or politics, a finding that reflects their status as Politics students. The different in attitudes towards David Cameron amongst this group in comparison with those in all the other groups is highly significant, as we might expect given the discussion in Chapter 4.
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6.3 Key Themes in Participant Image Selections
In order to provide a framework for the subsequent discussion, this next section highlights the main themes in the group responses. It provides an overview of the topics that were most pertinent throughout the research and highlights significant differences between the responses of the groups, and indeed, individuals. The tension between these positions was a very important finding and is examined later in this chapter.

6.3.1 Symbols of Scotland
Images described by participants as symbols of Scotland were included most frequently by participants in their top ten, as we see in these responses:

They’re the main symbols of Scotland
(Paul, 14 years old, Scottish Borders)

They’re the things that people remember about Scotland
(Eilidh, 14 years old, Scottish Borders)

Although these images had symbolic value, very few young people felt that these images were important to them as individuals:

I actually can’t remember why I ticked the ones I ticked, but I can tell the thistle is a sort of a symbol of Scotland. But it’s not that important to me
(Ewan, 14 years old, Barra)

They’re not important to me really I just think they represent Scotland
(Fraser 16 years old, Edinburgh Private School)

The majority of participants were surprised when they were asked to explain their decision, as they felt the image’s iconic nature meant that they did not require further justification. Significantly, they also stated that the majority would agree with their decision. This reasoning shows the importance of consensus when constructing a representation of the nation, a finding that is returned to later in this chapter. The most common images chosen were the Saltire and the thistle (See Figure 35 and Figure 36 below). The popularity of the Saltire as a symbol of nationhood is a literal example of Billig’s (1995) influential concept of ‘flagging’, whereby individuals are continually reminded of the nation in their everyday lives through banal activities, of which the media is of the most interest to Billig. Interestingly, while the Saltire was very popular, far fewer young people chose the image of the Saltire, Union Jack and European flag, a
finding that concurs with the rejection of British identities by many participants, as we saw in Chapter 4.

Figure 35  Torridon Thistle. Copyright The National Trust for Scotland. Accessed through SCrán (2011)

Figure 36  Scotland’s National Flag, the Saltire or St. Andrew’s Cross. Copyright James Gardiner. Accessed through SCrán (2011)
6.3.2 Everyday objects

Many images were felt to be significant as they were present in participants’ everyday lives. Images relating to food were especially popular for this reason. The strong support for Irn Bru (see Figure 37) was unsurprising given its status as ‘Scotland’s other national drink’, with a reported twelve cans consumed every second worldwide (Burn-Callander, 2013). However, its inclusion here is not necessarily based on its everyday consumption. That the sugary drink should be so important to these young people says less about its consumption (and merits based on taste) and more about the uniquely Scottish sense of humour associated with it; its adverts are known for their cheeky nature, an attribute that several participants referenced with pride. The drink therefore came to symbolise Scots very particular sense of humour.

Figure 37 Irn Bru Can, Copyright National Museum of Scotland. Accessed through SCRAM (2011)
Such was the fierce support for the justification of this image as uniquely Scottish that I was shouted down when I dared to suggest the drink was just as popular in the North East of England where I grew up:

Kat: What makes someone Scottish?
Donald: Well if you want a can of Irn Bru then you’re Scottish
Kat: I grew up in the North of England and you get quite a lot of Irn Bru in the North of England, would that make me Scottish?
Donald: They should be banned from drinking it
Ewan: Yes
Kat: Really?
Donald: Yeah, it should be illegal for them to drink it [laughs]

Donald’s response here indicates the importance of the drink as a signifier of behaving in way that is socially recognisable as Scottish. Although his answer was somewhat tongue in cheek, it provided him with a quick and simple response that did not require deeper consideration of other more complicated factors such as birthplace or ethnicity, as we saw in the previous chapter.

While Irn Bru was one of the least controversial images in the study, several young people made the distinction between everyday consumption and its value as a symbol of Scotland and there were fierce arguments regarding whether other ‘everyday’ foods such as ice cream, fish and chips and curry could be considered important enough for inclusion. For this reason, a small minority rejected its national significance, even though it was familiar to them, seen here in the remarks made by Fraser and Jamie from the Edinburgh Private School:

Fraser: Irn Bru is important because it’s local to Scotland. I think Scottish people themselves would identify more with the things like Irn Bru
Jamie: Yeah but like those sorts of images are more like what Scotland’s about but they’re not necessarily about what’s important

Jamie perceived ‘everyday’ markers of ‘Scottishness’ to be too trivial for inclusion, and stressed that the historical images discussed in the next section were the most significant.
6.3.3 Historical figures

Historical images were also among the most popular images chosen across all groups and featured heavily amongst the additional image suggestions, examined at the end of this chapter. These images were a great source of pride, seen here in George’s justification for the inclusion of William Wallace and Robert Burns:

They were people who were like proud to be Scottish and stood up for Scotland

(George, 14 years old Glasgow School)

Interestingly, only Robert Burns and the Hollywood depiction of Mel Gibson as William Wallace (see Figure 38) appeared to be easily recognisable to the majority of participants. Surprisingly few young people recognised the image of Bonnie Prince Charlie or Mary Queen of Scots, or other significant historical artefacts such as the Stone of Destiny and Honours of Scotland.

The most fervent responses across all groups centred on the image of William Wallace. The boys in the Barra group were especially passionate about this image, stating that Wallace was their ‘hero’ and very significant to them, although as we will see in the

Figure 38 Mel Gibson as William Wallace in the film Braveheart. Copyright Paramount Pictures/20th Century Fox (1995)

Image removed from electronic copy due to copyright issues

The most fervent responses across all groups centred on the image of William Wallace. The boys in the Barra group were especially passionate about this image, stating that Wallace was their ‘hero’ and very significant to them, although as we will see in the
next chapter, this patriotism had got them into trouble on several occasions. A similar sentiment was seen in the responses of George and Ryan from the Glasgow group:

George: I chose Robert Burns Night and William Wallace

Kat: Why did you choose those images?

George: Like you celebrate it and that because you’re proud to be Scottish

Ryan: Yeah and people like William Wallace who were like proud to be Scottish

The popularity of Burns’ Supper’s across the world was the predominant reason given for the inclusion of Scotland’s National Poet Robert Burns (See Figure 39). Significant emphasis was placed on the pride many felt because of the popularity of Scottish cultural traditions in other countries:

Fiona: I think most people would know that he [Robert Burns] was Scottish, he like wrote loads of famous Scottish poems

Frequent references were made to the way in which Auld Lang Syne was sung in many countries during Hogmanay\footnote{New Year} celebrations, seen here in Rhona from the Edinburgh State School’s enthusiastic response:

Kat: Why did you choose those particular images?

Rhona: I chose Robert Burns ‘cause if you asked someone from America what they think of Scotland probably the first person they think of is Robert Burns ‘cause of Auld Lang Syne

William: Is it?

Rhona: Yeah, people sing it

William: Do people know Robert Burns in other countries? I’ve always had the version that nobody knows it out of Scotland

Rhona: Yeah they do

William: Are people just like, they like to pretend

Rihanna: I kind of think that too ‘cause I’ve got family in England and I’m always telling them about things that happen in Scotland and like, they’re like ‘what, what happened?’ and I
think if I ever mentioned Robert Burns they’d be like ‘who’s that?’

Rhona: They definitely know Auld Lang Syne though, the song, they sing it at New Year. Like the Sex in the City film, they sang it at that! It’s like a really classic version there. It’s like on the soundtrack it’s like soul singing ‘should auld acquaintance be forgot’

The pride Rhona expressed in the significance of Scottish culture to those from other countries was a common theme in the responses and the importance of celebrating Scottish exports and inventions is discussed later in this chapter.

Several participants asked either their peers or teachers for help identifying the historical images, appearing visibly embarrassed when they realised who they were. Those who did recognise these figures appeared to pride themselves on their ‘superior’ knowledge and many saw this appreciation for Scotland’s history as an essential part of their
identity. An example of this passionate attachment to images relating to Scotland’s history can be seen in Donald’s justification for choosing the Stone of Destiny:

Donald: Yeah the Stone of Destiny [is a symbol of Scotland] because all the kings and queens of Scotland were cremated, no, what’s the word, coronated [sic] on that stone, until Edward the third went and stole it, ‘cause he’s a nasty fat [self-censors]

Donald was the only member of the Barra group to recognise this image and spent a considerable amount of time during the break telling his friends about its significance. He also nominated the majority of the historical figures in the additional image suggestion exercise, discussed below. Those individuals like Donald who felt passionately about history had a tendency to be highly critical of their peers’ inability to recognise these images. I witnessed many instances of young people who appeared to tick images out of embarrassment and a desire to fit in, rather than because of a genuine personal attachment to these images. The importance of conformity was therefore seen in many of the group discussions, a finding that explains the reluctance of individuals to challenge established discourses of nationhood. This is examined later in this chapter.

6.3.4 British/English images
Unsurprisingly given the findings discussed in the previous chapters, images perceived to represent England or Britain were the least likely to be chosen. Once again, this shows that for a small minority of respondents British and Scottish identities were not perceived to be nested or relational identities, but rather ‘exclusive’ categories.

The image of tennis player Andy Murray was very contentious. Although few stated that he was not Scottish, there was a feeling across all groups that it was unfair that the British media ‘claimed’ the tennis player as representing the whole of the UK, when they felt he should only represent Scotland. Again, it is worth remembering that the research took place before Murray’s win at Wimbledon and the 2012 Olympics, when both Murray and Chris Hoy—who was also included by just 6 participants—won gold medals as part of Team GB.

The images of the Queen and the Royal family in kilts were very unpopular, although it is interesting to note that there was marginally more support for images relating to Britain or the Royal family amongst the Edinburgh Private School group than other groups, with both the Queen and David Cameron selected by three participants in the first exercise.
This group were the most likely to choose images relating to sport and many discussed rugby and Princess Anne’s patronage of the sport as a reason for identifying the Royal Family as important to Scotland. Curiously, although some in this group still expressed the view that the Queen was only relevant when discussing the whole of Britain, they were slightly more enthusiastic about the image of the Royal family in kilts (See Figure 40).

Grant’s explanation for this was as follows:

The Royal Family at Balmoral do the most Scottish things, whereas the Queen herself in her full gear down in England that’s not very Scottish at all.

This finding indicates the importance of ‘performing’ ‘Scottishness’ through engaging with cultural practices and traditions recognised as distinctly Scottish. This had a profound impact on individual’s willingness to accept someone as Scottish, as Chapter 7 highlights.

6.3.5 Ethnic minorities
Images of ethnic minorities were among the least popular images chosen by participants. The image of Indian dancing at the Edinburgh Mela (See Figure 41), a multicultural festival held annually in the city, was particularly unpopular and was excluded by thirty-three participants. Those from the Edinburgh State School were more likely to include these images on a conditional basis, with four participants choosing the image of Indian dancing, a finding that appears to reflect the composition of this group, which included three students from Indian and Pakistani backgrounds.
Significantly, given the questions raised regarding Hardeep’s experience at the start of this thesis, pictures of individuals from ethnic minority backgrounds wearing tartan were less likely to be rejected than those that were not distinguishable as distinctly Scottish. An example of this can be seen in Figure 42, which shows the image selections from the Edinburgh Private School group and was representative of the responses to the images on this sheet, which shows the high number of crosses placed next to images of ethnic minorities. The image of the piper in the centre of the sheet in Figure 42 appeared to capture the attention of many participants, as several young people from different groups stated that they thought he looked ‘cool’. This image was one of the only images pertaining to an ethnic minority that was included within participant’s top ten, although it was only included by four participants. Less promising was the finding that the image of the Sikh men in kilts (top left in Figure 42) was one of the most contested images, with fifteen participants choosing to exclude it. The difference in young people’s perceptions of these two images raises interesting questions regarding the intersection of religion and ethnicity in constructions of cultural difference.
6.3.6 Religion
Images relating to Islam and Catholicism were amongst the most likely to be rejected by young people, with thirty-six participants excluding the Pope, thirty excluding the image of the girl in a hijab (see Figure 42), nineteen rejecting the image of the mosque and eleven excluding the church. However, while this could be viewed as evidence of both sectarianism and Islamophobia, these findings should be viewed within the wider research findings, as religious images relating to all faiths were very unpopular across
all groups, with few choosing to include them in their top ten. Daniel and Magnus from the Edinburgh State School group explained their reasoning for this as follows:

Daniel: When you think of Scotland you don’t really think of any one religion, in general, because

Magnus: It’s quite diverse

Daniel: Yeah, there’s just not that much religion in Scotland. ‘Cause, when you think of England you think of, you think Christian is the first religion that comes into your mind, but when you think Scotland you don’t think of any religion

This sentiment was echoed by Rihanna, William and Rhona from the same group:

William: If I’ve, if I’ve put like a cross or a tick against either the Church or the Mosque I’d feel compelled to have to tick or cross the other one

Kat: Right ok

Rhona: I’ve ticked both of them

William: I didn’t think either

Rihanna: Well I’ve crossed the Pope and I was thinking that you don’t really associate the Pope with Scotland unless you’re talking about religion in Scotland, but even then I don’t think…because although we’ve got Roman Catholics, it’s not, especially Edinburgh

However, surprisingly even those young people from strong Catholic communities also rejected the image of the Pope. Donald and Ewan’s response here is surprising given that the Barra School followed the Catholic syllabus of the Curriculum for Excellence and the historic importance of Catholicism on the island:

Kat: What about the things that you put a cross against, why did you put crosses against some of them? Which ones did you put crosses against?

Ewan: Because they’re not very Scottish things, so

Donald: I mean some of them could happen in any country all over the world, like you’re not going to know that a Church service is in Scotland ‘cause like church services aren’t Scottish, they’re a religion, they could be Roman, Roman Catholic Church service in Rome, so they’re not Scottish ‘cause they don’t come from Scotland.
Religious images were especially contentious for the Edinburgh Private School and Scottish Borders groups. The participants from the Edinburgh Private School group had the strongest reaction to the images of the hijab and mosque, with ten participants choosing to reject the former and nine the latter. Half the group rejected the image of the church, a finding that was unexpected given the important role of religion in the school, with pupils required to attend chapel every morning. Similarly, both the Pope and the Orange March were strongly opposed.

The responses of the young people from the Scottish Borders were surprising given that the research occurred during the Religious and Moral Studies lesson period. It was assumed that the classroom environment would encourage young people to be sensitive in their responses and wary of criticism from the teacher. Surprisingly, the mosque was accepted as conditionally Scottish by four participants in this group, in comparison to the church which was only chosen by three participants. However, when choosing which images they would exclude, five chose the hijab and two chose the mosque, while just one participant excluded the church. Interestingly, while the Orange March (associated with Protestantism) was chosen by four participants as an image they would conditionally accept, five participants rejected the image of the Pope. While it is tempting to view this as anti-Catholic sentiment, it is important to view this finding within the context of the other religious images rejected by this group and indeed across the whole study.

Having established the broad themes in the discussions surrounding the image selection exercise, the next section provides a closer analysis of how and why participants came to their decisions.

6.4 ‘To See Ourselves as Others See Us’: Heritage, Identity and Pride

Already in the discussion above we have seen that the main justification the young people in this study gave for their image choices was that these were the things that made these participants proud to be Scottish. Despite acknowledging that their image choices could be perceived as stereotypes that were not necessarily reflective of life in contemporary Scotland, the majority of young people embraced these images as the most important things they would want someone from another country to know about Scotland. The findings here are a good example of the phenomenon of emphasising national distinctiveness and achievements in order to construct and maintain a positive sense of self. While we may not wholeheartedly embrace a particular story of nationhood as relevant to our own experience or indeed reject certain narratives as
stereotypes that do not reflect everyday life, we may also suspend our cynicism and assert their importance if the context demands it, especially where national rivalries are concerned. The responses of those such as Paul, from the Scottish Borders group certainly appear to provide evidence for the positive impact that engagement with heritage can have on individual’s sense of identity.

Paul: You want people to know that these things are Scottish and this is what Scottish people can do. It’s like pride.

The negotiation between the stereotypical nature of some of the images and the feelings of pride they generated can be seen in the argument between Grant and Charlie from the Edinburgh Private School:

Grant: I'd say that there are certain things that are socially things in Scotland that are genuine, for instance carefulness with pennies, caniness with money, that sort of thing, the language, the Scots as I said it's pretty organic, same with Gaelic. But there's a lot of stuff that was just totally brought back in by the Victorians to make, quite literally to make life at Balmoral more fun for the Royal Family. Tartan, haggis, oh my goodness haggis that's quite, it's quite genuine, but there's some, there's a lot of stuff that's just been reinvented and I don't, the Loch Ness Monster [shakes head] where did this come from?

Charlie: I don't think you can have a false culture. I mean it's brought in, certainly it's not necessarily exactly what a lot of people think it is, Braveheart probably and Mel Gibson. But, it's very distinctive and it's based on a real strong sense of pride and independence. And not necessarily as a thing towards England, like a real sense of where you are. And I like the fact that yeah, tartan isn't necessarily dating back to the ages or with deep set roots, but it is now and it kind of represents Scottish, you know, Scottish pride and culture and that's kind of what I feel as well.

In these responses we see the importance of giving a ‘credible’ performance (Goffman, 1969) of Scottishness to others, while also the need to feel that one is acting ‘authentically’ (Giddens, 1991), an issue that is examined throughout this chapter. Charlie was keen to stress that his feeling of pride in Scottish heritage did not automatically lead to negative feelings towards those from other nationalities or ethnic backgrounds. Throughout the research he emphasised the positive nature of heritage and the benefits that he feels it brings to both individuals and communities.
I think overall, true Scottish heritage I think is pride in your own, in where you are and people latch on to things like tartan and things like that just to represent that. It's just, I suppose you could say that about all cultures really.

He did however highlight the distinction between his own pride in his heritage and those that he saw as placing too much emphasis on historical or cultural events when discussing Scottish identity, as he felt this could lead to ‘exclusive’ attitudes towards issues of belonging. The role of heritage in establishing positive feelings towards a collective identity was also a dominant theme in the additional image suggestions, as the next section examines.

6.4.1 Additional image suggestions

After the initial image selection exercise participants were asked if they had any additional suggestions for images that they would include to describe Scotland, which are shown below. This option was given in order to limit the bias of the researcher when choosing the images to be discussed. This exercise was envisaged as an opportunity for the young people to provide counter-narratives to the arguably stereotypical images selected for discussion in the earlier exercise. It was imagined that the young people would offer radical alternatives that resonated more closely with their own understandings of ‘Scottishness’. It was also anticipated that the young people would suggest things that were more relevant to their own lives, such as images that reflected their local area, or cultural practices that were personally significant. Such expectations perhaps reveal more about the assumptions inherent in the research process, rooted as they were in academic theories of heritage and representation, than the social worlds of the participants in this study.

In practice this exercise proved somewhat anarchic, with young people excitedly shouting out anything they could think of that was typically associated with Scotland, rather than a reasoned ‘alternative’ heritage. Although some participants were very passionate about their suggestions, particularly with regards to historical figures and inventions, many of the responses below demonstrates the ‘tongue-in-cheek’ nature of descriptions of the nation in which we all occasionally indulge in order to stress our ‘unique’ nature:
Places/ Landscapes

- The Isle of Skye
- Dunvegan Castle
- The Cullin
- Map of Scotland
- More historical sights
- Cannon/Mons Meg, Edinburgh Castle

Inventions

- Television
- Radar
- Bike
- Telephone

Food

- Whisky
- Tablet
- Deep fried mars bar
- Mince and tatties
- Smoked Salmon

Animals

- Scottie Dog
- Grouse
- Highland Cow
- Highland Animals
- Shetland Ponies
- Puffins
- Clydesdale horse

People

- Robert the Bruce
- Sean Connery (Actor)
- Neil Lennon (Celtic Manager)
- King James I
- St Mungo (Patron Saint of Glasgow)
- Sir Alex Fergusson (Football Manager)
- Billy Connolly (Comedian)
Scottish inventions were a significant theme in the image suggestions above and were a great source of pride for the individuals who nominated them. Here, Magnus and Daniel from the younger Edinburgh State School group discuss the reasons for their suggestions:

Magnus: I feel like Scotland’s done quite a lot to the other world that doesn’t really like sort of realise. Like the very first light bulb was sort of like ‘Scottish’, the idea and everything, but it doesn’t get that much credit for it you know. There’s like quite a lot of stuff like Dolly the sheep, cloning a sheep, in Scotland, but people say well scientists cloned the sheep, and sort of like, well they would name the person. It’s never like Scotland in general has done this or that for something

The importance of separating Scottish achievements from British ones was a recurrent theme throughout the discussions. However, one particular ‘Scottish’ invention was the source of heated debate amongst all the groups: Chicken Tikka Massala.

6.4.2 Chicken Tikka Massala: Made in Scotland?
The contested nature of what may be considered ‘Scottish’ was most clearly seen in the discussions surrounding the image of curry. The image was accepted unquestionably by some participants, whilst others rejected its legitimacy outright. The nuanced reasoning
surrounding whether this image should be included or excluded by the young people in this study provided a fascinating insight into the construction of identity and boundaries between groups.

This image was included in this study with a very specific reasoning. A number of academics have highlighted the declaration by the late Labour foreign secretary Robin Cook, that chicken tikka massala is ‘a true British national dish, not only because it is the most popular, but because it is a perfect illustration of the way Britain absorbs and adapts external influences’ (2001: n.p). As Buettner (2008) notes, Cook’s emphasis was on the way that such fusions of cultural practices did not challenge conventional definitions of British national identity. Rather, the dish represented the positive benefits that multiculturalism could bring. Such a declaration is convincing evidence of what Ashworth et al. (2007) describe as ‘exotic embellishments’ typically found in Core + models, that serve to enhance the core whilst leaving the essential concept of the nation unchanged, as Chapter 2 explained.

The dish was nominated as part of the ICONS of England project, discussed in Chapter 3. In their discussion of the nomination, Mason and Baveystock note that the ‘curry dish is equal in symbolism to the humble ‘cuppa’ in terms of its coupling of popular consumption with representation of the history of Empire.’ (2009:25). However, they observe that in contrast to tea, curry is unlikely to be accepted as an English icon, as 75 per cent of respondents in their study rejected the image as a national icon through the site’s voting process. Mason and Baveystock highlight the importance of the need for further research on why curry is unlikely to be accepted despite its ubiquitous consumption and this question partly influenced the inclusion of this image for discussion.

On the basis of the responses to the ICONS project, we might expect that the young people in this study would also reject the idea of curry being a national icon, particularly given its ‘British’ label. However, early in the research it became apparent that the respondents knew far more about the cultural significance of this dish than I did. In 2009, Mohammad Sarwar, Labour MP for Glasgow Central sought to gain EU protection status for the curry, claiming that its origins were in fact Scottish, rather than British, as it was believed to have been created in a Glaswegian restaurant (Devine, 2011). That the dish should be rejected as a national icon by English commentators is
entirely in line with the assertions made by some of the young people that chicken tikka masala is in fact *Scottish*.

During the week spent conducting fieldwork on Barra I ate in a small café on several occasions. This café was one of only a handful of places to eat on the island and the only takeaway that I could find. It caught my attention because of its unusual food combination: serving both Italian and Indian cuisine, alongside the standard fried offerings. Upon hearing about research interests on my arrival at the school, several teachers encouraged me to sample the local delicacy of a scallop pakora. Working on the assumption that as the only takeaway on the island the majority of young people would not only be aware of its menu choices but know its owners, I asked the group specifically about some of the fusion foods they had on offer in the hope that this would lead to a broader discussion about ethnic diversity on the island:

Kat: What about on the plate there they’ve got haggis pakoras? That’s taken something Scottish and combined it with Asian food and made something entirely different.

Martin: I think haggis should be copyrighted so it can’t be changed.

Isla: Then no one would be able to make it.

Ewan: It’s very confusing. Because you’ve got something Scottish and something not Scottish, so you don’t know if you should call it Scottish or not Scottish.

Donald: Well if you find it in Scotland then it’s Scottish.

Ewan: It’s semi-Scottish.

Martin: How much percentage of it is Scottish?

Kat: Of a haggis pakora? You tell me, you could think about it anyway you want. You could say it’s 50% Scottish 50% Asian, you could say it’s 75% or 100% Scottish because it’s made in Scotland by people who live in Scotland.

Martin: No.

Erin: That’s weird.

Ruaraidh: I don’t think you can say it’s Scottish.
Isla: I think that sounds really cool. I’d like to try that. I’ve never heard of a haggis pakora but it sounds quite cool the way they’re mixing the two different cultures.

Although some young people such as Donald felt that anything made in Scotland could be considered Scottish, the rejection of my suggestion that the dish was 100% Scottish provides a good example of the agency of young people during the research, with participants refuting statements they did not agree with even though I asked leading questions at times.

The discussion amongst the young people in the Glasgow group was the most heated response I encountered during the research, a finding that was unsurprising given the Glaswegian claim to the dish. The following extract also shows the unique dynamic of this group, who barely stopped talking and happily argued amongst themselves, posing questions and challenging responses, with little input from myself:

Adele: What’s curry got to do wi’ Scotland? Curry’s got to do with Indians

George: I’ll have you know chicken tikka masala is actually a British thing

Adele: No, but where is it originally were?

Dean: Is that chicken tikka masala? It was invented in Glasgow

George: Aye thank you

Adele: Aye but it’s an Indian dish

George: It was curry and they put tomato sauce in it

George: It’s a British dish, it’s a British dish

Adele: But see all the things that you put in it, where are they from?

George: Like spices?

Dean: Glasgow!

Adele: Naw, it’s Indian

George: It’s naw Indian

---

15 ‘with’
16 ‘No’
Ian: Yeah but it originated in India

Adele: Curry…it’s…everything…the people. Right if you [pointing at George] said it’s an original Indian idea who takes credit for it? Indian people.

Dean: Me [with hand up]

Ian: It’s their spices

Adele: Right, but they would take more credit for it than us

Ian: Aye I know what they’d say “Indian Curries”

Adele: Aye, they wouldn’t say Indian/Glaswegian curries

Dean: Everyone’s got like a Scottish curry shop, that’s true, or a Scottish Kebab parlour

Adele: They always say like, it’s never like...

Ian: It’s like this tae^{17}, they take credit for kebabs but Turkish people make kebabs.

Adele: I know it’s Turkish people that make kebabs

Ian: But then we weren’t talking about kebabs.

Kat: Is there not a curry shop in the West End called the ‘Wee Curry Shop?’

Dean: Yip. That does sound Scottish

George’s categorisation of the dish as British fitted with the findings of Chapter 4, which highlighted this groups’ tendency to move between talking about their immediate neighbourhood and discussions of Britain, bypassing the Scottish level altogether on several occasions. George and Dean’s strong arguments for the inclusion of the dish were also in-keeping with the discussion of pride in claiming things invented in Scotland as national achievements seen above. This is an interesting example of the way in which minority cultures in ‘Core+’ models are celebrated for enhancing the core, through providing an exotic ‘flavour’^{18} to feelings of national belonging (Ashworth et al. 2007). As we will see in Chapter 7 however, this group strongly rejected the notion that the definition of the core should be re-imagined in plural terms.

^{17} ‘too/ as well’
^{18} Pun unintended
The strong sense of pride felt by some of the respondents above should not be seen as evidence that the dish was unquestionably accepted as ‘Scottish’. The young people from the older Edinburgh State School group made important distinctions between issues of representation, everyday consumption and exactly ‘who’ had ownership of the dish:

Steven: I don’t know why that’s specifically not Scottish, because there’s a lot of, you know, ethnic cuisine here

Jenna: I wouldn’t say it’s not Scottish

Steven: I’d say it’s Scottish it’s just not representative of Scotland

Jenna: Yeah it’s just that it doesn’t necessarily say that it’s in Scotland

Kat: So in your day-to-day lives what’s more common? Something like haggis or curry or Chinese, fish and chips? What’s more common for you?

Jenna: Curry

Steven: Curry

Morag: I’d probably say curry

Stuart: Not haggis

Jenna: Yeah I wouldn’t eat haggis because it’s not very nice

Kat: That’s interesting then because there are lots of crosses and question marks against curry but lots of ticks against haggis. So why do you think that is?

Stuart: Because it’s just not Scottish. I don’t know. Although we eat a lot of curry and Chinese it’s not ours personally

Alexa: Yeah but well there’s been like curries that have been like invented here that are now eaten by people all over the world.

Kat: Do you know which curry was invented here?

Alexa: Is it not like chicken tikka masala?

Jenna: I think that’s like Glaswegian isn’t it, is it not kind of in a way?

The conversations here concur with Mason and Baveystock’s (2009) findings that everyday consumption does not equate to national significance, although when we
compare the criteria generated in these discussions with the debates surrounding Irn Bru, it becomes apparent that there is something more going on here rather than simply separating the mundane from the symbolic. Although few young people specifically referred to issues of ethnicity in these discussions, tensions regarding the construction of an ethnic ‘other’ appear to lie beneath the surface of these responses, particularly in the discussions regarding images which were excluded. Stuart’s statement that ‘it’s not ours personally’ was significant, as it echoes Ian and Adele’s distinctions between ‘them’ and ‘us’ in the Glasgow group’s debates. It is also interesting to note that Jenna settled on labelling the dish as Glaswegian rather than Scottish. The importance of distinguishing between experiences of the local and questions of whether these could be generalised to the nation emerged as very important in all of the Edinburgh groups, as we will see in the discussion in the next section.

The responses above demonstrate the way in which individuals attempt to reconcile new information or alternative viewpoints with previously expressed ideas in order to maintain their existing sense of self. While the young people in these discussions acknowledged that there were tensions within their responses, in the majority of cases they were reluctant to alter their original statements, instead seeking out ways to mediate challenges. However, as we have seen, not all participants adopted this strategy. Those such as Isla from the Barra group openly acknowledged that their response had changed one they encountered new information and saw this as a positive encounter. If we return to Giddens here, we can understand this as an example of the ‘secure’ individual, who is comfortable with encountering new experiences and adjusting their understanding of the world in relation to changes in social context. The ‘cosmopolitan’ individual in Giddens’ work is one who is able to maintain the feeling of an ‘authentic’ sense of self, even when faced with the need to ‘alter’ that self in order to accommodate new information. Thinking about the relevance of this finding for museums, it is possible that such individuals actively seek out learning opportunities that challenge their existing ideas and take pleasure in activities that encourage them to re-evaluate their positions, as seen in Isla’s delight and eagerness to try new experiences. However, as we have seen here, such responses to ‘challenging’ museum displays may be rare, an issue that is discussed in Chapter 9.
6.5 Maintaining the ‘Core’: Cultural Distinctiveness, Collective Belonging and Consensus

Despite the vast differences in young people’s individual narratives explored further in the previous chapters, the overriding finding of the image selection exercise was that there was a high level of consensus regarding which images could legitimately be accepted as ‘Scottish’. This was surprising, given the supposed ‘contested’ nature of both heritage and national identity. As we saw in Chapter 2, heritage is widely conceptualised as a process of negotiation between competing and sometimes contradictory narratives.

A recurrent theme within young people’s responses was the emphasis they placed on the differences between how they would respond as individuals and their responses as part of a wider group. As we will see throughout this chapter, many young people were often unwilling or unable to challenge existing discourses of nationhood, as they felt that others would either confirm their choices or dismiss their alternative suggestions. This finding can be explained through considering the tension between individual and group identities.

Smith argues that although heritage may contribute to the ‘affirmation of identity and a sense of belonging, that identity may also nonetheless be one that is governed or regulated by wider social forces and narratives’ (2006:7). Identities are therefore always a product of the interrelation of ‘social structure and social action’ (McCrone 2009:9). Issues of structure and agency were therefore fundamental to understanding the responses of the young people in this chapter.

We make sense of our identity not through only through internal reflection, as we saw in the previous chapter, but through situating our individual identity narratives in relation to collective narratives (Dicks 2000:203). Rounds argues that:

> Identity work includes both the ways that we strive to establish identity as part of something larger than ourselves—to meld ourselves into some form of structure offered by our socio-cultural environment—and the ways in which we assert agency and try to escape from the constraints of those same structures (Rounds 2006:138).

Similarly, Ashworth et al.(2007) argue that the ‘identification of people with their pasts’ is both an individual and collective process, whereby collective identities may be both an ‘aggregate of the individual’ or ‘additional dimension imposed from above for some
collective purpose’ (2007: 51). Hall argues that ‘cultural identities are the points of identification…which are made within the discourses of history and culture. Not an essence, but a positioning.’ (1997:53). When claiming a national identity, we therefore position ourselves within the wider public story of that nation. This is an idea echoed by Anico and Peralta, who, drawing on the work of Somers (1994), suggest that “‘[B]eing part of” requires a narrative in which we locate ourselves and are located in. These narratives, which are seldom of our own making, are constituted through representation and performance, conveying not only who we are but also who we will come to be’ (2009:1). Heritage is an important resource for identity narratives, providing a sense of precedence, continuity and coherence (Lowenthal, 1998).

Because individuals actively identify with such narratives as a means of developing a coherent sense of self, we may therefore have a considerable emotional investment in these narratives. Indeed it is for this reason that the concept of a ‘national heritage’ may give individuals a sense of ontological security, by providing a pre-existing narrative upon which to base our understandings of what it means to ‘belong’ to a particular location or to claim a particular identity. By adopting this pre-existing narrative, individuals are able to convince both themselves and others that they are behaving in an ‘authentic’19 manner, that their claims to a particular national identity are credible. As such, we may be unwilling or perhaps unable to offer or accept revisions to pre-existing narratives. Indeed, we may also challenge the validity of alternative narratives and their subsequent identities (Lawler 2008:12).

6.5.1 Place distinction
The lived and imagined experience of place was an important theme throughout the responses of the young people in this study. In Chapter 4 we saw that young people frequently used narratives of place as a means of positioning both themselves and others, while Chapter 5 highlighted the way in which particular places within Scotland were held as being more ‘authentic’ than others.

The role of heritage in establishing places as unique was also a very important feature of the narratives of the young people in this study. Whitehead (2009), in his study of the role that art plays in shaping a distinctive regional identity in the North East of England,

---

19 It is recognised that the use of term ‘authentic’ here is problematic, given the debates surrounding the ‘inauthentic’ nature of the Scottish heritage industry. Authenticity is used here to refer to the belief that one’s actions are in-keeping with a particular set of established values (Giddens 1991).
points to the work of Ethnologist Amundsen (2001), who identifies four key elements in the construction of place identities:

1. Spatial qualities that distinguish place from others

2. Characteristics or qualities of the inhabitants that distinguish them from other places e.g. values, customs, physical appearance

3. Social conditions and relations between inhabitants

4. Culture and/or history unifying element that connects inhabitants to tradition and distinguishes them from the ‘other’

The importance of distinctions based on both culture and history as a unifying element that distinguishes a place from others was a prominent theme in the research. Throughout the conversations many young people stressed the importance of differentiating between images they felt represented the unique aspects of Scotland and those images that were simply accurate reflections of daily life in all modern, globalised societies:

If you’re talking with someone from Scotland then yeah there are a lot of different cultures. But in today’s society that’s almost assumed. So you pick the things that make it distinctive from other places.

(Sam 16 years old, Edinburgh Private School)

Well I also crossed the Chinese Restaurant and the curry, because that would be like any country, it could be England, Ireland, China, India you know, but they’re not associated with Scotland. It could represent the whole of Britain as well.

(Stuart, 16 years old, Edinburgh State School)

If it’s not something that I look at and I think of Scotland then I put a cross against it. Like it might be something that’s in Scotland but if I don’t look at it and immediately think of Scotland then I’m not going to tick that. Like the Church, I didn’t look at that and immediately think of Scotland, so I crossed that. It’s only really things, like that when you really look at it you know what it resembles that I ticked.’

(Michael 17 years old, Edinburgh Private School)
A similar position can be seen in Kieran and Fraser’s responses, which emphasises the ‘foreign’ nature of the images relating to ethnic and religious diversity:

You identify with the things that are distinctive and make the country what it is. Most of these things that are crossed are foreign. You only choose the things that distinguish Scotland from the UK and the UK from like the rest of Europe. That’s why you don’t include any of the foreign ones.

Yeah, you think of that as being something that’s, you know, in Scotland but it’s been brought in from an outside culture. It’s not Scottish; it’s a feature of a different culture.

(Kieran and Fraser, 17 years old, Edinburgh Private School)

Although there were no explicit discussions of diversity as being an English or British issue, Kieran’s comments that images chosen distinguish between Scotland and the rest of the UK resonates with the perception of England as multicultural and Scotland as ethnically homogenous, as seen in Miles and Dunlop’s (1987) study.

The majority of young people interpreted the image exercise literally, imagining how an outsider would perceive Scotland or what they might want to know about the country, rather than their own perceptions of what was important. As such, there was very little interest in questions of authenticity when choosing images to represent Scotland. Instead, the majority of young people approached the task through the eyes of a tourist, a finding that concurs with Dicks’ observation that discussions of ‘our’ heritage encourage individuals to view the ‘self as other’ (2000b:203).

Through selecting images that have global significance, participants were able to strengthen their own sense of what it means to be Scottish and thus gain a greater sense of pride in that identity. A useful theory for understanding this trend is Herbet Gans’ (1979) concept of ‘symbolic ethnicity’. In their work on the role that outsiders play in ethnic identification, Henry & Bankston explain that ‘symbolic ethnicity is not simply a matter of group members’ subjective identification with symbols of ethnicity but…it involves the participation of group members in ideas of ethnicity based in part on received historical images constructed by outsiders’ (2001:1021). The importance of outsider perceptions in the construction of the self also fits with the concept of identity as ‘a dialectic between internal identification and external ascription” (Howard, 2000:375).
While many young people acknowledged that the images they chose were not an accurate representation of everyday life in Scotland, they still felt that it was important to adhere to this imagined external perspective when attempting to define what was ‘distinctive’ about Scotland. However, while the majority of young people changed their answers when discussing an ‘insider’ perspective of Scotland, significantly a small minority continued to assert the importance of these ‘symbolic’ images and rejected those that showed the diversity within modern day Scotland. The rationale behind such decisions frequently centred upon definitions based on generalizability of the experience of certain places to wider definitions of Scotland.

6.5.2 Downplaying the significance of ‘diverse places’
Frequent distinctions were made by participants across all groups between images of ‘things that happened in Scotland’ and ‘things that could be considered ‘Scottish’. For many young people, something had to be considered applicable to the whole of Scotland in order for it to be accepted as Scottish. As we see here in the discussions of Donald, Ruairaidh and Ewan from Barra:

Kat: So how do you feel about some of the images about different cultures in Scotland?

Donald: Well it is, it’s not just one culture, it’s not just Catholics, it’s Sikhs, it’s Muslims, its Protestants

Ruaraidh: It doesn’t really affect us here

Ewan: But I wouldn’t say they were a symbol of Scotland

Donald: Yeah, I wouldn’t say they were a symbol of Scotland, because a symbol of Scotland’s like

Ewan: Something that is

Donald: You’d know that it’s Scottish as soon as you seen it, whereas, see like someone tying a turban, you don’t like, they could be tying their turban in like India or whatever

Ewan: And like Indian dancing is like Indian, it’s not Scottish

Ruairaidh’s perception that issues of ethnic or religious diversity had very little to do with their experience of living on the island was significant. De Lima (2011) in her study of migration in the Scottish Highlands and Islands, argues that while ethnic minority groups are perceived to be a wholly urban phenomenon, rural places are largely perceived to be homogenous, both in terms of their population and their cultural
practices. Although the findings here appear to concur with this viewpoint, this is not a simple case of individuals from rural areas holding ‘exclusive’ views while the opinions of those from urban, cosmopolitan areas were more inclusive. Similar responses to those from Barra were seen in both the Edinburgh and Glasgow groups. This was surprising, as the participants from these groups were much more familiar with ethnic and religious diversity as part of everyday life in Scotland. The reasons for this are now considered.

Although the young people in the Edinburgh Private School recognised that ethnic and religious minorities were a feature of Scottish society, they downplayed the significance of this, as we see here in Sam’s justification for the Edinburgh Private School group’s decisions:

Across the whole of Scotland you see more bagpipes than burqas

(Sam, 16 years old, Edinburgh Private School)

While many of those from Edinburgh recognised the diversity of their city, the value of this to discussing a broader discussion of Scotland was mediated by their view that Edinburgh as an ‘exception’ and ‘less Scottish’ than other places. Here Michael, who we first encountered in Chapter 4, discusses whether he thought that everyone in Scotland needed to have a shared understanding of what it meant to be Scottish:

Kat: How important is it to you that other people in Scotland share your view of what to include in your top ten?

Michael: Being from Edinburgh, I don’t think it’s hugely important because a lot of people from Edinburgh aren’t even Scottish and if they are they’re from different backgrounds in Scotland. But I think it’s important that everyone in Scotland has the same sort of idea what they sort of stand for, what Scotland stands for. And I mean, that’s really up to who’s living in Scotland, but yeah, I think I need to go back to the idea of social communities and that you always have somewhere that you can sort of identify with, is an important thing. But I don’t think that, well from my point of view, because I’m from Edinburgh probably half the population aren’t fully Scottish, so I don’t think it’s hugely important that they all have the same beliefs.

(Michael, 16 years old, Edinburgh Private School)
Although his response recognises the diversity that he sees in his home city, his view that half the population ‘aren’t fully Scottish’ shows a tension between his ‘inclusive’ attitude and his ‘exclusive’ definition of who may be considered Scottish. Similarly, while those at the Edinburgh State School recognised diversity as an important aspect of their own experience of living in Edinburgh, there was reluctance amongst the majority of participant’s from this school to generalise their experience as representative of the whole of Scotland.

Jenna: There’s lots of stuff that’s Scottish but I wouldn’t really say it symbolises Scotland

Steven: If you’re showing normal things to someone who’s never seen Scotland before then you’re not telling them much about Scotland you’re just telling them that it’s a normal place, which is true. But if you were going to show them something from France you wouldn’t show them a street in Brittany you’d show them the Eiffel Tower, the things that were most recognised.

Kat: What about if you were showing it to a Scottish person?

Jenna: I’d include more unusual things, like that [indicates Sikh men], it looks interesting.

Morag: I was a bit scared to put anything down

Kat: Why are you nervous about putting anything against there?

Morag: Because we do have other cultures in this country and they are an important part of Scotland, it’s just not necessarily something that you’d initially put down when trying to represent Scotland.

(Jenna 16 years old, Morag 16 years old and Steven 17 years old, Edinburgh State School)

Surprisingly, a number of individuals from the younger Edinburgh State School excluded images relating to ethnic and religious diversity (see Figure 43). This was unexpected, given both the strong emphasis on diversity within the school’s ethos and the experience of living in a ‘diverse’ place, as the next chapter examines. However, they were eager to stress that their responses were not necessarily a statement about whether or not they considered something to be Scottish, but rather they based these decisions on whether or not something was representative of Scotland. They emphasised the difficulty with discussing issues of ‘heritage’, as they felt that this
encouraged them to approach the task in a particular way and was not representative of how they would respond to the identity claims of individuals in real life. The challenge to their self-image as holding ‘inclusive’ attitudes is investigated further in Chapter 8.

Discussions of heritage frequently intersected with the distinctiveness of place in young people’s narratives of exclusion, as seen here in the exchange between Daniel and Magnus from the younger Edinburgh State School group:

Daniel: There’s not much Scot, Scottish culture is pretty much like other cultures, well it’s still a culture, kind of

Kat: Still a culture?

Magnus: I wouldn’t agree with that

Kat: Why don’t you agree with that?
Magnus: It’s like, um, it is sort of now more sort of Western society than it was before, but originally it wasn’t as much, you know. Like um, Robert the Bruce and Bonnie Prince Charlie and stuff

Kat: Why did you put a cross next to the mosque and the mela?

Magnus: Well the thing is that

Daniel: Err racist

Magnus: Well people put like a tick next to the mosque because they thought ‘oh that’s in Scotland’. But I don’t think it’s just something that’s in Scotland makes it Scottish. ‘Cause you could say like Mel Gibson visits Scotland and now that he’s in Scotland, that doesn’t mean he’s Scottish. Like just ‘cause something’s inside of Scotland that doesn’t mean that it’s actually Scottish. I think that the mosque and the dancing has got like it’s been, ‘cause it is sort of a, because it is sort of a deal with Scotland

Daniel: Yeah it’s not like, it’s like if Scotland didn’t have immigration and all that, there wouldn’t be mosques and all that multicultural dancing, it would just be like Scottish. ‘Cause all the other stuff has been brought over by other people

Magnus: ‘Cause you can get like a mosque and like dancing, Indian dancing in lots of places, but the reason that I put like a cross against it was because those are specifically Scottish things. Like that particular mosque is sort of like, like I think everybody that lives in Edinburgh would sort of like analyse that as ‘oh that’s the mosque in Edinburgh’ and like the dancing as well.

Although Daniel downplayed the ‘unique’ attributes of Scotland, a statement that concurs with his general scepticism of Scottish identity and nationalism discussed in the previous chapter, Magnus’ disputed this. His emphasis on what Scotland was like ‘originally’ here is significant, as the importance of long-standing homogeneity, predating historical immigration was a key feature of young people’s narratives of exclusion examined in the next chapter. As Daniel and Magnus’ conversation here highlights, participants from this group had a tendency to downplay the legitimacy of this experience, arguing that although images such as the Edinburgh Central Mosque were familiar to them in their everyday lives, it was not generalizable to the whole of Scotland and therefore not significant enough to include. The discussion between George and Ryan from the Glasgow also echoed this view:
Ryan: Well I don’t want to come off as being racist, but Islam isn’t really a big deal here, so it doesn’t really describe who we are.

Kat: Some of the groups put ticks against the things that you’ve crossed, like the mosque, how do you feel about that?

Ryan: That’s alright because they’re describing multicultural, like they’ve put the Scottish ring around them. Like they’ve put culture from their countries and they’ve still got culture from other countries but they’re mixing them in. So it’s kind of like they’ve taken some of our culture and mixed it in.

George: They’re kind of like multicultural, so if you like strongly agree with them then you’d agree, but if you disagree then you’d just like leave it, like ignore it. It’s like some of them have nothing to do with like general Scotland, they’re just like specific parts of Scotland.

Ryan: Most Scottish people would probably put the same things though, because they have like that same opinions because they were brought up in the same way. Are the people you’ve talked to born Scottish?

Kat: As far as I know most of them were born in Scotland. But if your question is were they all white then no.

Ryan: Not if they were all white but it they all had the same culture and heritage.

Kat: In what way?

Ryan: Like were they born Scottish? Were they born in Scotland and they had Scottish parents? Or did some of them have parents from other places?

Kat: A lot of them were born in Scotland but some had a parent from another country.

Ryan: Ok. That might be why.

Kat: Does that change your view of why they might choose different images?

Ryan: That’s their opinion, like you can’t really go against that as you don’t want to offend them.

(George and Ryan, 14 years old, Glasgow)
Ryan’s interest in why other people held different views to him highlights another significant theme in participant’s responses: the importance of consensus. While Ryan does not directly challenge the legitimacy of those whose definitions of Scottishness vary from his own, his view that anyone who was brought up in Scotland would have the same view was telling. A more direct challenge to the credibility of those whose opinions varied from the group consensus can be seen in Paul’s response here:

Paul: They’re not Scottish, but something that’s going on in Scotland.

Kat: Do you think other people in Scotland would share that view?

Paul: It depends where they’ve been brought up because they probably have things like that, the chapels and that. But I wouldn’t say that’s anything to do with, I would disagree with them because like I said, it’s got nothing to do with Scotland. And you get, like people have different views about what Scotland is, but some people are more, some of us are more proud, they are a bit more proud to be Scottish and those other people might not really care so they might view Scotland as like everything, like the Italian Chapel and the Mosque just because it’s like related to Scotland and Scotland has it and that

(Paul, 14 years old, Scottish Borders)

While Paul acknowledged that other people may have different definitions of Scotland based on their own experiences, he seeks to discredit these views by positioning them in opposition to his own definitions, which are based on pride. For Paul, it appears that any attempt to revise pre-existing discourses of nationhood is a threat to his own distinctive sense of identity. The only way that he can maintain his sense of self is by rejecting these perceived threats and discrediting those who attempt to challenge the ‘core’.

Considering the impact of these findings, I suggest that while research such as this may wish to alter people’s notions of places as ‘fixed’ and ‘settled’, such approaches may have little real world impact if individuals perceive these ‘re-imaginings’ of place as top-down constructions that have little resonance with their own experiences. This is an important issue for museums that are engaged in this form of work, through displays that examine the diversity within places, examples of which were highlighted in Chapter 2. As stated in the introduction, this is not to refute the value of such work, which I believe to be vital on matters of principle. However, I argue that the effectiveness of such approaches lies in whether or not individuals perceive such representations to be
credible. As we will see in the next chapters, where such representations are perceived to be ‘false’ or over-emphasising the significance of diversity, individuals may become hostile and reject the legitimacy of institutions that promote such ideas.

6.6 Conclusion
Here then we see both the importance of Goffman and Giddens for understanding the responses of the young people in this study. Through engaging in the artificial process of the research, the participants were required to both consciously ‘perform’ and the role of Scottish person, by behaving in a manner that was deemed ‘authentic’. At the outset of the exercise they were required to consider the expectations that the audience may have of this performance and consequently strived to live up to these expectations, a process that Goffman (1959) describes as ‘dramatic realisation’. Thus, when selecting images, participants actively evaluated whether choosing a particular image would be considered ‘out of character’ and leave them open to accusations of a ‘false’ performance. This was an issue that was apparent when those with English parents chose images relating to Britain, choices that were rebuked by others as evidence that their ‘mask’ of Scottish identity had slipped, revealing their ‘true’ English nature, an accusation that led to some participants feeling upset or out of place. This fear of being deemed ‘inauthentic’ therefore leads to feelings of insecurity, which Giddens (1991) argues results in individuals adopting strategies to mediate the dangers that such feelings bring about for an individual’s sense of self. Consequently, individuals are able to adopt experiencing cognitive dissonance by imposing their own sense of order on conflicting information, through strategies such as generating a set of alternative ‘clauses’, as we saw in the discussion of differences between places, or discrediting information sources, an issue that I argue is highly relevant for museums.

At the beginning of this chapter I suggested that the degree to which individuals are inclined to accept heterogeneous representations of the nation is largely dependent upon what they perceive to be ‘at stake’. We have seen in the responses above, young people had a tendency to draw upon existing concepts of heritage when constructing collective narratives of identity, rather than attempt to challenge hegemonic discourses of nationhood. These narratives were sustained through the appropriation of external stereotypes which were utilised in order to emphasise the unique and culturally distinct aspects of place. This served a useful purpose by providing young people with a sense of pride and achievement in ‘being Scottish’. We have therefore seen that, even
amongst the young people who strongly identified with an inclusive, territorial definition of ‘Scottishness’, there was reluctance to challenge ‘core’ understanding of what it means to be Scottish, because this would undermine participant’s sense of belonging to a collective identity and thus destabilise their sense of being part of something ‘unique’.

The findings indicate that rather than bringing about heterogeneous understandings of identity through the examination of the diversity within nations, many of the young people in this study sought to downplay geographical and historical differences in favour of an established, homogenous discourse of nationhood, albeit one to which non-threatening ‘exotic embellishments’ may be added. The legitimacy of these definitions were sustained through participants’ belief that others in Scotland would agree with their views, as well as attempts to discredit those whose opinions differed from the group consensus. This in turn allowed them to strengthen their belief in both the credibility and authenticity of their own sense of self.

While this chapter examined how young people constructed the ‘core’, the next chapter examines how young people attempted to maintain the relationship between the margins and the core through negotiating the impact of migrant communities on Scottish identity.
Chapter 7. Joining the Nation or Re-imagining the Core? ‘Tartan Turbans’, ‘Happy Multiculturalism’ and the Boundaries of Belonging

[The margins in no small part define the core. They establish boundaries within which the core can be understood. Without the margins there can be no core, just as without borders there can be no nation. The two concepts are not only inextricably linked—they are logically symbiotic...what is categorised as marginal and what is understood to be core has, at its root, nothing to do with numbers and everything to do with power...en route from the margins to the mainstream are many gatekeepers—some official, others self-appointed—keen to stamp their imprimatur of authenticity and exact a price for entry (Younge, 2012: 106-7).]

Critics of the ‘core+’ model in public policy in the UK have argued that museums need to move beyond the ‘social inclusion’ approach to issues of cultural diversity, in which minorities are accepted as ‘exotic embellishments’ that enhance the core without threatening the mainstream (Ashworth et al. 2007). Those such as Younge above have argued that such approaches serve to sustain the power dynamics between the margins and the core. Instead, both theorists and practitioners have argued for a more radical approach that seeks to destabilise the relationship between the ‘margins’ and the ‘core’ through emphasising the plural nature of national identity. Within the UK context, there have been increasing calls amongst both practitioners and theorists to redefine the nation in plural terms through re-writing ‘the margins into the centre’ (Hall 2005: 31). As already identified, one proposed method of achieving this is to move beyond the ‘celebration’ of migrant communities’ attempts to ‘join the core’ through ‘adapting and blending’, towards approaches that critically examine the concept of a historically homogenous mainstream. Increasing evidence can be found within the European context of museums that have attempted to disrupt the concept of a settled nation through highlighting the longstanding history of population movement and change. However, although such narratives are increasingly emerging in institutional contexts
such as museums, the degree to which public understandings of diversity view migration as a ‘natural’ part of human existence is questionable. This chapter therefore aims to address the following questions: How do individuals respond to displays that attempt to re-imagine Scotland’s national heritage and identity as culturally diverse through the ‘inclusion’ of minority groups? Are young people willing to accept conceptualisations of both Scotland and Scottish identity that challenge their definitions of the ‘core’? Or are ethnic minorities and migrant communities accepted as ‘exotic embellishments’ that enhance the core without challenging mainstream conceptualisations of Scottish heritage or identity?

This chapter firstly contextualises the responses of ‘majority Scots’ in this study by examining the experiences of migrants who have attempted to ‘adopt the culture’ as a means of affirming their sense of belonging. It proceeds to analyse how the young people in this study responded to the attempts of ethnic minorities to ‘join the nation’, particularly through the adoption of the Scottish cultural icon: the kilt. Building on Littler and Naidoo’s (2004) concept of ‘white past/multicultural present’ it then examines the way in which these participants utilised distinctions between ‘culture’ as fluid and ‘heritage’ as fixed in order to emphasise the perceived disjuncture between historical homogeneity and modern heterogeneity and thus maintain the divisions between the margins and the core. The final section seeks to understand the degree to which young people were willing to accept stories of modern migration within a museum context, based on their preconceptions of museums. The implications of these findings for current museum approaches to issues of migration are then considered.

7.1 Performing ‘Scottishness’

Before proceeding with the discussion in this chapter is therefore necessary to reintroduce the key theoretical ideas put forward by Goffman and Giddens that are relevant to the issues identified in the responses of the young people in this study. It is important to reassert that there are key differences in theoretical approach of these authors; however these points of divergence are useful for understanding the way in which identity is both a product of social interaction and individual agency. As outlined in Chapter 2, Goffman argues that identity is a process of ‘becoming’. Consequently, we may consciously or unconsciously adopt a role in order to become the person that we wish to be. While Goffman himself does not suggest that the conscious adoption of a
role is an act of deception, an attempt to hide the true self, the concept of ‘performance’ helps us to understand the way in which the active adoption of a role may be judged as ‘false’ by others. For Goffman, the issue at hand is whether or not our performances are deemed to be credible by others. As Younge argues in the quote at the outset of this chapter, the degree to which the identity claims of those from ethnic minority or migrant backgrounds are deemed ‘authentic’ is an important issue, as our ability to claim an identity is limited by those who view themselves as possessing the right to judge such performances.

In contrast, while Giddens is also interested in the way in which social interaction shapes identity, he places a greater emphasis on the ability of the individual to resist such structural pressures, by mediating experiences that may challenge our sense of self. Although I am more inclined towards Goffman’s position, Giddens’ argument that the ‘project’ of the self in modernity demands that we strive behave in an a manner that we perceived to be ‘authentic’, regardless of changes in social context, offers useful insights into the young people’s responses that we see in this chapter.

7.1.1 Establishing ‘credibility’
In Chapter 1, we saw that despite Hardeep’s attempt to ‘join the nation’ through ‘adopting the culture’ of Scotland, the legitimacy of his identity claims were still challenged by those who argued that his ethnic identity meant that no matter what he did, he would always be viewed as belonging somewhere else. This is a stark reminder of the way in which identity is often beyond our control. As McCrone and Bechhofer observe: ‘In terms of our national identity, who we are and are judged to be in a particular context depends on how well our claims are regarded by those around us. Being considered ‘not one of us’ means being an outsider whether one wants to be or not’ (2008: 1245).

Within this research, I spoke to a small number of young people, primarily at the Edinburgh State School, who were both ethnic minorities and first-generation migrants in Scotland. These participants discussed the difficulties they had adjusting to life in Scotland, primarily due to tensions between their strong feelings of belonging and their perception that they could never legitimately claim to be ‘Scottish’. For these young people, engaging in ‘Scottish activities’, such as wearing tartan or participating in ceilidhs, was a means of asserting their feelings of belonging and celebrating their sense of attachment, without necessarily having to claim a Scottish identity, or have this
identity challenged, as to claim to be Scottish would leave them open to accusations of ‘inauthenticity’.

One means of explaining this lies in Giddens’ concept of the ‘pseudo-self’ (1991:191), where changes in an individual’s mode of behaviour and values brought about by a new environment, while outwardly convincing (although not necessarily, a point returned to later), are experienced as ‘false’ by the individual, who experiences the self as ‘inauthentic’. Giddens argues that in these instances the ‘individual only feels psychologically secure in his [sic] self-identity in so far as others recognise his behaviour as appropriate or reasonable’ (1991: 191). Here, we see the way in which Mariana and Pria attempted to gain a sense of ontological security through engaging in what they perceived to be ‘appropriate behaviour’, which they felt would increase their acceptance by others.

**Mariana and Pria, 14 years old, Edinburgh State School**

The desire to gain external acceptance through living out a form of ‘Scottishness’ can be seen in the responses of Mariana and Pria. Mariana described herself as ‘Venezuelan living in Scotland’. A Spanish speaker, she was born in Venezuela and moved to Scotland when she was 9 years old. Her mum was from Venezuela and her dad was Portuguese by birth, while her stepfather and stepsister were born in England. Pria moved to Scotland when she was 5 years old and described herself as ‘British-English’. Her dad was born in India, while her mother was born in Uganda, but moved to England following the expulsion of the Indian community from the country. Although Pria moved to Scotland at a young age, she did not feel particularly Scottish, as all of her family lived in England. Likewise, Mariana was also careful to say that she did not feel Scottish, but rather stressed that she lived in Scotland and ‘sounded Scottish’. However, while neither claimed to be Scottish, both talked about their need to act in a particular way in order to feel like they belonged and discussed the importance of adopting cultural practices such as celebrating Burns’ Night and eating haggis as a means of achieving this. Importantly, neither explicitly discussed this issue in terms of a need for external acceptance and they did not talk about experiences of racism or having their identity openly challenged in contrast to the experiences of the young people discussed in Chapter 4. Pria explained that when she first arrived in Scotland she found many Scottish traditions strange, as she was not familiar with them:
Um, well like on Robert Burns Day, like in primary we always had like poems and maybe like competitions for like first place and second place and um yeah, I tried haggis, which is ok [laughs]. And I wore some tartan in my hair. And then on St. Andrew’s Day like we’d kind of just like, in primary school we’d have to, we’d like have to wear something tartan and it’s obviously like the same here. ‘Cause like on past St Andrew’s Day [in England] we like hadn’t.

She appeared to identify with the images of the Sikhs wearing the kilt, explaining that:

They might have been a Sikh person who’s Scottish and celebrating that, a Scottish day. Or they just like acting Scottish, like wearing the kilts and dancing and that.

Although she originally states that the Sikh’s could be Scottish, Pria’s observation that the men in the image may have just been ‘acting Scottish’ is interesting, as it hints at the notion that their behaviour was not authentic, but rather a ‘performance’ that would end once they changed their clothes.

Similarly, Mariana felt that it was important to ‘do Scottish things’ in order to feel a sense of belonging. The importance Mariana placed on engaging with cultural practices in order to become ‘more Scottish’ is seen in her disappointment at not being able to join in with eating haggis with her family:

I well, you know for Robert Burns Day? Well I tried to eat haggis and I didn’t like it [laughs]. I felt a bit like left out, ‘cause um, yeah my stepdad and my stepsister tried haggis and they both liked it but, I didn’t so I felt quite left out…My mum, she bought like this kind of tartan skirt for me and my little sister and we wore it, but it didn’t fit me, so I just like, I just didn’t wear the skirt and I just celebrated without wearing the skirt, yeah.

Mariana felt that she could not be considered Scottish because she did not participate in activities such as playing shinty, tossing the caber and Highland Dancing that she was not Scottish. I asked her if she knew anyone who did those activities:

No. Well in my primary school we had a sports day, and it was like, these Scottish players that taught us Scottish national games, so that’s how I know something. Like if you’re Scottish you believe that if you do this you will be like more Scottish then. I’m not sure how really to put it, but that’s what I think.
Her perception that she could not be Scottish because she did not participate in such activities was curious given her awareness that no one she knew took part in such activities. Like Pria, her exposure to ‘Scottish customs’ occurred very soon after she arrived in Scotland and clearly had a profound impact on how she perceived both Scottish identity and the legitimacy of her claim to ‘belong’. However, in contrast to Pria, Mariana excluded many of the images relating to ethnic and religious minorities, including the images of individuals wearing kilts. This finding was unexpected, especially given her attempts to ‘adopt’ the culture as a way of ‘becoming’ Scottish. While she felt that it was important to try and act in a Scottish way, she appeared to feel like an outsider and therefore judged others with a migrant background in the same way. Significantly, Mariana’s views were in keeping with many of her peers from the younger Edinburgh State School group, a finding that was also surprising given the relatively high proportion of individuals from ethnic minority backgrounds in this group in comparison to the other groups who participated in the research. While we might expect those from minority backgrounds to challenge mainstream conceptualisations of heritage and national identity based on theories of heritage and dissonance, we instead see young people adopting the attitudes and values of the mainstream.

The experiences of Mariana and Pria echo those of English migrants in Kiely et al.’s research, which found that these migrants do in fact ‘feel ‘or ‘live out’ a form of Scottishness, but need external acceptance or some form of legitimation of their identity (2005: 165). For these individuals, ‘adopting the culture’ allows them to strengthen their own claim to belong, thus demonstrating a willingness to ‘join the nation’. Hussain and Miller’s (2006) research on Islamophobia and Anglophobia in Scotland has highlighted the issue with assimilatory approaches to issues of migration and minority rights. Drawing upon Kellas’ definition of civic nationalism as ‘inclusive in the sense that anyone can adopt the culture and join the nation’ (1998:65), they express scepticism over the Scottish approach, suggesting that it is: ‘inclusive, even welcoming, though not multicultural’ (2006: 121). They argue that:

Minorities in Scotland may seek to contribute to the development of the culture and the redefinition of the nation—rather than ‘adopt’ an existing culture or ‘join’ an existing nation. The danger for them is that the civic nationalists’ offer of equality and welcome may be conditional upon ‘adopting and joining’ what already exists. (2006: 121).
Hussain and Miller suggest neither English nor Pakistani minority groups in Scotland are both willing and able to ‘adopt the culture and join the nation’ (ibid). They found that English migrants had a tendency to attempt to ‘adapt and blend’ through taking an interest in Scottish history, literature and traditional culture through attending local history societies and playing instruments. However, they were still unable to ‘join the nation’ as they felt they already ‘belonged’ to another nation: England (2006:130). In contrast, Pakistanis’ were willing to ‘join the nation’ by identifying as Scottish, but felt unable to adopt the culture. The participants in Hussain and Miller’s study stressed that they wanted to ‘contribute’ to the nation, rather than assimilate, by keeping their dress, culture and language (2006: 129).

Both Kiely et al.’s and Hussain and Miller’s studies raise interesting questions when viewed alongside the findings of this research regarding issues of agency and the degree to which individuals feel they are able to challenge existing definitions of nationhood, through seeking to redefine what Smith (2006) has termed the ‘authorised heritage discourse’. As we will see throughout the responses below, there was reluctance even amongst those from migrant or ethnic minority backgrounds to attempt to re-define the core in plural terms by demanding greater representation of stories relating to migration within public institutions such as museums. Whether this is because individuals from these backgrounds felt they were unable to challenge the ‘core’ or because they too were invested in the ‘unique’ nature of Scottish identity is difficult to assess and a broader study of individuals from these backgrounds would be required in order to evaluate this finding. The latter explanation is certainly unconvincing given Hussain and Miller’s findings above. The question that can be addressed by this research is whether so-called ‘majority Scots’ respond positively to the attempts of migrants to ‘join the nation’ through engaging with heritage, and if so are they prepared to accept migrant stories as an integral part of Scottish heritage? The responses of the young people in this study relating to attempts by migrants and ethnic minorities to ‘adopt the culture’ and ‘join the nation’ are therefore now examined.

**7.2 Young People’s Reactions to Images of Ethnic Minorities: ‘Tartan Turbans’ and ‘Tartan Tosspots’**

The discussion in this section analyses whether public perceptions of the role that ethnic minorities play in the nation’s story are as positive as political discourse on Scotland’s so-called ‘multicultural nationalism’ would have us believe. It looks specifically at
responses of young people to images of individuals from ethnic minority backgrounds that have arguably been ‘Scotticized’ through their adoption of tartan dress. As we saw in the introduction to this thesis, images such as Figure 44 echo those found in a number of museum displays in Scotland that seek to address issues of national identity and cultural diversity.

While the responses to images such as this, taken in isolation, with little contextual information, are perhaps not accurate depictions of how individuals would engage with the same ideas within a full-scale museum exhibition, they do provide us with fascinating insights into individuals’ perceptions of these issues outside of the museum and may help to identify the preconceptions visitors bring with them when attending such exhibitions. The impact of these preconceptions on visitors’ ‘willingness’ to accept such interpretations of the nation is considered in Chapter 8.

7.2.1 Rejection
As we saw in Chapter 6, images of ethnic and religious minorities were the most commonly excluded across all groups. Unsurprisingly then, a small minority of young people were unable to accept the images of ethnic minorities engaging in Scottish cultural practices such as wearing tartan or playing bagpipes as legitimate for inclusion within their representation of the nation. This decision appeared to stem from their
inability to reconcile concepts of ethnic difference with their own definitions of ‘Scottishness’ based on a shared ancestry and experiences of place. For these participants, this performance was unconvincing and therefore ‘false’.

An example of this can be found in the discussions of the Scottish Borders group. During the conversation with this group I brought up the example of the Singh tartan discussed at the beginning of this thesis and discussed the example of Hardeep’s desire to wear a kilt to show that he belonged. In the extract below I asked them whether this information changed their response to the image of the Sikhs wearing kilts:

Kat: That image is of Sikhs in Scotland wearing kilts. A lot of you put crosses next to that image. Would you change your mind about that image if you had known about the special tartan made for Sikhs?

Beth: I think it’s to do with like, you were saying about the black piper guy and he’s like playing the bagpipes, but if you look at him, I know this sounds really bad, but you don’t really, it’s like black people are from another country, they’re not originally from here and if you see a picture of them you wouldn’t think “Oh he’s Scottish” unless he had a kilt on’

Kat: So you might not think someone’s Scottish but you might change your mind if you saw them in a kilt?

Fiona: Yeah but like they’re not saying that just because he’s black, like it doesn’t mean that he’s not Scottish, because he could have been like born in Scotland and have like Scottish parents as well

Paul: Yeah. Can I just say like if you picked up some random and like, some South African guys who’d just come to Scotland and then you grab someone like Fiona for example, if you asked them who was Scottish, they’d say Fiona because she just looks more

Kat: So even if, what if they spoke with a Scottish accent or they were wearing kilts?

Paul: I’m not trying to be racist but

Kat: Carry on
Paul: But you can sort of like tell that like a lot of people, are like foreigners, or their parents. You can sort of tell that their original family would have been different to, would have been used to a different culture and that, so you sort of, you sort of like try and link them with different things, like the colour and that, instead of like haggis.

Although in this discussion Fiona was quick to challenge the idea that an individual’s nationality was based on their ethnicity, both Beth and Paul’s emphasis on where someone was ‘originally’ from highlights the importance of ethnicity to definitions of ‘Scottishness’ for the majority of young people in this group.

Paul was very sceptical of my attempts to ‘include’ this image and returned to the topic on several occasions:

Paul: I don’t think the one with the guys; you say they’ve made their own tartan? Well I don’t think you can do that, because like tartan, every sort of tartan was sort of made a few hundred years ago. Like, I’ve got my own sort of tartan, for my family, so

Kat: If the Singh tartan was a hundred years old would that change your opinion?

Paul: No because the original tartans are like, centuries old, lots of centuries old.

It is worth remembering that Paul felt his own claim to being Scottish was somewhat weak, due to his Lithuanian ancestry, as we saw in Chapter 5. For Paul, the idea that anyone could adopt or indeed ‘adapt’ this item of Scottish traditional dress appeared to challenge his own feelings of uniqueness and belonging. Paul’s feelings of insecurity here highlight the issue of evoking tradition as a means of providing ontological security: if a tradition is not perceived to be ‘fixed’ but rather understood as ‘fluid’, does it carry the same feelings of continuity upon which to base an identity claim? This certainly appeared to be a pertinent issue for many of the young people in this study.

Paul’s attempts to discredit the validity of ‘new’ tartans on the basis that are not ‘old enough’ points to the powerful way in which the past is used to justify the actions of the present. As Anderson argues, ‘history establishes how we must always be by virtue of how we have always been’ (1983:19). The way in which the young people in this study drew upon distinctions between the past and present in order to justify their responses is returned to later in this chapter.
7.2.2 Conditional acceptance
For the majority of participants the engagement of migrant groups in cultural traditions such as wearing a kilt was not sufficient evidence upon which to accept the individuals in these images as Scottish. These participants stated that other identity markers would be needed in order to accept the claims of individuals from ethnic minority backgrounds as Scottish. The visual nature of the task was emphasised here, with many young people stating that they would need to speak to the person to find out their motivations for wearing the kilt in order to assess the claim. This was partly explained by a general suspicion of people they perceived to have no claim to be Scottish, such as ‘tourists’ or ‘Americans’ wearing kilts. For these young people, engagement with Scottish heritage on its own was not enough to legitimate an identity claim or show commitment to the country, as we see here in the discussion of Donald, Ewan and Ruairidh from the Barra group:

Kat: What is it that makes someone Scottish?
Donald: Owning a kilt
Kat: Owning a kilt. Why is that?
Ewan: I don’t own a kilt
Donald: Never mind
Kat: This is interesting, so why do you have to own a kilt?
Donald: I don’t know, it’s like having something Scottish to show that you are Scottish
Kat: What about this image of the Asian man in a kilt? Does it make him Scottish if he was wearing that, if you guys said it was really important for people to wear a kilt?
Ruairidh: Well I mean
Donald: Well it depends, I mean is he from Scotland or is he just some person who said he wants to wear a kilt today
Kat: So what about if you knew they were born in Scotland?
Donald: Then yeah, they’re Scottish
A similar response was seen in the discussions with the Edinburgh Private School group. In assessing the credibility of images such as Figure 45 above, the young people in this group drew upon their own experiences of being required to wear a kilt on certain occasions at the school, even though many of them were not Scottish:

Ben: Looking at that picture I wouldn’t think he was Scottish, even though he’s wearing a kilt. But then if I met him and knew something about him I might think differently.

Sam: I think there are huge assumptions being made based on wearing a kilt. I wear a kilt when I go to the rugby, but I’m not Scottish.

Kat: Your teacher was telling me about some of the Scottish traditions that you have at the school.

Alistair: Yeah we have a Burns Supper every year and a Pipe Band.
Sam: We wear kilts to chapel every Sunday

Kat: How do you feel about wearing a kilt?

Sam: You’re at school in Scotland so you’re supposed to embrace the culture of the school as much as they can to allow them to be a part of Scotland, so you might as well embrace it.

Sam’s response here to the image above demonstrates the contradictions between how many of the young people in this group discussed their own identity and how they assessed the identity claims of others. Sam proudly declared he was English and from Yorkshire. Although he began his comment here by reflecting on his own experience as an English migrant, he quickly shifted the focus onto ‘other’ people’s need to adapt; the ‘you’ at the end of the sentence appears to refer to him, but actually feels like an instruction to others. My analysis of this encounter was supported by the teacher, who had stayed in his office adjacent to the classroom during the research and had listened intently to the opinions voiced. His first comment once the research finished focused on what he viewed as the irony in the group’s responses, pointing out what he felt was the lack of awareness amongst the class that many of them were migrants and yet he felt they had no empathy with the experiences of others. There are parallels here with the findings of Hussain and Miller, who observe that ‘while English migrants were very enthusiastic about the importance of attempting to assimilate, they had a tendency to respond to questions about “adapting and blending” as applying to others, not themselves’ (2006: 130). This finding highlights significant challenges for museums that wish to encourage others to empathise with experiences of migrants through reflecting critically on their own feelings of belonging. In the case of both Sam and Paul above, rather than bring about a greater understanding of migrants’ experiences, such experiences may result in individuals seeking to further solidify the distinction between ‘us’ and ‘them’ as a means of stabilising their own identity.

Not all participants were as sceptical as Sam and Paul however. For those who struggled with definitions of ‘Scottishness’ based solely on territorial claims, the adoption of existing cultural practices by ethnic minorities and an obvious respect for Scotland’s heritage made it easier for them to accept these images, as they felt that individuals in them were demonstrating a commitment to the nation, as the next section shows.

7.2.3 Demonstrating pride and commitment
Chapter 5 highlighted the importance young people placed on migrants and those from ethnic minority backgrounds demonstrating feelings of pride and commitment to the
nation when assessing their identity claims. For some, a sense of pride was the only marker of identity required in order to accept someone as Scottish. A large proportion of young people however expressed the view that it was necessary for individuals from these backgrounds to show outward signs of this commitment to the nation. One means of achieving this was for individuals to adopt the cultural practices of the majority, with many stating that it was necessary for ‘New Scots’ to ‘show their respect’ and commitment to Scotland by learning about its heritage. This was perceived by these young people as an attempt to integrate and thus ‘join the nation’. As such, they were more willing to accept the images of ethnic minorities wearing kilts as Scottish than other images, seen here in Alistair’s reflection:

Kat: Does that fact that they're wearing kilts change your perceptions?

Alistair: Yeah, I guess so. You judge that if they're wearing a kilt then you assume that they’re quite proud to be Scottish

(Alistair, 17 years old, Edinburgh Private School)

The young people from the Glasgow group debated had a particularly heated debate about this issue:

Kat: Can someone become Scottish?

Vicky: You have to like prove that you’re Scottish. Well not prove, but show that you’re committed

Dean: How?

Vicky: Like I don’t know, wearing a kilt or something

Dean: That’s just going back to being stereotypical

Vicky: No but like not being stereotypical

Dean: Just because you wear a kilt doesn’t make you Scottish does it?

Vicky: I know but

Ian: Just because you say you’re Scottish doesn’t make you Scottish

Kat: What do you think of the image of the Sikh men wearing kilts?
Adele: They might be going to a wedding Miss. I’ve been to an Indian person’s wedding. Well the wedding reception, the dancing and that

Kat: And did anyone wear they’re kilts?

Adele: Um, no

George: What is it you’ve been to?

Adele: An Indian person’s wedding reception. But my Uncle was just in India there, his pal’s Indian and they wore kilts and that there and he had to wear like a wee hat and everything. So they kinda took Scottish culture but then like tied in wi’ it

Vicky: I think they do, they look Scottish to me. I think that picture makes me think they’re Scottish

Kat: What if they weren’t wearing the kilt?

Vicky: If they weren’t? I dunno. Like if they're coming over here then I think they need to respect our culture

Dean: We need to respect theirs as well

Kat: So do you think someone who wears a kilt is more respectful than someone who doesn’t?

Vicky: No but I don't think they should go around like saying stuff about it. Like if you're wearing a kilt and I don't think they should make fun of you, I think they should respect the tradition. That’s what you believe so

Dean: I think not wearing a kilt is maybe more respectful. Just because you're wearing a kilt doesn't make you more respectful does it?

Vicky: No that's not what I'm saying

Dean: I'm not saying that just to you, but just because you're wearing a kilt doesn't make you more respectful to Scottish. You can wear anything and still be Scottish, you can wear anything.

Vicky: No, I'm not saying they should only wear that. I'm just saying they shouldn't mock it. They shouldn't make fun of us
Ian: It's like you don't need to go over the top with it, but as long as you're not against it. It's like why come to Scotland if you don't like it? I don't know

Kat: What do you think about people who move to Scotland and adopt the culture, by doing things like wearing kilts?

Dean: It’s good. People think it’s hurting the economy and that but then the more people we can get over here the better

Ryan: But then the more people…

George: There’s lots of Nigerian people living here

Adele: But then they need to tie in with it

Dean: I think it’s good. As I said, you want people to get a multicultural thing. The thing that annoys me and like I’m not being racist at all but we have people in our school who say they can’t do it but I think it you’re in Scotland you can embrace the Scottish culture. We’re all one happy family together

Kat: Ok so you think these people have embraced Scottish culture because they’re wearing a kilt. But what about the picture of the lady wearing a hijab?

George: Hijab?

Kat: The headscarf. But the fact that she’s not dressed up in tartan, how does that fit with what you were just saying?

Adele: Well she’s not Scottish, she’s not embracing Scottish culture

George: There should be a law

Adele: Well she’s in like…I’m trying to think how to say this without…like she’s no, she’s in like Scotland but she’s like

George: Not embracing the culture

Adele: Showing her culture. But if it’s like against her religion, her culture to take that off, should they stay here?

Despite Adele’s personal experience of migrants attempting to ‘tie in’ with Scottish culture, she remained unconvinced about the identity claims of those from other ethnic and religious backgrounds that were unfamiliar to her and she was significantly less enthusiastic about images that showed individuals who did not ‘embrace the culture’ in a demonstrable way. For participants like Adele, ‘embracing the culture’ appears to not
just be a matter of adopting the values of the majority, but also of the need for migrants to abandon ‘their’ culture, where this was perceived as threatening to the core. The discussion here highlights the distinction between the requirements of ‘integration’ and ‘assimilation’. While in political discourse the two terms are often used interchangeably, the theoretical differences between them point to significantly different ideological positions. While integration refers to the ability for a minority group to function within a society and the adaptive process that may be required for this, such as learning the language and engaging in the political system, assimilation, as seen in the case of France for example, fits closely with ideas of ‘acculturation’, whereby minority groups are required to ‘join the nation’ through ‘adapting culturally to the majority society until indistinguishable from it’ (Ashworth et al. 2007: 74).

What was also interesting in this discussion was the way in which Dean moved between rejecting the need for migrants to ‘adopt the culture’ towards a position that was closer to Vicky and Ian’s assertion that incomers need to both engage and respect the culture. The tension between these positions was seen most clearly in the differences between the Glasgow group’s response to images that they perceive as showing ethnic minorities ‘adapting’ and those that show individuals preserving distinctive cultural practices that are separate to the core. An example of this can be seen in their reaction to the image of the Chinese Dragon (Figure 46).

![Image removed from electronic copy due to copyright issues](Figure 46 Glasgow Hong Lok Dragon And Lion Dance Troupe. Copyright Beth Moon (2011))
George: I didn’t realise I’d put a cross next to the Chinese Dragon, but like Chinese culture is like different to Scottish culture and that

Ryan: Aye but it’s not like Scottish culture, it’s more like Chinese culture and that

Kat: Is there a Chinese community in Glasgow?

Ryan: Yeah but it’s quite, it’s not overwhelmingly big

Dean: The Chinese dragon, I put a cross against that, because I think they’re forcing their things on us, like their New Year’s Eve

Vicky: They’re trying to take over

Dean: Like shoving it down like our throats. I mean yeah it’s like their thing, but have it as like a quiet thing in your house, don’t go OTT

Kat: What do you think they should be doing instead?

Dean: I like it, it’s just I don’t think they should force it down our throats

Kat: Do you think people are forcing it down your throats?

Ian: I’ve never seen it in Glasgow

Vicky: I’ve not seen that before. I don’t think it’s like shoving it down our throats to have like lanterns up and like the dragon

Dean: But they do do that

Vicky: But like where though? I’ve never seen it

Dean: Yes they do

Ian: Yeah like she said that’s a picture in Scotland

Vicky: But I have never seen it

Kat: Have any of you been to the Glasgow Mela? It’s a big festival that happens in the West End and they have performances from lots of different cultures

Dean: It’s like we have a multicultural day at school, we have like ceilidh bands and everything, Irish dancing and rapping and things
Vicky: I think people just maybe do it so they can feel at home. Because if they’re coming over here to work and they can’t go back because they’re sending their money back to their country or whatever, so maybe they just do that so they can feel at home because they maybe can’t go back home because they have to work.

A significant feature of the responses here—which reflected many of the discussions amongst other groups—was the tension between their celebration of the principles of multiculturalism and their appreciation of why migrants may wish to both move to Scotland and retain a sense of cultural distinctiveness, with their belief that such practices were a threat to the mainstream. The young people in this group were unable to see the irony that while they saw ‘multicultural’ activities at school as interesting and enjoyable, they were unable to put the principles of this ‘lesson’ into practice in the real world. This disjuncture between the desire to hold ‘inclusive’ attitudes and participants’ actual behaviour is examined further in the next chapter. However, not all participants experienced such difficulties negotiating the requirement for migrants to ‘join the nation’ while abandoning their own cultural practices. For a small minority of young people the ‘fusion’ of ‘Scottish’ and ‘other’ cultures was of great interest and a source of pride, rather than a threat.

7.2.4 Enhancing the core: ‘exotic embellishments’ and pride

A small number of participants were very enthusiastic about the images of ethnic minorities wearing tartan, which they described as ‘unusual or ‘interesting’. Several of these participants expressed the view that the popularity of Scottish traditions amongst ‘New Scots’ increased their own sense of pride in being Scottish. An example of this can be seen in Isla’s explanation for her image choices:

**Isla, 14 years, Barra**

Isla was a Gaelic speaker who described herself a ‘Scottish Islander or Barrach (someone from Barra)’. Both of these aspects of her identity were a great source of pride for her. She actively identified with being an accepting and open-minded person and this self-identification was present in her responses. She was also quick to challenge the assertions of others in the group that she felt were unfair or unsubstantiated. In the group discussion she was very enthusiastic about the diverse aspects of Scottish society. She praised the comments made in the film by the women who identified herself as both Ethiopian and Scottish, stating that she liked the fact that the women was proud of both aspects of her identity and celebrated both cultures. During the image selection exercise...
she expressed disappointment that other people were not ticking the same images as her, such as the ‘black piper’, which she thought was cool. I asked her how she felt about this and the other images of people in kilts:

Isla: I like the one of the guy wearing the pipes

Alexa: Yeah

Isla: I put a tick next to that ‘cause you see that a lot of it usually. And sometimes like abroad they have bagpipers in random places. Like I was in London and there was a piper on like one of the bridges going across to see the Queen and I thought it was quite random because he was in the wrong city!

Isla enjoyed going to ceilidhs (dances) and playing traditional music, particularly the clarsach (harp) and fiddle. During the group activity she even light-heartedly complained that there were insufficient images of traditional music and dancing. She described these types of activities as a very important part of her own life and this appeared to influence her position on the relevance of these activities to a sense of a Scottish identity. Because of the importance she placed on participating in such activities I was interested in finding out whether she thought it was important that everyone in Scotland took part in these activities, regardless of whether they were born in Scotland:

Kat: If you didn’t necessarily know someone was Scottish, but they went to things like ceilidhs and things like that, would you think that that made them more Scottish, or do you think it doesn’t make a difference?

Isla: It would be like they were trying to be more Scottish. Like they were making an effort to live like a Scottish person

Alexa: Or maybe they just enjoy it?

Both: [laugh]

Kat: Ok. Right, does it make them more Scottish than someone who doesn’t do things like that?...So, you know, I moved to Scotland ten years ago, if I decided that I wasn’t ever going to go to a ceilidh or wasn’t going to ever, I don’t know, go to a Burns Supper, or go and listen to folk music, things like that. If I wasn’t interested in things like that what would you think?

Alexa: It would be quite strange to like
Isla: You want to live in Scotland but you don’t want to have a like

Alexa: To do Scottish things [laughs]

Isla: It would be kind of pointless in a way

Both: [Laugh]

Kat: Pointless?

Isla: Yeah.

Importantly, Isla did not express the view that immigrants had to engage in such activities in order to ‘belong’. However, she viewed such practices as such an important part of her own life that she could not understand why others would not also want to participate in them. For Isla, taking an interest in Scotland’s heritage and participating in specific cultural practices were an important part of being Scottish. The joy she expressed at seeing individuals in other countries participating in ‘Scottish’ activities demonstrates the way in which the perceived attractiveness of Scottish identity to outsiders enhanced her own understanding of what it meant to be Scottish, thus increasing her sense of pride in this identity. This finding echoes the discussion in Chapter 6 of the way in which culturally hybrid practices may enhance the core, without threatening the mainstream, as we saw in the case of Chicken Tikka Masala. While Isla’s views were echoed by a small minority of participants, her suggestion that it would be ‘pointless’ to live in Scotland without undertaking such activities was significant, as a number of participants challenged the validity of what they perceived to be ‘stereotypical’ depictions of ‘Scottishness’ when assessing individual’s identity claims, as the next section examines.

7.2.5 Heritage, identity and authenticity

While the majority of young people understood that individuals might want to do particular activities such as playing the bagpipes or wearing a kilt in order to feel like they belong, they challenged the authenticity of such identity ‘performances’. For a small proportion of participants, this challenge was not based on the legitimacy of those from migrant backgrounds to claim to be Scottish, but rather because they felt that such practices actually heightened the differences between migrant and settled communities. Participants such as Magnus and Daniel from the Edinburgh State School felt that few people who were born in Scotland would feel the need to do what they labelled as ‘stereotypical things’
Magnus: If you actually think about like how many people actually do stuff like that because they’re Scottish, then that’s like, not a lot of people do it. Like if they like do it just because they want to show their heritage, I feel like most of the people who do that are people like, are people that aren’t properly Scottish.

Daniel: Like there’s lots of Scottish play, like there’s this guy that lives across the road from me and he’s from Poland and all of his family are Polish. But the second they moved here their dad took up the bagpipes and then he made his son play the bagpipes, and his brother. So they all play the bagpipes and I’m like why, it’s a horrible instrument.

Magnus: I feel like people like just do that kind of stuff if they’re trying to be more Scottish than they already are. But then like, actual Scottish people, will, well they don’t do it.

Daniel: Most Scottish people hate the bagpipes.

Magnus: I think it’s only related about people that like, it’s like, I feel it’s more the people, their parents, when they move here; they want to sort of connect more with the culture and stuff.

Daniel: And the community, they want to fit in with the community.

While they appreciated that ethnic minorities may wish to ‘perform’ their Scottishness or learn about Scotland’s heritage, they strongly felt that this was a personal choice and in no way affected whether or not they would be considered Scottish. This scepticism towards the attempts of migrants to assimilate by engaging in ‘Scottish’ activities was seen in many of the responses of the young people from Edinburgh State School, as we see here in Rhona and William’s discussion:

Rhona: Nobody does them. I mean obviously you are going to get people who do them, but it’s not like collectively everyone’s like ‘oh yeah let’s have a ceilidh’. It’s not like an everyday thing that you do, like wearing kilts; people will wear them at weddings maybe, but not.

William: Do you?

Rhona: I don’t wear them but people will generally wear them when there’s like special events.

Kat: That’s interesting, because you put a cross next to the image of the black piper.
Rhona: I put a cross next to the black piper because I thought it’s a bit, I felt it was just a bit too ‘try hard’ if you know what I mean. It’s like a bit cheesy. Fair enough, you’re welcome to wear a kilt, it’s just a bit

William: It’s multicultural. Well I didn’t tick or cross that ‘cause it’s got like lots of different places there ‘cause there’s in India there’s just like tartan tosspots everywhere

Rhona’s response was particularly interesting, given her own background as the daughter of a first generation migrant from Ethiopia and her experience of living in the Western Isles as a Gaelic speaker. While we might expect her to identify with the image of the piper in the same way that Pria identified with the image of the Sikhs wearing kilts above, she rejected it as ‘inauthentic’. For Rhona, such behaviour was evidence that the individuals in the images were not being ‘true to themselves’, to use Giddens’ term. Consequently, such performances were not credible as the ‘performance’ was too visible; the audience too conscious that the actor is playing a role. For Rhona, a subtler or more ‘naturalistic’ performance would be more credible.

Importantly, Rhona did not challenge the legitimacy of this individual’s claim to be Scottish. However, her view that the image was a bit ‘try-hard’ shows the heightened sensitivity amongst this group towards images that were deliberately representative of ‘multiculturalism’. While they understood and appreciate the value of ethnic minorities within Scottish society, they resented such tokenistic and superficial approaches to these issues. As the next chapter shows, they preferred to identify with images that showed migrant and ethnic minority communities engaging with cultural practices that had not been ‘Scotticized’ in such an obvious manner. Such criticisms echo Brown’s assessment of the use of images of ethnic diversity with the Museum of Tolerance in LA as a means of challenging prejudice, which she labels ‘happy multiculturalism’ (2009:116). Brown’s cynicism regarding the lack of sophistication in the museum’s heavy handed approach to the issue of ‘tolerance’ resonates strongly with the attitudes of many of the young people in this study, who were sceptical of deliberate attempts to re-imagine the core plural terms and challenges the motivation behind discussions of diversity, as we will see in the remaining discussion of this chapter.
7.3 Maintaining the ‘core’: negotiating diversity

While the discussion thus far has examined how young people responded to attempts by migrants and ethnic minorities to ‘join the nation’ through adoption of the cultural practices of the ‘core’, this next section specifically examines how participants responded to the idea of Scottish museums attempting to include such images within representations of Scotland. It is worth reiterating that this discussion was theoretical and therefore not necessarily reflective of young people’s responses to an actual museum display. However, the views expressed here provide useful insights into young people’s perceptions of museums and the degree to which they felt stories about migration and ethnic minorities were appropriate topics for discussion within the museum environment.

7.3.1 The Culture/Heritage Dichotomy

The majority of young people were prepared to accept the images discussed above as representative of multiculturalism (albeit reluctantly in some cases); however they were keen to downplay the significance of migrant communities to a broader understanding of Scotland as a nation. The choice of words used by many young people to justify these distinctions is significant. Frequent references were made to the differences between ‘culture’, which was used to refer to modern diverse societies and conceptualised as fluid, versus ‘heritage’, which as we have seen in the discussions of previous chapters was perceived as relating to either historical events or ancestral ties and was thus ‘fixed’. This distinction is seen clearly in Amy’s reaction to my question of whether she would accept any of the images relating to ethnic minorities as part of Scotland’s heritage:

I’d say that those things are part of the culture but I wouldn’t say that they’re heritage

(Amy, 14 years old, Scottish Borders Group)

A useful explanation for how and why these distinctions were perceived to be necessary by many participants can be found in Archie’s account. Archie had significant reservations in the group discussions regarding whether new cultural influences brought about by migration could ever be considered ‘heritage’:

People from other cultures are a really important part of our culture, but not necessarily our heritage because of the fact that they don’t necessarily go back a long way and so for me the whole idea about Scotland is about things that have been, you
know, engrained in the past and are long running, that just have a real identity with Scotland and for that reason that’s the reason why I put crosses against them.

Archie’s definition of heritage here comes close to ethnic definitions of national identity. He emphasised that while the cultural practices of migrant communities might be accepted as part of the story of modern Scotland, other historical events were far more important to the story of the nation and thus outweighed the contribution of these groups to national heritage. A slightly different stance was seen in the reflections of his classmate Alistair, who tried to adopt a more ‘inclusive’ position through his focus on what Scotland was like ‘nowadays’:

I think it’s important to include different nationalities that have come to Scotland because Scotland itself, the Scottish people have come all over the world and you hear all these Scottish names in New Zealand and Australia and Canada and stuff like that, so it would be a bit hypocritical to say that Polish people and Indian people don’t have a place in Scottish culture, because Scotland would be offended if New Zealand were to say that Scotland wasn’t important to them. Nowadays it would be unfair to not include them at all because nowadays foreign countries are very influential on Scottish culture, even if people don’t want to accept it. I think people would eat curry or other things like that far more than they’d eat haggis. And yes it was invented in Glasgow but it was influenced by other cultures. So it’s just as important to Scottish culture as like haggis.

(Alistair, 17 years old, Edinburgh Private School)

Alistair’s attempts to empathise with the experiences of Poles by imagining how he would feel if another country rejected the importance of Scottish emigration to its national heritage paints a more positive picture of the influence that museums could have than some of the responses we have seen thus far. His attempts to focus on the modern Scottish experience rather than dwell on the past were echoed in the approach of Charlie:

**Charlie, 16 years old, Edinburgh Private School**

Charlie placed a strong emphasis on the value of ‘heritage’ in defining a sense of identity. Importantly, he drew upon this experience to reflect upon the way in which individuals who were born in other countries might also wish to continue to reaffirm a connection to that place through ‘celebrating’ heritage:
I think it’s important to believe in heritage as like, just the heritage full stop. I think it’s important for me to have a heritage and everyone else—-not necessarily a Scottish heritage, just something you embrace as part of you. Like people living in China, they would celebrate the heritage of that place. For me, heritage is not where you are but where you feel comfortable and what you feel is part of you. So you might celebrate the heritage in Edinburgh but the heritage of somewhere you’re not living is also very important.

Charlie was one of the few members of the Edinburgh Private School group who appeared comfortable discussing the images relating to ethnic and religious diversity and was one of only ten participants throughout the whole research who did not exclude any images and he was quick to draw attention to this as a means of distancing himself from some of the negative comments made by his peers:

Charlie: I don’t think I crossed anything. There were some things that were clearly, weren’t necessarily completely Scottish. But then I thought ‘You can have that nowadays’ and so I just put a few question marks.

Kat: Do you think other people would share your view?

Charlie: Probably not necessarily, ‘cause a lot of people focus on like the classic kind of image. But if you look at modern Scottish culture then a lot of that would fit in.

His reflection on his change in reaction can be interpreted as an attempt to demonstrate his rational, and perhaps more mature response in relation to those around him. He warmed to this theme in the paired interviews when asked whether he thought it was important that everyone shared a similar understanding of Scottish identity:

Everyone should be able to fit in. And Scotland has changed so much and has so much going on that really anybody should be able to fit in and they can. I’m not really very happy with the fact that necessarily there’s a quite a, kind of real classic latching onto the past, very very conservative with a small c, they’ve kind of got this thing where they’re resistance to change and because of that a lot of people can’t fit in with new things and really they should be able to and I’m not very happy with that. And I think people really need to take a look at what Scotland is now and see that a lot of people can get along just fine. [Laughs] Peace out!

Charlie’s use of irony at the end of his response appears to show an awareness that his views might be rejected by his more cynical peers. Indeed, Charlie’s comment above that some images were not ‘completely’ Scottish hints at a disjuncture between this
celebration of modern Scotland and a notion of a longer-standing, ‘purer’ Scotland. Despite these young people recognising the importance of migrant communities within modern society, they appear to still feel unable to challenge the ‘authorised heritage discourse’, while still criticising its restrictive power. This wariness perhaps explains their lack of enthusiasm for the idea that museums should represent the experiences of ethnic minorities as part of Scotland’s heritage.

It is important to note that both Charlie and Alistair chose to emphasise the importance of recognising modern diversity, rather than taking a longer view of the fundamental interconnectedness of Scotland with other countries throughout history. The distinctions made in the young people’s responses here echo Littler and Naidoo’s (2004) assertion that discussions of cultural diversity in the British context are frequently framed in terms of a false binary between ‘white past/multicultural present’. The next section examines the impact of this approach on young people’s responses to the idea of museums representing the experiences of migrant communities within the story of the nation.

7.3.2 Perceptions of migration stories in Scottish museums
Perhaps unsurprisingly, the majority of young people give the distinctions made between the past and the present in the discussions above, the majority of young people did not feel that museums were appropriate environments to represent the experiences of ethnic minorities. This view stemmed primarily from the frequently expressed belief that museums only represented ‘history’, by which they appeared to mean pre-twentieth century events. Indeed, many participants appeared confused as to why I asking them about museums in the context of these issues, as we see here in the discussion of William, Rhona and Rihanna from the Edinburgh State School:

Kat: Have you been in the National Museum of Scotland?
Rhona: Yeah
Kat: Have you been in the Scottish bit of it?
William: Yeah
Kat: How would you feel if you saw pictures some of those things you chose in that building, what would you think?
Rhona: I would just think it’s more like historical stuff in there. And like inventions
Rihanna: Well you can’t really do anything about it, it’s like
Rhona: It’s more like, sort of like our achievements and what we’ve done and blah blah blah. It’s not really, like culture, it’s more like history and politics I think

While the young people in this group felt that diversity within modern Scotland was very important and indeed reflected their own experience, they did not view this as an appropriate topic for a museum to address. This scepticism was shared by the young people from the Scottish Borders group. I began the discussion by asking participants how they would feel about seeing some of the images they had either excluded or overlooked in a museum about Scotland:

Kat: If you saw some of these things in a museum about Scotland how would you feel?

Eilidh: Well they’re not really Scottish

Paul: Yeah, it's like they’re not Scottish symbols

Fiona: But they’re like, like the Sikhs or the Mosque or things like, there are people like I know this sounds bad because there are people who are English as well, but there are people who are Sikhs who live in Scotland, and I know that there are like English people as well, but like they’ll always be English, whereas there’s a picture of some Sikhs, they don’t, they can make themselves Scottish, like the English people will never be Scottish so

Kat: What about if you were to see a picture of someone wearing a headscarf in a Scottish museum would you accept them as being Scottish?

Sara: No

Kat: But if they were wearing a kilt you might?

Sara: I don’t want to sound horrible

Paul: It just feels like they’re not part of our country

Fiona: We wouldn’t like not accept it, we’d just think it’s a Scottish museum so what does it have to do with Scotland?

Beth: Yeah like if you see a girl in a headscarf you think of like India or somewhere

Fiona: But if they had, well in museums there’s always information and that beside it saying they were Scottish, so maybe that would explain it
It is worth highlighting that Fiona had recently been to the National Museum of Scotland and at the end of the research she talked enthusiastically about watching the *One Nation* film while she was there. While Fiona did not reject the idea that museums could tell stories, she felt that the museum would need to provide significant justification for displaying the experiences of ethnic or religious minorities within the broader context of Scottish history in order to maintain its authoritative stance. It is tempting to see her more moderate position in comparison to others in this group as a result of experiences such as this, however it is impossible to draw such a conclusion without further in-depth research into the way in which this museum visit was situated within her wider experiences.

A similar confusion between perceptions of museums as representing ‘Scottish symbols’ and historical achievements, rather than addressing ‘modern’ issues was seen in the responses of the Edinburgh Private School:

Kat: How would you feel if you saw stories about some of these images, like this Sikh family, in a museum display about Scotland or Scottish identity?

Archie: I’d think that it’s quite a modern, idealised idea of what Scotland is, because like some of these Sikh families, have only been around like, at the absolute most like say a hundred years? So I’d say it would be a very up to date, twenty-first century representation of Scotland in a museum, not one that’s specifically focused on Scotland’s past, so not looking backwards

Kieran: If you set it out as being in the twenty-first century context then that might be ok, I think you’d need the ancient things about Scotland added in though, otherwise it might be a bit, like Sikhs wearing kilts would be a bit strange on their own

Kat: So it would have to specifically be about modern Scottish culture?

Kieran: Yeah

Kat: Why do I need to make that distinction?

Michael: Because you potentially could offend some people if, like a Scottish person, if you tried to tell them that there were Sikhs around in the 1800s in Scotland or if there were like Sikhs fighting in the Jacobite Rebellion, or like if there was anyone
there who doesn’t look traditionally Scottish, which I’m sure there weren’t

While Michael’s response shows the difficulties many young people had when trying to understand why the experiences of ethnic or religious minorities could be considered ‘heritage’. By changing the parameters of the discussion, from a question of whether the stories of Sikhs could be included in a representation of Scottish history, to whether this image could be legitimately accepted within the context of a specific historical event, Michael was able to easily reject this plural definition of identity, while avoiding discussing the tricky topic of ‘race’ seen in his reference to individuals who look ‘traditionally Scottish’. Recognising that perhaps my line of questioning was confusing, I tried a different approach by discussing a migrant group with an established historical presence in Scotland.

7.3.3 ‘New’ and ‘Old’ Migrants

In recent years the long-established links between Scotland and Poland have been emphasised in public discourse, as a result of increased interest amongst historians (See Devine and Hesse, 2011). Drawing on this research, exhibitions such as The Original Export (2009) at the National Library of Scotland have highlighted the interrelated nature of the two countries through historical trade links. The impact of trade on population demographics was a theme also emphasised in the Migration Stories exhibition at the Scottish National Portrait Gallery. The interpretation in the exhibition asked visitors to look out of the window to the Port of Leith and consider the groups of people across the centuries that either left or came to Scotland through the port for trade and work. Such an interpretative strategy is common in museum exhibitions that seek to draw links between historical migration and modern diversity, as evidenced in the Galleries of Modern London at the Museum of London, which emphasises London’s historical status as a ‘global city’. Drawing upon these examples, I sought to examine how the young people in this study responded to attempts to draw parallels between historical population movement and modern globalisation, through the deconstruction of the concept of place as ‘fixed’ and stable. I therefore questioned participants on their rejection of the image of the Polish deli (See Figure 47). The image is one that is very familiar to me from my experiences of living in North Edinburgh. The Polish community in this area is the largest in Scotland and as I walk down towards Leith from the city centre I pass numerous specialist Polish shops, while banks and other services all have signs in Polish in the windows.
Drawing on this anecdotal experience of living, I asked the young people from this group why they had excluded this image and whether or not they would accept the inclusion of Poles in a museum exhibition about Scotland:

Michael: I guess they might have influenced the culture of Scotland

Kieran: The Polish people would be Polish living in Scotland, just because they’re living there doesn’t make them Scottish, like they weren’t born there, and they’re inhabiting it doesn’t change Scottish culture miraculously. There are Polish people living, like set up in Scotland but it doesn’t change anything

Grant: I think if there’s like a community who’ve lived in Scotland for centuries then by now they’d be pretty much Scottish, but they might have tried to retain their Polishness and say ‘oh I’m Polish’, but it would be pretty obvious that they would have been there for a very long time and so I’d make a distinction between two different groups; the recent Polish are different

Archie: I think it would be important if these Poles were in a particular part, say they were in Leith, or you know like Edinburgh, and if they’d stayed there, then I think if there was a museum specifically about Leith then they’d have a really important part to play. But I think in the wider outlook, the
whole of Scotland, everything is still roughly the same, even though obviously they are important.

Here we see the importance of place once more in young people’s narratives of belonging and exclusion as Archie attempts to negotiate between recognising the diversity within modern societies, while still attempting to sustain the distinctiveness of Scotland from ‘other’ places by emphasising the ‘unique’ nature of Leith. By emphasising the boundaries within places—in this case distinguishing the ‘diverse’ nature of Leith not just from a discussion about Scotland but even excluding this story from a discussion of Edinburgh—participants were able to maintain the ‘core’ while acknowledging the existence of minorities. As the next chapter shows, rather than re-imagine the nation in plural terms, the young people from this group in particular sought to maintain the power dynamic between the margins and the core through the discourse of ‘tolerance’, which allowed them to recognise diversity without altering their pre-existing definitions of Scotland.

7.4 Conclusion

The research found that the majority of young people in this study felt that migrants or ethnic minorities who both showed a respect for and engaged with the existing heritage of the nation were better able to demonstrate their pride and commitment to the country and therefore had stronger claims to belong than those who simply lived in the country and maintained separate cultural identities. There was therefore a willingness amongst many participants to accept ‘exotic embellishments’ such as the ‘tartanisation’ of new cultural practices as enhancing the core, through showing the attractive nature of Scottish identity to incomers. I therefore argue that the acceptance of these hybrid cultural practices did not represent a radical re-imagining of national identity, but rather served to reaffirm the values of the core.

Significantly, for a minority of participants, adopting the cultural practices of the core was not sufficient evidence to support a claim to a Scottish identity. Some based this decision on the perceived inauthenticity and irrelevance of ‘heritage’ to claims to belong as this undermined the civic principles of national identity. A ‘credible’ identity performance for these individuals lay in the adherence to particular social and moral values, rather than the adoption of what were perceived as ‘trivial’ identity markers. The wearing of a kilt or engagement in Scottish traditions was viewed by these young people as a temporary ‘act’ that may mask the ‘true’ self. In order to truly ‘become’
Scottish, they felt individuals should be less conscious in the efforts to step into the role. These participants were therefore uninterested in re-imagining existing definitions of ‘heritage’ to accommodate migrant communities. Instead, they emphasised the importance of celebrating modern Scotland and aspects of daily life that were more relevant to them, preferring to draw a line between the past and the present rather than attempt to challenge the legitimacy of existing narratives. However, for the majority of young people who rejected the legitimacy of identity claims based on engagement with heritage, ethnicity was still the most significant factor in determining national identity, particularly amongst those at the Edinburgh Private School and Scottish Borders. Consequently these young people drew upon concepts of heritage as a means of further sustaining divisions between ‘us’ and ‘them’. Furthermore, there was a tendency even amongst those participants who accepted the ‘tartan turban’ approach of ‘adapting and blending’ to reject cultural practices that were perceived to be challenging the mainstream and thus threatening the core. This was particularly the case in discussions of religious difference, of which Islam was perceived to be the most dangerous.

In both the positions outlined above there was a feeling that museums were not necessarily the appropriate environment within which to address issues of migration, ethnic diversity and national identity. A small minority of participants challenged the legitimacy of representations of migrants and ethnic minorities within the story of the nation and questioned the motivations of museums that aimed to tell these stories in the theoretical discussions. While I am cautious about drawing firm conclusions regarding whether these participants would have the same response upon visiting a museum exhibition on these issues, in comparison to simply discussing these ideas in an abstract manner, the findings are not as positive as we might hope and point to considerable challenges regarding the degree to which museums are able to use their perceived ‘authority’ to challenge prejudice. The implications of this finding for museum practice are considered further in the final chapter of this thesis.

Throughout the discussions we saw an increasing level of insecurity and self-doubt in many young people’s responses. Discussions of ‘heritage’ or ‘culture’ appeared to present a challenge to the self-image of many of these participants, by apparently forcing them to discuss issues of identity and belonging in terms that they either avoided or had not previously considered. Consequently, although the majority of participants were really positive about the principles of both multiculturalism and an ‘inclusive’ national identity, there was a lack of understanding amongst many young
people about what this actually meant in practice, with many failing to see the contradictions in their responses, or becoming distressed when they realised they had contradicted themselves. The next chapter examines the way in which these participants attempted to address the tensions within their narratives through strategies that aimed to preserve their positive self-image.
Chapter 8. Narrating an ‘Inclusive’ Identity: Beyond the Language of ‘Diversity’

*Many museum experiences offer opportunities to learn about alternative ways of living, and of making sense of the world, without the risks that might be involved in actual immersion in those alternatives. The visitor can maintain the present boundaries that define his or her personal identity, while becoming familiar with the fact that other people see things very differently...In the modern world, of course, we can hardly avoid bumping up against contrasting ways of life in our everyday activities. But such encounters must be carefully managed, to avoid threats to our existing identity. Otherness is tolerated rather than embraced, and even tolerated only within certain limits. True immersion in the actual environment of another culture entails the risk of “going native” (Rounds 2006: 146).*

This thesis seeks to gain a greater understanding of how visitors may react to museum displays that seek to disrupt the concept of a ‘fixed’ and homogenous nation and encourage individuals to conceptualise national identity in plural terms. Throughout this research I argue that by studying how individuals approach questions of national identity, heritage and belonging outside the museum it is possible to gain greater insights into how they may react to the examination of these issues within a museum environment. This chapter analyses how individuals’ existing sense of self influences their approach to issues of national identity and belonging. The research found that while those young people who identified as ‘inclusive’ and ‘open-minded’ had a tendency to respond positively to plural representations of the nation, those who were strongly invested in the concept of a homogenous ‘core’ adopted strategies to negotiate perceived challenges to the mainstream, rather than alter their existing ideas and thus challenge their sense of self. In order to understand this finding, this chapter draws upon Rounds’ (2006) concept of ‘identity work’, which utilises Giddens’ (1991) work on narrative as a form of identity maintenance that produces ‘ontological security’ in the museum environment. Rounds argues that museums visitors strive to maintain a coherent sense of self in the face of challenges to their identity, rather than radically alter their existing viewpoints when faced with new information.
This chapter firstly identifies the importance of being perceived as a ‘nice person’ to the majority of young people in this study and examines the way in which demonstrating ‘inclusive’ attitudes within the discussions of national identity and belonging supported this self-image. Utilising Giddens, it then analyses the way in which young people negotiated threats to this positive self-image through discursive strategies such as distancing themselves from racism and positioning themselves as more ‘inclusive’ in attitude than others. The importance of social relations in shaping these responses is then highlighted, through analysing the impact of the educational environment on young people’s attitudes to these issues. The final section identifies the tension within a small minority of participants’ narratives between stressing the importance of respecting cultural difference while simultaneously rejecting the legitimacy of plural definitions of nationhood. Specifically, it focuses on the tendency amongst these young people to utilise the discourse of ‘political correctness’ in order to reject perspectives or ideas that challenged their definitions of heritage and national identity. Brown’s (2009) criticisms of the discourse of ‘tolerance’ are utilised in order to analyse the way in which these individuals adopted ‘strategies of resistance’ to reject institutional attempts to elicit ‘appropriate’ responses.

8.1 Performing an ‘Inclusive Identity’
We have already seen the importance of taking an ‘inclusive stance’ to issues of identity and belonging throughout the discussions in earlier chapters, particularly in discussions of ‘civic’ identity. In contrast to Mason and Baveystock’s study, which found that respondents in their study had a tendency to overlook images whose symbolic power sat in their representation of multiculturalism (2009:24), many of the young people in this study chose the images of ethnic diversity in the image selection exercise as a way of ‘performing’ their inclusive identity, by articulating their belief that diversity brought benefits to Scottish society.

It is important to remember here that Goffman (1959) emphasises that through performing a role we demonstrate to both our audience and, significantly, ourselves the person that we wish to be. To state that such actions were a performance and therefore ‘masked’ individuals ‘true’ nature is thus misleading. Instead, these young people were engaged in an ongoing process of becoming the kind of person that they wanted to be. Whether or not this commitment was a result of individual motivation or societal expectations is of course contentious and points to wider debates in the field of
sociology. Both Goffman and Giddens would suggest that the actions of the individual cannot be separated from their social context, a view with which this study concurs. However, Giddens is more cynical in his suggestion that individuals may actively resist social structures, placing a greater emphasis on individual agency. The way in which these tensions between behavioural expectations and individual desires are managed is returned to later in this chapter.

8.1.1 Celebrating ‘multiculturalism’
The most passionate identification with ‘multiculturalism’ was seen in the responses of Dean, from the Glasgow group, as we see here:

Scotland’s a multicultural, an amazing multicultural place. Like you see everybody over here, I bet there’s one person from every country in the world in Scotland. At least one Ethiopian, one Ukranian. We’re all different in our own ways which is better, because if we were all the same it would be boring wouldn’t it? So we’re all different and I’m proud to be Scottish because of that.

(Dean, 13 years old, Glasgow)

However, as we saw in the previous chapter, while Dean was very keen to demonstrate his positive attitude towards issues of multiculturalism and employed the language of ‘diversity’ throughout the discussions, he frequently struggled to put this into practice. This tension between Dean’s own values and the wish to be perceived and how he actually behaved was a common theme in the narratives of the young people in this research.

The importance placed on ‘inclusive’ attitudes was especially strong amongst the participants from the Edinburgh State School. This school was a somewhat unique environment in comparison to the others visited during the fieldwork. A large number of students at the Edinburgh State School actively identified with liberal values encompassing a broad range of issues, particularly with regards to Human Rights. When I entered the school I was immediately struck by the visible ethnic and religious diversity of the school community. A screen over the main corridor reminded students to purchase tickets for the upcoming ‘Divercity’ show, taking place over three consecutive nights and I watched a group of young people rehearse their Highland/Bollywood fusion performance to a loud Bhangra track while I waited. As we
walked through the corridors to the classroom the teacher cheerfully pointed out signs in Gaelic, Mandarin and Urdu, while she proudly talked about her own Latino identity, while her colleague, who described herself as Scots Asian, discussed the positive attitude that she felt the SNP had towards the Scots Asian community and informed me that the students had discussed this with her in class on many occasions. As Modern Studies teachers, both women had an interest in many of the issues that are pertinent to this study and they talked passionately about their experiences of working in the school. Both felt that the school was unusual in Scotland, recalling negative experiences they had had as both teachers and pupils elsewhere. They stressed that the school was unique because of its considerable ethnic and religious diversity, as well the large number of Gaelic speakers and what they referred to as the broad range of socio-economic backgrounds in its catchment area.

Through my discussions with the teachers, observations of their interactions with the pupils and also conversations with friends who were past pupils, it became clear that issues of diversity were frequently talked about in a frank and open manner:

You won’t get a racist comment out of this lot

(Teacher, Edinburgh State School)

Indeed, it is because of this attitude within the teaching approach that I was invited to undertake a second focus group at the school, as the teachers felt it was beneficial for the pupils.

This comfort with discussing issues such as diversity came through strongly in the responses of the majority of the young people I spoke with at the school. For many of these young people, having an ‘inclusive’ or ‘open-minded’ approach to issues of diversity and questions of belonging was an integral part of their self-identity and it appeared very important to these young people that I understood this.

The older participants at this school were the least likely to reject images of ethnic or religious minorities, a finding that was in keeping with the ‘inclusive’ self-image of these participants. They did however appear the most self-conscious when undertaking the image selection exercise. There was very little discussion amongst participants while they made their image choices, making it difficult to gain additional insights into their choices. They also appeared to consider the images more carefully than other groups, taking a long time to make their decisions. The participants from the older
group were keen to stress that images of ethnic minorities resonated with their everyday experience and they probably would have selected them if they had been given more time to complete the task:

Stuart: Like the mosque is a noticeable part of Edinburgh

Steven: I would have ticked it if I recognised it as I walk past it every day.

Kat: What about that image [Sikh men in kilts]? How does that image make you feel?

Steven: I don’t really have a particular reaction to it either way

Fergus: It’s actually quite normal; it shows other cultures coming in and being influenced by us

Kat: Is that something that is quite normal to all of you?

All: Yeah [Nod]

Kat: Would you see something like that quite often?

All: Yeah [Nod]

Sandy: I think being in the city, it’s more diverse

Steven: But then I think Edinburgh possibly more than other cities just like Glasgow, just what I would say, not like a fact or anything. But I think [the school] itself is very unique

Stuart: I think it’s more about the attitudes towards it as well. I think, I don’t know that well, but I think compared to other cities like Glasgow Edinburgh’s much better

Eilidh: Probably because we’re much more used to seeing things like that, because up in the Highlands or whatever, it’s bad I know, but you don’t see anyone else or any other real cultures, which is strange, but I suppose it’s just the population is different

Sandy: I think the culture’s different depending on what place you’re in. Like in bigger cities I think we’re more accepting of different things, whereas in the Highlands, some of them are so, quite, still stuck in the old traditions

Kat: Could you explain a bit more what you mean by that?

Sandy: Like, I don’t know, there’s like not many different minorities there, there’s like, there’s basically about 99% of the people are white there. I don’t know it’s like, it’s like they
wouldn’t mind if other people lived there, I don’t know, for some reason they don’t I think

Through reflecting on how they thought other people in different areas in Scotland would respond to these issues the young people in this group were able to position themselves as more ‘inclusive’ than other people, thus strengthening their positive sense of self. These responses concur with Rosie and Bond’s study of attitudes towards ethnic minorities in Scotland. They report that when respondents were asked to compare their own attitudes to how they thought ‘most people’ would respond most respondents ‘thought themselves to possess more inclusive attitudes than those they believed were held by the wider population’ (2006: 153-6).

8.1.2 Prejudice and changes in attitude
A key issue outlined at the outset of this research was the degree to which museums are capable of bringing about changes in attitudes towards cultural difference, particularly issues of migration and ethnic and religious difference. As Chapter 2 identified, the most significant work in this field is Sandell’s (2007) study Museums, Prejudice and the Reframing of Difference. Sandell interrogates the term ‘prejudice’ and assumptions made in mainstream social psychology, which has tended to view prejudice in individualist and cognitivist terms (2007: 33). Sandell advocates instead for a discursive approach to the study of prejudice. He points to the work of LeCouteur and Augoustinos, who encourage a shift away from the study of ‘attitudes’ towards the concept of ‘interpretative repertoires’ which they define as ‘sets of metaphors, arguments, and terms that are used recurrently in people’s discourse to describe actions and events’ (2001: 218 cited in Sandell 2007:34). Such an approach is in-keeping with the ethos of this study, which seeks to avoid labelling individuals as ‘racist’ or ‘prejudiced’. However, despite sharing Sandell’s concerns, it would be wrong to dismiss the significant insights that can be gained from cognitive approaches. With these caveats in mind, the next section highlights some key issues that must be considered in order to understand.

The educational environment at this school clearly played an important role in shaping this ‘inclusive’ self-image. In his book Prejudice Brown argues that there is convincing evidence from the field of psychology that individuals’ immediate social environments are a powerful influence on their behaviour, particularly with regards to prejudice. He asserts that ‘it is almost a truism in social psychology that our opinions and behaviour
are strongly influenced by such factors as the attitudes of others around or near us, the norms of our group, and the relationship between our group and others’ (2010:28).

The most significant theory from psychology for understanding the responses here is Allport’s (1954) Contact Hypothesis. The theory is based on the premise that the most efficient means of tackling prejudice between groups is to bring them into closer proximity. However, Allport’s research, which has been supported by multiple studies since, indicated that mere contact between groups was not sufficient in reducing prejudice, as proximity between groups, such as different ethnic groups living in cities, may actually increase tensions, rather than resolve them. Rather, ‘contact’ between groups may only be successful in addressing prejudices if it occurs under certain conditions. Brown provides a useful summary of the four conditions that must be met in order for contact to reduce prejudice identified by social psychologists:

1. Social and institutional support
2. Acquaintance potential: The power of cross-group friendships
3. Equal Status

Although Brown cites his own research in British primary schools as a positive example of the role that mixed schooling may have on young people’s attitudes, he notes that it is important to understand that what happens within the school environment is only one part of an individual’s experiences; without support within the home and other peer group environments prejudice may still occur however well designed the school curriculum (2010: 250-3). Acceptance of minority groups as part of the nation was not therefore simply a matter of proximity and awareness.

Despite the ‘inclusive’ self-image of the participants at this school, it is important to highlight that the younger participants from this school were just as likely to omit images of ethnic and religious diversity as other groups. I also witnessed the same level of disagreement and hostility to suggestions that certain images should be included in the younger group as those from other schools. Reflecting on their experience of participating in the research Rhona, Rihanna and William sought to position themselves in opposition to their classmates, by showing their disproval of racism and discrimination:
Kat: How did you feel about some of the other people in the class putting crosses against those things, when you could hear people saying things under their breath?

Rhona: I think it was quite blatant, anything that they thought wasn’t Scottish, it was like ‘a Mosque, not Scottish, Muslim girl’ it’s, I don’t know

Kat: Is that something that you encounter in the school in general or

Rhona: Of course, you encounter it everywhere don’t you

Rihanna: Well, it’s like this school is very diverse, it’s not like other schools because you get like Chinese people and you get people from different religions and different races. So it’s like you kind of like, if people are going to cross stuff out they kind of have to go along with it because they’ve got people in the school that are that religion or that race of whatever, so they can’t really just dodge it out

Kat: How do you think other people in Scotland answered those questions?

William: I think like, Scotland can, is like most places. There are racist people in Scotland and things like that and there are people who are just ignorant and they don’t know about other religions because they haven’t encountered other religions, but they’re

Rhona: It’s a very touchy subject ain’t it?

Kat: It is. I’m finding it really interesting doing the research

Rhona: You have to like say the right things, people can get really defensive over things, even if it doesn’t really make sense they still get really defensive over it

Rihanna: I’ve like witnessed some racism because I um, I do like Arabic lessons, it’s quite recent and to go there you need to like cover yourself. So I was walking over to get into the classroom and then these group of like people walked past and they were like ‘Oh I thought I was in like Scotland not India’ or something

Kat: Where did that happen?

Rihanna: Just like at a school at the west of Edinburgh. But I just walked away I didn’t you know want to say anything because I just, didn’t care because if that’s what they think then I’m not going to change their opinions so
Rhona: Those people are really strange as well, that’s just like the stupidest thing that like, most of them are very inaccurate insults, very inaccurate

Rihanna: It’s like [Teacher] said, soon people can’t be racist to other people because they would have some type of like different blood in their family, because like a lot of people are marrying into different cultures and different races and stuff

William: Yeah, there was this thing I saw where they like tested all these right-wing like properly racist people for like where they come from, and they tested this one guy who was like ‘nobody should be allowed to live in England unless they are of Anglo-Saxon heritage’ and then they like tested him and it’s like ‘yeah you came up as middle eastern’ [laughs]. And it’s like yeah, it’s probably like two great grandparents, one grandparent

Rihanna’s experience of both racism and Islamophobia highlight the importance of addressing these issues in the Scottish context. Hussain and Miller (2006) in their work on Islamophobia and Anglophobia are highly sceptical both of political assertions and academic studies that suggest that Scots hold inclusive definitions of national identity. They argue that while Scots, particularly those who are highly educated, have a tendency to profess a lack of prejudice towards minorities, this finding does not tally with the experiences of discrimination reported by Muslims and English migrants. Assessing this apparent discrepancy, they suggest that well-educated people are either better at hiding ‘politically incorrect’ responses or instead employ self-denial in their responses because such views are ill at ease with ‘their own liberal, multiculturalist self-image’ (2006: 90). Similarly McCrone and Bechhofer identify a problem with drawing direct conclusions from research into national identity and social exclusion, as they observe that there is a ‘tendency for people to be willing to allow folk to say what they like even if they do not accept it if asked directly’ (2008:1263). They advise caution regarding such findings, reminding us that their research focuses on ‘expressed attitudes, rather than people’s actual behaviour’ (ibid). It is important to state that I am not arguing that the young people’s identity narratives presented here are ‘false’. However, there did appear to be tensions between the views that many young people expressed during the research and their desire to hold ‘inclusive’ definitions of national identity and belonging. Rather than attempt to uncover how ‘authentic’ or ‘truthful’ such representations are, it is perhaps more useful to study how this tension between how young people wished to be perceived and how they felt they portrayed themselves
during the course of the research influenced their responses and what impact this had on their ‘capacity for change’.

This next section considers how these individuals attempted to both stabilise their identity and gain control over how they were perceived through the use of narrative strategies of avoidance and rationality.

8.2 ‘Being a Nice Person’: Maintaining a Coherent Sense of Self
The desire to be perceived as a ‘friendly’ or ‘nice’ person emerged as a very important issue for the majority of the young people in this study. As we saw in Chapter 4, just under half described themselves as ‘friendly’, ‘kind’ or ‘caring’ or other similar terms in the first written exercise. The value attributed to being ‘friendly’ in many of the written responses is unsurprising given the wording of the question, which focused specifically on young people would describe themselves to someone they had never met. While this could be considered a weakness in the methodology, these responses indicate the importance of being perceived in a positive manner to the majority of young people in this study.

As social actors, we often strive to foster impressions of ourselves that will encourage our ‘audience’ to respond in a favourable light. If we want our audience to believe that we are ‘nice’ people we generally try to avoid expressing opinions that may encourage others to challenge this self-image. Goffman’s theory of the performative nature of the self is useful for explaining this phenomenon. He argues that identity should be understood as a ‘pattern of appropriate conduct’ (1959:65). If we are conscious of our audience and their sensibilities, we may therefore be inclined to modify our ‘performance’ in order to keep the audience on our side.

Throughout the research it became apparent that many young people felt that their self-image as a ‘nice’ person was being challenged by discussing issues of national identity and cultural difference. A number of participants expressed the view that the activities undertaken in the research forced them to discuss ideas that they would not usually share for fear of offending someone. This was evidenced by their apparent caution or discomfort when discussing issues of ethnicity rather than the ‘safer’ topics of ‘civic’ identity that we saw in Chapter 5. As we have already seen in the previous chapters, there were considerable tensions within young people’s responses and the shifts in their narratives are evidence of their struggle to ‘make sense’ of the complicated nature of
national identity. The responses here also show the high level of self-awareness amongst participants of the sensitive nature of these discussions and many of the young people I spoke to were very concerned about how their actions and words were perceived, an issue that left many of them visibly uncomfortable.

An important issue that arose early in the research process was a concern amongst the participants that their views would be perceived as racist. Significantly, at the end of the research with the young people from Barra one of the teachers commented that she felt that many of the views expressed by the young people in this group were racist:

They don’t want to be perceived as racist but they are.

(Teacher, Barra)

It is important to state that I do not share the teacher’s assessment of the participants in this group as ‘racist’; such a categorisation is reductionist and ultimately unhelpful. However, her observation that young people feared being perceived as racist was convincing and thus had a significant impact on my own analysis.

It is vital to understand that the majority of the young people I talked with during the course of the project were very sensitive to issues of racism and were very keen to emphasise their disapproval of people who used racist language or displayed what they perceived as openly prejudiced behaviour. However, some demonstrated an awareness that their statements could be construed as prejudiced and acknowledged this in their speech, adding clarifications such as:

I don’t mean that in a racist way
(Magnus, 14 years old, Edinburgh State School)

I don’t know how to say this without sounding racist
(Paul, 14 years old, Scottish Borders)

I don’t like crossing things because it makes me feel racist
(Fiona, 13 years old Scottish Borders)

An example of this concern can be seen in Ryan and George’s reflections on their responses to the image selection task:
Kat: So you were saying before you were worried about sounding racist, do you find talking about this sort of thing quite difficult?

Ryan: I think it is quite difficult, because you don’t want to come across as someone who is being quite arrogant, so yeah, it’s quite difficult.

George: You don’t want to be racist but you want to say what it is. You don’t want to be offensive or anything, you don’t want people to be offended, just like that.

Kat: Is that something that comes up as an issue at school?

Ryan: I’d say if you want to make a point about say another person, not another person, but like another person’s culture like a point like that, you don’t want to come off as racist or offend them, because you want to be seen as quite a nice guy and that.

Ryan felt that his responses during the research challenged his self-image as a ‘nice guy’. Understandably, both Ryan and George were concerned about how they were perceived, not just because they might upset someone else, but because the idea that they might hold ‘racist’ views challenged their sense of identity. For these young people, the idea that they might be perceived as racist was very distressing and led to feelings of insecurity, as they were unable to reconcile their behaviour with their self-image. The problems caused by this inability to resolve this internal conflict may be usefully explained through returning to the idea of ‘coherence’ discussed in Chapter 6.

It is worth returning to Giddens here once more. He argues that feeling that one is not being ‘true to oneself’ brings about feelings of anxiety and insecurity. Consequently, if we identify our behaviour as ‘false’ we may adopt strategies that allow us to explain and justify this ‘false’ behaviour to ourselves and thus maintain a coherent sense of self. Giddens argues that the primary means of achieving this is through narratives, which allow us to address moments of cognitive dissonance and thus feel that our actions and words are still ‘authentic’.

Rounds provides a useful explanation of the way in which we use narratives of identity in order to ‘make sense’ of the tension between our actions and our morals and thus provide a coherent sense of self within the museum context. Drawing upon both Giddens and Goffman, he emphasises the vital role that narratives play in imposing ‘an order on our sense of identity that is not readily apparent in so much of our actual
behaviour’ (2006: 137). He explains the impact that this has on what he terms ‘identity work’ here:

Because identity is concerned with the proper way to live, identity work necessarily strives toward consistency…Thus, we construct a kind of master narrative of identity to tie the threads of our lives together, and we signal that identity to other people in a variety of ways… However, consistency is more apparent in our narratives of identity than it is in our actual behaviour. The world is just too complex, and conflicting demands (from both within and without) are too common, to always be the same person. Everyday life requires a great deal of improvisation (2006: 137).

Significantly, Rounds is interested in the way in which this desire for consistency in an individual’s construction of their own identity may bring about significant challenges for museums that seek to alter individuals’ attitudes and tackle prejudice. Drawing upon Doering and Pekarik’s (1996) research, he reflects upon their finding that visitors strive to have their ‘entrance narratives confirmed, thus undermining any notion that museums may radically alter visitors’ perception of the world or sense of identity within a single visit. Instead, he suggests that museums may have a more subtle impact, by ‘building capacity for transformations that may or may not happen at some time in the future’ (2006:144). This assertion certainly concurs with theories of identity as a process, rather than a fixed state that can be forever changed as Chapter 2 outlined. However, this ‘capacity for change’ is mediated by the degree to which individuals are prepared to engage with alternative viewpoints in the first place, as Rounds acknowledges.

As we saw in the previous chapter, rather than critically reflect on their own preconceptions and prejudices, a number of young people choose to challenge the legitimacy of institutions that were perceived to challenge the authority of the core, rather than accept heterogeneous definitions of nationhood as valid. Questions remain therefore regarding the degree to which individuals may resist engaging with ideas or viewpoints that pose a challenge to their identity. The remaining discussion in this chapter attempts to understand how museums could contribute to developing this ‘capacity for change’ by examining the way in which individuals managed threats to their identity by avoiding difficult issues or challenging alternative viewpoints.
8.3 Impression Management

In her study of attitudes towards English and British national identity Condor (2000) identifies a trend of distancing the self from nationalism and racism within individual’s speech, a finding that echoes Fenton’s research on national identity discussed above. At the heart of Condor’s study is an interest in what she terms ‘impression management in location interaction’. She describes this as a concern with ‘the ways in which people may, in the course of describing or accounting for the social world, attempt to avoid being imputed with the stigma of prejudice’ (2000:175). She explains that individuals’ ‘accounts of their own attitudes may be contaminated by social desirability response biases, reflecting the commonly held view that it is “not nice” to display or admit to, categorical thought in general or negative beliefs about other ethnic groups’ (2000:176). Although many researchers have attempted to create research methods that circumnavigate such behaviour in an attempt to reveal participants ‘true beliefs’, she argues that the discursive strategies used to avoid being accused of racism or prejudice have long been established as a valid topic of study in their own right. Condor’s approach draws heavily on the work of Van Dijk (1987), whose work on prejudice in discourse has focused on identifying features such as disclaimers, avoidance strategies, and denial of racism, and the role that such assertions play in presenting a positive image of an individual or their wider group. Building on Van Dijk’s work, Condor highlights a number of key features within the narratives of the participants in her study that are utilised in order to ‘manage’ their identities and present themselves in a positive light. These include demonstrating rationality, avoiding or challenging questions that have discriminatory implications and the use of irony and humour to present views without acknowledging them as their own. She suggests that individuals employ these strategies when attempting to orientate themselves towards the nation as a means of avoiding accusations of prejudice. The narrative strategies identified by Condor are useful for understanding the way in which the young people negotiated and managed ideas that represent challenges to both their self-image and their existing definitions of ‘Scottishness’.

8.3.1 Avoidance and denial

An interesting picture emerged from the young people’s image choices regarding which images participants felt confident about selecting or rejecting without fear of criticism from their peers. Both the lack of interest in particular images and the ‘taboo’ nature of certain topics was an extremely relevant finding. Participants appeared to feel more
comfortable discussing the images labelled as British or English than those relating to ethnic or religious minorities and were more likely to announce their decisions to exclude these images to the others in the group and encourage or even demand that they do the same. Similarly, when asked to reflect upon these choices in the group discussions and interviews the majority of young people attempted to steer the topic of conversation back to these ‘safe’ topics rather than discuss what were clearly difficult and complicated issues for them.

Most coped with this discomfort by simply trying to ignore the images they found problematic or challenging. When asked why they had not expressed an opinion on these images, be it positive, negative or indifference, participants would frequently avoid the issue by saying they simply had not noticed it.:

Kat: How did you feel, you know there were pictures of the Sikh men in the kilts, how did you guys feel about that?
Ewan: Umm
Donald: I didn’t really mind
Ruairaidh: I didn’t know they were Sikh, I just thought they had orange hair
Donald: Yeah same
Kat: Their turbans?
Ruairaidh: Yeah because I didn’t see the picture up close so
Donald: I just thought they were ginger
Ruairaidh: Yeah
Kat: What about, there was a guy playing the bagpipes and he was wearing his kilt, what do you guys think about that?
Donald: Don’t mind.

It is important to understand that both Donald and Ruairaidh’s claims that they did not notice the ethnicity of the individuals in the images. However, their reluctance to discuss this issue when asked to consider it points to an attempt to avoid putting themselves in a situation where they may experience dissonance (Giddens 1991:191). Although Ruairaidh’s response here could be interpreted as ‘colour blindness’, I am inclined to interpret this response as a deflection, used to avoid discussing the awkward issue of ‘race’ and thus accusations of racism. In doing so, he was able to maintain his
positive self-image by reaffirming his ‘inclusive’ stance that we saw in his discussion of my potential claim to a Scottish identity in Chapter 5. Again, this approach allowed him to by-pass topics that could not easily be resolved.

8.3.2 Rationality

While some participants attempted to avoid addressing difficult issues, others took a more direct approach by reflecting on their actions and demonstrating an awareness of how they might be perceived. In doing so, they were able to offer rational explanations for why they made their decisions and in some cases reflected on how the process had encouraged them to think critically about their reactions and how they might respond differently in the future:

Grant: Initially when I saw someone that was strange or a little bit weird, normally I’d look at something that was a little bit quirky I’d think of that’s really cool, that’s really good, but within the space of a few photos I found my attitude changed and it became very very easy to get into a mind-set of ‘that’s not Scottish, they’re not Scottish’, like that, so I thought that was quite interesting how I changed

Archie: Like when you saw some of the minority things, like the things that aren’t really Scottish then you find yourself just ticking certain things and it sort of becomes quite generalised into like different sections

Kat: So do you feel like you might respond in a different way in real life?

Archie: Yeah because you’ve got to respect people’s traditions and that and like even if they’re like a minority they’ve still got like the right to have everything they want, like if they want to have a Pakistani grocers then that’s fine, they’re over here, they can’t be denied that

Sam: Also like if you were basing this on real life, like this is very visual, you see this guy like I wouldn’t think he was Scottish because he looks Chinese, but then if I was actually with him and I was meeting him and I knew something about him, then I’d be more likely to think he was as Scottish as any of the others.

Further examples of this rationalisation of the decisions during the group activity can be seen in the comments made by Fiona and Sophie from the Borders group. Fiona made several remarks to Sophie during the image selection about her discomfort about the
task. When asked in the follow up interview why she had put crosses against certain images she reflected upon the difficulty and discomfort she had experienced during the ‘crossing’ exercise:

Fiona: I feel really bad because I crossed the lady with the headscarf. I don’t mean it like I’m being prejudiced or anything, I just mean like when you see it you wouldn’t immediately think of Scotland

Sophie: I feel a bit racist after the things I put but it’s not ‘cause like

Fiona: We’ve not got anything against them

Sophie: Yeah it’s just because when you think of Scotland you don’t immediately think of a curry house or like a black person like in a kilt. You kind of think of like a ginger person and wearing tartan and stuff. So it’s not like I’m being racist it’s just

Fiona: I remember I didn’t put a tick against the black guy wearing the kilt and I didn’t even notice that he was black, I just saw the bagpipes and thought he was Scottish. I’m really not.

Later in the interview, they explained that they had not fully understood the task and would have felt more comfortable putting question marks next to these images, as they felt that this represented their views more accurately. Fiona’s comments that she did not notice the individual in the image was black illustrate the issue raised by Norton et al. (2006) in their discussion of what they term the ‘political correctness game’. They observe that the tension between presenting oneself as ‘colour-blind’ while at the same time observing differences based on ‘colour’ undermines strategies adopted to avoid accusations of provision (2006:949). While individuals may wish to present themselves as unbiased, in their efforts to do so they may therefore undermine their self-image. The next section looks at the way in which the desire to adhere to or indeed reject ‘politically correct’ responses shaped young people’s narratives of identity in this study.

8.4 Tolerance and ‘political correctness’
While the majority of respondents attempted to reconcile the tension between their professed attitudes and their behaviour by reasserting their ‘inclusive’ identity, a vocal minority expressed the view that they resented feeling that they needed to modify their behaviour in order to act in a manner that was socially acceptable. In contrast to the
participants discussed above, these young people acknowledged the disjuncture between
their actions and words, but had no interest in revising their beliefs in order to ‘fit in’ or
attempting to resolve these tensions. Instead, these participants adopted the strategy of
‘tolerance’. This approach can clearly be seen in the comments here from Paul
regarding ‘majority Scots’ perceived liberal attitudes to ‘foreign’ cultures:

The Italian Chapel that’s got nothing to with Scottish people. It’s
just got to do with people coming over, and they need, to them
they need this because that’s their religion or something. And it’s
got nothing to do with us, we just sort of let them have it, do you
know what I mean? We don’t need it. And if you were showing
that to like tourists, that’s got nothing to do with us, we just have
that for them.

(Paul, 14 years old, Scottish Borders)

While Paul is able to clearly demonstrate his knowledge of why the Italian community
might with to have their own places of worship (see Figure 48), this understanding does
not lead to acceptance. Instead, it serves to emphasise the distinction between the
accommodating ‘us’ and the tolerated ‘them’.

Figure 48 The Italian Chapel, Orkney. Copyright Richard Welsby. Accessed through SCRAM
(2011)
Brown explains the issue with this approach as follows:

[T]olerance does not offer resolution or transcendence, but only a strategy for coping. There is no Aufhebung in the operation of tolerance, no purity and no redemption. As compensation, tolerance anoints the bearer with virtue, with standing for a principled act of permitting one’s principles to be affronted; it provides a gracious way of allowing one’s tastes to be violated. It offers a robe of modest superiority in exchange for yielding. (Brown 2009:25).

Brown argues that we should surrender: ‘an understanding of tolerance as a transcendent or universal concept, principle, doctrine, or virtue so that it can be considered instead as a political discourse’ (2009:4). She asserts that the discourse of tolerance should be viewed as a form of ‘governmentality’ and significantly draws on the example of the Museum of Tolerance in LA as an example of the way in which this discourse:

produces and positions subjects, orchestrates meanings and practices of identity, marks bodies, and conditions political subjectivities. This production, positioning, orchestration, and conditioning is achieved not through a rule or a concentration of power, but rather through the dissemination of tolerance discourse across state institutions; civic venues such as schools, churches, and neighbourhood associations; ad hoc social groups and political events; and international institutions or forums (2009: 4).

Tolerance, therefore, does not offer understanding of alternative viewpoints, or require a re-examination of one’s own position. Instead, it provides an opportunity to maintain a coherent worldview while also painting oneself as taking a moral standpoint, by permitting difference, while at the same time challenging its legitimacy.

Paul’s shift in position from recognition that Italian Catholics ‘need’ a place of worship to his clarification that ‘to them they need it’ hints at this construction of the ‘other’ as the problem. His comments suggest that in his view there is nothing to stop this group from ‘joining the core’; therefore he perceives the ‘problem’ to lie with the desire to maintain a separate identity. Paul’s comments can also be viewed as reflection of the problems identified with the ‘core+’ model in public policy in the UK by critics such as journalist and social commentator Gary Younge. In his address to the conference From the Margins to the Core?, held at the V & A, he argued that:
all too often those at the core do not see the need to meet people halfway and thereby fail to recognise that everyone else is doing all the travelling. For them, being at the core is an objective position in itself…. those at the core are likely to remaincrippingly unaware of their bias and… the inability to recognise and interrogate one’s own perspective paves the way for their experiences to be evoked, not as an identity, but as a grievance…[They] evoke the threat of marginalisation as a pretext to build a fortress around the core. This sense of siege usually demands a bespoke reality. Every victim needs an aggressor, every aggressor has a tool of oppression. And in the event that these do not exist they must be invented. In this case the aggressor is usually the ‘liberal establishment’ and their instrument of social control is ‘political correctness’ (Younge, 2012:110-111).

Rather than examine their own preconceptions, Younge therefore argues that those who consider themselves to be the majority are more likely to reject perceived ‘challenges’ to the core, than accept plural representations of the nation. His observation that the discourse of ‘political correctness’ is often evoked as a means of challenging the legitimacy of those who seek to ‘write the margins into the centre’ is pertinent, as references to ‘pc’ interpretations of heritage were frequently seen in the narratives of young people at the Edinburgh Private School.

The young people in this group were extremely articulate and were capable of giving nuanced responses about the benefits of a diverse society at an abstract level. They had a tendency however, to distance themselves from the statements that they made by asserting these ideas without necessarily engaging with them. An example of this can be seen here in Sam and Michael’s response to the One Nation, Five Million Voices film shown at the start of the research:

Sam: They’re saying Scotland’s varied

Michael: They’re saying that they’re part of our identity, as a country. It’s a mixture of cultures.

Sam: They’re proud to have those people in their country.

While I am cautious about the benefits that can be gained from undertaking a purely textual analysis of individual’s speech, I have highlighted the language used here as this pattern of reflecting back the ‘intended message’ of the museum without personally engaging with it provides useful insights into Rounds’ theory of ‘identity work’ outlined at the beginning of this chapter. Here we see an excellent example of the way in which
indivials may learn about different perspectives and ways of viewing the world, without necessarily altering their own.

Brown argues that ‘we may keep our prejudices, but a commitment to tolerance will prevent us from voicing them publicly or otherwise enacting them in dangerous or damaging ways (2009:116). By avoiding actively engaging with issues that result in the experience of dissonance, individuals are thus able to negotiate threats to their positive sense of self. This was apparent in the behaviour of the young people in the Edinburgh Private School group, who were very cautious in their choice of language throughout the group discussions, their words did not tally with the behaviour that I witnessed during the image selection exercise. During repeated viewing of the research film I witnessed many instances of participants appearing to point out images of ethnic minorities and laugh or pull faces. I also saw numerous occasions where participants teased their friends for ‘crossing all the foreign ones’. In some cases this appeared to be a genuine criticism and a means of positioning themselves as more ‘inclusive’ in attitude than their peers. However, in some instances this appeared to be a means of diffusing tension rather than challenging ‘incorrect’ attitudes, an observation that points to the awareness amongst this group of the controversial nature of some of their responses. These observations were supported by the comments made by some members of this group at the end of the discussion. Up until this point this group had been somewhat cautious in response to my direct questions (although not when discussing issues amongst themselves). However, at the end of the research, when asked if there was anything that we had not discussed that they wished to add, the following topic was raised by Fraser, who referenced the image of the Asian food store (See Figure 49) in his explanation of the difficulties he felt he faced during the research:

Fraser: Well you see things like Sikhs in corner shops. I don’t mean that in a racist way but there are lots of them. You probably wouldn’t think of them as Scottish when you see them corresponding to each other and they’re speaking Urdu or whatever. So yeah, if you saw them you wouldn’t really think

Kat: Why are you all laughing? What is it about what he has said that is making you laugh?

Sam: It’s controversial

Ben: It’s not politically correct
Kat: Ok. Thank you for being honest. Why do you feel uncomfortable saying these things?

Kieran: Because it’s not socially acceptable

Grant: Because there’s this obsession with political correctness. You can’t say anything now

Ben: Maybe it outlines the example of how many different cultures there are in Scotland. If there weren’t any Sikhs or that then you probably wouldn’t have any reason to talk about them. But if there weren’t then I don’t think you’d be shy about saying what you really think. But now that there are and if you were to speak, if you use Sikhs as an example, you wouldn’t speak about them if you knew you were in an area of Scotland that had a high Sikh population

Rather than modify their attitudes, the young people in this group instead viewed the problem as the discourse of ‘political correctness’. This evocation of political correctness as a strategy of resistance however is unsurprising however when we consider the question of ‘what is at stake?’ raised in Chapter 6. As we have already seen, the majority of young people in this study were heavily invested in the concept of
a distinctive core, because of the pride this gave them and the positive impact this had on their identity and self-esteem. I therefore argue that it is not enough to simply declare that those at the ‘core’ are unwilling to accept challenges from the margins. This study does not simply wish to rehearse the same arguments that have dominated discussions of national identity and cultural diversity in the UK museum sector for the past ten years. Instead, I argue that if museums are to achieve their goals of ‘re-imagining the relationship between the margins and the core it is first necessary to try and understand why individuals may resist such attempts. This should not be interpreted as an ‘apologist’ position. Rather, it is an attempt to bridge the increasingly polarised views of ‘pro-immigration liberals’ and ‘anti-immigration Right-wingers’, as the two camps are frequently labelled in debates in the British press. I argue that further dialogue is needed between these positions if we are to avoid public debates on these issues becoming further entrenched in binary terms.

8.4.1 The ‘retreat to place’
While Chapter 4 argued that place identities are not inherently exclusive, it also highlighted the concerns of theorists such as Massey, regarding the way in which constructions of ‘place’ and ‘heritage’ may intersect in narratives of exclusion. While ‘place’ may provide a source of stability, this desire for stability can lead to attempts to ‘fix’ place identities and defend them against perceived threats from outsiders. The example of Jamie below provides us with a useful insight into why individuals might feel threatened by challenges to the core and draw upon their experience of particular ‘places’ as a means of rejecting plural definitions of the nation.

Jamie 16 years old, Edinburgh Private School

Jamie lived in Edinburgh during school term time and spent his holidays at his ancestral home on the Isle of Bute, a small island off the west coast of Scotland, relatively close to Glasgow. He was born on the island and his family had lived there for several generations, although some of his ancestors had emigrated to Canada and Australia.

Jamie was the most difficult participant to work with during this study as he was both visibly uncomfortable with some of the topics and also angry at the nature of some of the questions. He was disruptive during the research, making jokes and sarcastic comments under his breath and sat slouched down in his chair, arms folded, throughout the group discussions. As a researcher, I found this very difficult, as I initially struggled
to empathise with Jamie’s views. He was very vocal in his rejection of images of ethnic and religious diversity, referring to them as:

all the foreign ones. No one has ticked them because they’re not Scottish, simple as that. They’ve got nothing to do with Scotland.

Unlike many of the others in his group who initially made similar comments, he did not change his stance throughout the discussion or attempt to understand why someone else might accept those images as Scottish. He was unapologetic in his views and appeared increasingly exasperated by the discussions of his peers. It was not until I interviewed Jamie that I was able to gain an insight into why he was so frustrated.

Although Jamie described himself as ‘proudly Scottish’, he felt that his love of sports was more important to his sense of identity on a day-to-day basis and he strongly resented having to make what he felt was an obvious statement about his nationality:

Kat: What makes you feel Scottish?

Jamie: My hair looks quite Scottish, I act in a Scottish way. Other people here seem more English, although I’m not saying I’m anti-English. I know it’s an un-pc thing to say but I feel like everyone from here shouldn’t have to say ‘I’m from this country’.

He explained that he did not feel particularly Scottish until he began attending the school in Edinburgh. Although he enjoyed school life, he found it very hard to adjust at first and at times still felt like an outsider. He found the school environment difficult as he felt that no one acted in a very Scottish way, and that he was forced to be ‘politically correct’ in order to fit in:

Everyone here tends to be quite pc. I find it difficult because it’s such a multi-racial school…it’s different, it’s weird. If you go up North it’s really different. Glasgow is like a bubble. Everyone here seems to be British not Scottish. People here don’t even know Scottish words; they just speak pure English words. Like I’ll say “it’s a dreich day today” and people are like “sorry?” I’m in Edinburgh in a Scottish school but I’m outnumbered. There are more people from everywhere else than there is in Scotland. You can’t even speak your own Scottish dialect.

The differences between Jamie’s experience and those at the Edinburgh State School are important to consider here, particularly in light of Brown’s (2010) emphasis on the
quality of inter-group experiences, and the important role that a positive institutional environment plays in forming meaningful relationships. While the young people at the Edinburgh State School were familiar with the concept of ‘New Scots’ from their lived experiences within their school and neighbourhood, it is possible that Jamie struggled to comprehend that someone from an ethnic minority background could be Scottish simply because everyone he knew came from overseas. This finding was supported by the teacher’s assertion that he was unaware of any Scottish pupils at the school from ethnic minority backgrounds. His fellow pupils were boarders like himself, living in Edinburgh for short periods of time before returning to their home countries. Jamie’s responses should therefore be viewed in light of this context. His frustration at feeling like an outsider in his ‘own country’ is therefore understandable.

Jamie’s comments here bring us back to the issues raised at the beginning of the discussion chapters regarding the importance of the lived experience of place to young people’s definitions of national identity and questions of belonging. Jamie appeared to feel justified making such statements because the ‘multicultural’ definition of Scotland discussed during the research had little resonance with his own experience of what it means to be Scottish, which he equated with particular places such as Bute and the ‘North’:

I can deal with people having different views [of Scotland] at school, but when I’m at home everyone’s from there and everyone’s the same and thinks the same about most things. And I think that’s quite important to have that because if you don’t you feel a bit isolated I suppose. And I know you’re not supposed to think what you think, but when I look at the picture of like the Mosque or the Chinese people, I just can’t like, I know I’m supposed to be like multicultural and I just couldn’t be bothered to be honest.

Jamie’s views echo those of a number of participants in this study and highlight a key challenge for museums that attempt to address issues of diversity through the paradigm of ‘place’. Jamie’s rejection of plural definitions of national identity on the basis that they do not resonate with his own experience of ‘place’ highlights the issue raised in Chapter 4 regarding the degree to which individuals may accept the discussion of ‘diverse’ places as legitimate to wider conceptualisations of the nation.

Jamie’s belief that other people in Scotland with the same shared cultural background and experiences would support his views allowed him to reject the alternative
viewpoints he experiences at the school. Such a stance once again shows the importance of consensus—or rather the belief that one’s views are supported by others—as a means of sustaining existing definitions of nationhood, as we saw in the discussions in Chapter 6. Rather than adapt his views, he instead appears to focus his energy on ‘fitting in’ by altering his behaviour in order to be socially acceptable.

It is useful here to return to Giddens’ discussion of the ‘authentic’ self in order to understand this process. In explaining the anxiety that may result in behaving in a manner that is not reflective of one’s ‘true feelings’, Giddens quotes Fromm:

‘The individual ceases to be himself; he adopts entirely the kind of personality offered to him by cultural patterns; and he therefore becomes exactly as all the others are and as they expect him to be…this mechanism can be compared with the protective colouring some animals assume. They look so similar to their surroundings that they are hardly distinguishable from them’ (Fromm 1960: 160 cited in Giddens 1991: 191)

Giddens argues that while individuals may outwardly appear to conform, this does not necessarily mean that they experience the performance of this identity as ‘authentic’. Rather, they experience a constant feeling of insecurity, as they feel they are unable to reveal their ‘true selves’. According to Giddens, this results in feelings of existential anxiety that the individual must attempt to resolve through strategies such as challenging the legitimacy of alternative perspectives.

Jamie’s resistance to perceived attempts by the school to modify his attitude brings us back to the issue raised at the beginning of this chapter regarding the degree to which institutions such as museums can encourage individuals to adopt different viewpoints, rather than simply modify their outward behaviour in order to maintain a veneer of social acceptability.

8.5 Conclusion
This chapter has highlighted the importance of adopting ‘inclusive’ attitudes to the majority of young people in this study. Through demonstrating their empathy towards the experiences of others and in particular the desires of migrant communities to ‘belong’ these young people were able to ‘perform’ their identity as ‘nice’ people and thus maintain a positive sense of self. However, some individuals were more cautious in their responses and found the research process a difficult experience.
As we have seen throughout the narratives examined in this thesis, the young people in this research were highly sensitive to issues of cultural difference and were well aware of the ‘appropriate’ responses they were expected to make regarding the benefits of ‘multiculturalism’ and ‘diversity’. This was particularly the case in discussions of religious difference, with Islam featuring prominently in these ‘difficult’ conversations. This finding is perhaps unsurprising given the way in which discussions of Muslims and questions of ‘integration’ have dominated public debate in the UK since 9/11, a significant proportion of these young people’s lives. However, despite this familiarity with the language and principles of ‘diversity’, a recurrent feature of young people’s responses to issues of cultural difference and questions of belonging was an awkward silence. This was especially the case whenever the use of the label ‘multicultural’ was not a sufficient descriptive term for why it was important to recognise the plurality of national identity, or indeed why certain cultural practices should be rejected as ‘Scottish’. Despite the prominent emphasis on issues of ‘multiculturalism’ within the school curriculum, as evidenced in the descriptions of the young people from the Edinburgh State School and Glasgow groups in particular, these participants lacked the vocabulary to address their feelings of discomfort or explain their difficulty in accepting heterogeneous definitions of nationhood. Rather than ‘work through’ these issues during the relatively safe environment of the research, they tended to shift the conversation onto ‘safer’ topics, leaving these difficulties unresolved and controversial ideas unchallenged.

This finding can partly be attributed to the age of the participants in this study. As identified in the methodology, young people may face more problems than other age groups when attempting to express themselves verbally. However, given that these problems were seen even amongst the most articulate of the older participants, I am inclined to suggest that this is not just an issue for this age group, but rather is a difficulty experienced by anyone who wishes to discuss these issues. This leads us to the question therefore of what can museums contribute to young people’s—and indeed individuals from all other age groups—ability to engage with these issues in a meaningful way? If museums wish to promote intercultural understanding, as we saw in Chapter 2, how can they encourage a deeper and more robust response to these issues than simply promoting the binary between migration/diversity as ‘good’, intolerance/prejudice as ‘bad’?

Finally, the findings here suggest that individuals who oppose heterogeneous definitions of the nation are more likely to find ways to challenge the authority of museums that
represent such stories than to radically alter their views on migration, identity and belonging. This is an issue that has been largely overlooked in debates surrounding the potential for museums to address issues of national identity and cultural diversity in museums. If the only individuals who respond positively to plural representations of nationhood are those who already identify with such ‘inclusive’ definitions, what impact can museums have on those who reject the rhetoric of ‘diversity’ on the grounds of ‘political correctness’? The next chapter considers these issues in relation to examples from current museum practice.
Chapter 9. Conclusions and Implications for Further Practice

This thesis set out to address the question: How do young people in Scotland construct and utilise concepts of ‘heritage’ and ‘place’ when negotiating national identity and cultural diversity?

The key findings from the research were as follows:

Aim 1: Critically analyse the importance of national identity to young people in Scotland’s sense of self

Key Findings:

- Being ‘Scottish’ is very important to the majority of young people in this study, but understandings of national identity intersect with local experience. Some places are considered to be ‘less Scottish’ and therefore identity claims of migrants based on the experience of place may be perceived as weak.
- Young people are likely to draw upon the importance of family and ancestry in shaping their sense of ‘Scottishness’. This caused problems when they were asked to consider the identity claims of those without longstanding family connections to place.
- Museums could make positive contributions by highlighting the diversity within individuals’ family biographies, but they need to be aware that individuals may perceive attempts to encourage them to critically reflect on their own identity as challenging the legitimacy of their identity claims. This may lead to feelings of insecurity and attempts to stabilise this identity through an emphasis on perceived differences between ‘us’ and ‘them’.

Aim 2: Evaluate the role of heritage in young people’s constructions of Scottish identity

Key Findings:

- In young people’s daily lives ‘civic’ definitions of national identity based on residency, place of birth and language differences are more significant than ideas of ‘heritage’.
- But the majority of young people strongly invested in the concept of a core ‘heritage’, even if it is not an important feature of their daily lives.
• ‘Heritage’ contributes to a positive self-image by emphasising achievements and showing the potential of Scottish people.

• Narratives of ‘heritage’ intersected with discussions of the cultural distinctiveness of place, which was felt to be important in the face of globalisation.

• A minority of young people were suspicious of attempts to deconstruct the distinction between the past and the present as they felt this was an attempt to undermine the importance of heritage to their sense of identity.

**Aim 3: Analyse how the concepts of ‘heritage’ and ‘place’ are utilised in young people’s narratives of belonging and exclusion**

**Key Findings:**

• Young people had a tendency to make distinctions between ‘heritage’ as the past and ‘fixed’ and culture as the present and ‘fluid’.

• While the majority of young people were happy to accept representations of diversity as reflective of modern Scottish society, they emphasised the homogenous nature of the past in the narratives.

• Young people had a tendency to draw upon the lived and imagined experience of place in narratives of exclusion, with those who lived in ‘diverse’ places downplaying the legitimacy of their experience, and others emphasising the homogeneity of the majority of Scotland.

• The findings suggest that individuals in Scotland may reject museum displays that deconstruct particular ‘diverse places’ such as cities as unrepresentative of the wider national experience.

**Aim 4: Evaluate how discussions of heritage and national identity on an individual level relate to institutional practice and political rhetoric**

**Key Findings:**

• The research highlights a gap between the focus on ‘civic’ national identity in Scottish political discourse and the shifting definitions of civic and ethnic identity found in individuals’ narratives of identity.

• The ‘inclusive’ approaches to issues of migration in political discourse do not necessarily reflect attitudes of the Scottish public. Greater critical attention is
therefore needed on issues of racism and discrimination in the Scottish context, especially if the Scottish Government plans to increase immigration to Scotland in order to expand the workforce.

- The findings in this research raise significant challenges for museum approaches that attempt to encourage visitors to reflect critically on their own identity in order to gain a better appreciation of the plural nature of national identity, as young people were more likely to challenge the legitimacy of institutions that attempted to re-imagine the core in plural terms than change their existing attitudes.

9.1 Gap in the literature
This thesis has addressed a number of gaps in the heritage and museum studies literature. The research has challenged some of the normative assumptions in the literature about the impact that museums can have on public attitudes towards issues of migration and ethnic, religious and other forms of cultural diversity. This study has highlighted methodological issues regarding the degree to which research undertaken within the museum environment influences participant responses and, unwittingly, limits the ability of research participants to express contradictory views. The responses in Chapter 8 provided important insights into this phenomenon. This finding has been supported by more recent research within the museum environment undertaken as part of the MeLa* Project, where research with visitors to the National Museum of Scotland identified similar ‘silences’ in response to the difficult topics of migration, national identity and citizenship (Whitehead et al. 2014). This research has shown that a deeper understanding of not only how individuals respond to heterogeneous conceptualisations of place but the reasons why visitors may ignore or ‘resist’ institutional representations of place as constructed and shifting is needed if museums are to have an impact on public debates on this issues.

This study contributes to an emerging area of research into issues of heritage, diversity and identity beyond the museum environment. In contrast to Schorch’s (2013) study, where interviews with young people in the classroom environment after a museum visit sought to establish the impact of visiting the museum on their attitudes to racism in their daily lives, this study has aimed to gain a greater appreciation of what Doering and Pekarik (1996) refer to as visitors’ ‘entrance narratives’. While Schorch perceives interviews in the classroom as a methodological weakness (2013: 4), this study has
shown that research that focuses on the experiences of individuals in their daily lives can provide us with valuable insights into the way in which these individuals may mediate ‘new’ information and experiences within the museum environment. Drawing on Giddens’ (1991) theory of identity maintenance and ontological security, it has shown how individuals may seek to minimise feelings of anxiety brought about the experience of dissonance, while the work of Goffman (1959) has facilitated the study of how visitors assess the ‘credibility’ of both the ‘identity performances’ of individuals featured in museum displays, and indeed the museum’s own ‘performance’ as an ‘objective’, ‘authoritative’, and ‘politically neutral’ institution, an issue that is returned to later in this chapter.

The Scottish dimension of this research has also highlighted the need for a greater consideration within the literature of the way in which the specific social and political context of place both influences public attitudes and shapes the way in which museums may address issues of identity and diversity. While in the UK context the literature has tended to focus on museum practice in major urban centres in England, as Chapter 2 identified, this study has shown that issues that may now be taken for granted by museums and theorists working in London may not resonate with the issues faced by museum practitioners in Edinburgh or Newcastle. While it is important to ‘re-write the margins into the core’ (Hall 1999), there was a sense amongst the young people in this study that they were at the margins in the UK context and attempts to revise the historical narrative of Scotland to reflect its heterogeneous nature were a distraction from efforts to ‘reclaim’ the Scottish dimension from British history. Reflecting on the political context of Scotland within this study, it is possible that the explicit rejection of cultural similarities between places may be more pertinent within geo-political contexts where borders are being actively negotiated. There is no universal solution to these issues and therefore more research is needed in these areas.

9.2 Implications for museum practice
It is difficult to assess the degree to which these findings can be generalised beyond the research context of Scotland, where arguments for the historical distinctiveness of place frequently intersected with debates regarding the contemporary political autonomy of the nation. It is important to remember that discussions of cultural difference in the classroom vary considerably from the immersive experience of the museum, which may produce ‘affective encounters’ (Witcomb, 2013: 267) that offer ‘embodied resources’ that encourage visitors to critically engage (Schorch, 2014: 8), and further more allow
deeper potential for emotional empathy with historical understanding, a condition that Witcomb argues is vital for meaningful engagement (2003:140). Both the age and the relatively small number of participants in this study should also be remembered; the responses of the young people who participated in this study should not be viewed as representative of people within Scotland as a whole. Despite these limitations, the research highlights a number of pertinent issues for museums and policy makers in Scotland, the UK and further afield.

9.2.1 ‘Place’ as an alternative paradigm to ‘identity politics’? Opportunities and challenges for museums

Chapter 2 traced a shift in both museum policy and practice relating to issues of cultural diversity and national identity. In the Scottish context, evidence for this change in approach can be seen in the Museum Galleries Scotland publication (2013) *From Strategy to Action: A Delivery Plan for Scotland’s Museum and Galleries 2013-2015*, within which discussions of national identity and specifically ethnic or religious diversity are absent. While this does not mean that such work is no longer supported through public funding, the expectation is that issues of ‘diversity’ are now mainstreamed and should be embedded into all aspects of museum practice, rather than funded separately. As Chapter 2 identified, this ‘mainstreaming’ of diversity in the UK context—while undeniably also influenced by increased budgetary restrictions within the cultural sector since 2008—has predominantly stemmed from criticisms of the ‘essentialising’ and ‘tokenistic’ nature of existing museum practice, an approach that while well-intentioned, led to the further reinforcement of the boundaries between the margins and the core, according to critics such as Hall. In both the UK and specifically the Scottish context, the convenient visual shorthand of ‘multiculturalism’—found in the types of images used in this study—has tended to overshadow a more nuanced approach to issues of cultural difference.

Mason’s (2013) proposition for a ‘cosmopolitan’ museology seeks to address these issues within current museum practice, As Chapter 2 outlined, Mason argues that a more subtle approach, where stories of migration are interwoven within the existing displays, rather than confined to particular areas of the museum, may offer visitors a deeper level of understanding of the complexities within both historic and modern societies. Rather than take issues of ‘difference’ as a starting point, Mason has advocated the paradigm of ‘place’ as an alternative approach to issues of cultural diversity and national identity. As saw in Chapter 2, interpretative approaches that seek
to disrupt the conceptualisation of places as fixed have been advocated by some theorists and practitioners in the UK and wider European context as a means of bypassing the structural inequalities that are maintained through the ‘social inclusion’ or ‘core+’ approach to minority groups.

The established argument within the literature rests on the assumption that by deconstructing the dichotomy of ‘homogenous past/multicultural present’ in public understandings of place, museums have the potential to challenge this power dynamic between the margins and the core. The findings in this research challenge some of these assumptions. While the paradigm of place offers considerable potential for museums that not only strive to represent but actively challenge public attitudes towards cultural, ethnic and religious difference, the findings here have raised a number of important issues for museum practice.

9.2.2 Negotiating the national and the local

A key issue identified at the outset of the research was the degree to discussions of diversity at the level of the nation can be successful in altering visitor attitudes to migration at the local level. The responses here, alongside those from visitor research conducted as part of the MeLa* Project (see Whitehead et al. 2014), indicate that while visitors may accept migration and diversity as a reality of the modern nation state, this does not mean that they accept such representations as relevant to their local experience and thus their understandings of national identity. While sensitive to issues of diversity in contemporary society, the participants in this study had a tendency to approach such issues in an abstract manner, as they did not view issues of cultural, ethnic or religious diversity as relevant to their immediate location. The findings here suggest that while the majority of participants in this study would respond positively to the ‘intended message’ of the need to respect cultural difference in a museum such as St. Mungo’s Museum of Religious Life and Art, which examine religious differences, both within Scotland and the wider world and features in Sandell’s (2007) study, they may struggle to ‘apply’ the information encountered within a museum setting to their daily lives.

In contrast, there is some evidence in the responses represented here that museums that present issues of migration and diversity as relevant to visitors’ immediate location, may be able to foster a greater level of critical engagement and potentially feelings of empathy than displays that focus on more abstract issues of respect for cultural difference. The findings here suggest that by encouraging visitors to see the relevance of
such discussions to their own lived experience of place, rather than viewing diversity as something that happens ‘elsewhere’, museums may be able to generate more immediate responses, an idea that relates to recent interest in ‘affect’ as a strategy for evoking empathy (see Witcomb 2013, Whitehead et al. 2014). This is particularly relevant finding for museums beyond ‘cosmopolitan’ centres. As the responses highlighted here have shown, individuals living in such ‘diverse’ places may reject the validity of their experience as representative of the nation and instead seek to emphasise the relatively homogenous nature of places beyond the city.

9.2.3 Stabilising place identities
A further issue raised by this study relates to the degree to which visitors may respond positively to representations of place that actively attempt to destabilise conceptualisations of places as fixed and settled through a focus on historical migration. While theorists and indeed museum practitioners may seek to emphasise the fluid nature of identity and the constructed nature of place, I suggest that beyond academia the desire to hold a ‘fixed’ and ‘unique’ understanding of place serves a very real purpose in allowing individuals to gain a sense of stability and coherency. Rather, the desire to maintain one’s existing position on definitions of national identity and debates on immigration may stem from an individual’s own need for a sense of stability (Giddens, 1991). Claiming an identity based on a clearly defined national heritage, that sets apart the experience of belonging to a particular place from all others, is a significant way of achieving this.

Caution therefore needs to be exercised by museums who strive to disrupt this narrative of the distinctiveness of place, for any attempt to show the inextricable links between places risks being perceived as attempting to undermine the value of this unique sense of identity. This is not to refute the value of such work, as museums have a responsibility to represent the realities of both historical and contemporary society, even if such views are not popular within current social and political debates. However, museums need to be sensitive to these issues and strive to build further dialogue with those who challenge such representations, or else they face the problem of contributing to further polarisation of public debates.

9.2.4 Mediating challenges to identity
The work of Giddens (1991) and Rounds (2006) on identity maintenance and ontological security has been useful for re-thinking the impact that a single museum visit may have on long-term changes in attitudes towards ‘diversity’. Giddens’
suggestion that individuals are highly skilled at navigating ‘new’ information, while avoiding the experience of dissonance, leads us to challenge some of the positivist findings we see in studies such as Sandell’s (2007). As stated in the introduction, this thesis does not question the validity of existing studies of this nature; instead it seeks to gain a deeper understanding of the complexities of visitor responses, the nuances of which are very difficult to capture within traditional research in the museum setting, as recent visitor studies undertaken at the National Museum of Scotland as part of the MeLa* Project have shown (Whitehead et al. 2014).

This research has provided empirical evidence that supports Rounds’ (2006) assertion that individuals may learn about alternative ways of seeing and being without necessarily adapting their own beliefs or behaviour. This desire to ‘maintain’ one’s existing sense of self and thus reject alternative views does not necessarily stem from ‘misinformation’ or ‘ignorance’ regarding a historical understanding of migration as a fundamental part of human experience, as is implied by those such as Cuno, who argues that the role of the museum is to dissipate ‘ignorance about the world and promot[e] inquiry and tolerance of difference itself.’ (2013:54). It is simply not the case that individuals may reject the validity of stories of migration to the wider ‘national heritage’ simply because they have not been taught about such stories at school or encountered them in a museum, although this is of course a significant contributing factor. The differing experiences and views of the young people in this study have shown that even those individuals who have encountered ‘positive’ messages about cultural difference may still have wildly different reactions to the concept of a plural national heritage.

9.2.5 ‘Authenticity’ and ‘credibility’ in museum representations of cultural diversity
Goffman’s (1959) emphasis on the importance of social interaction in the construction of identity has been utilised here to rethink the way in which individuals may respond to the types of stories often found within museum addressing migration, ethnicity, identity and belonging. Goffman’s work on performance has provided a useful framework for understanding how young people assessed the credibility of representations of identity and diversity in the Scottish context. As we saw, participants’ responses to the images used in this study ranged from finding them ‘cool’, ‘unique’ or ‘interesting’, to a more cynical, although still sympathetic ‘a bit try hard’, to the more critical assessment that they were ‘too PC’. Interestingly, for those young people who encountered high levels
of cultural diversity in their everyday lives, such images were not rejected on the basis that they were inaccurate *per se*, rather they were not deemed to be ‘credible’ as the ‘performance’ of identity within such representations was too one-dimensional.

A common approach adopted by museums that aim to encourage visitors to re-evaluate their assumptions about who may legitimately claim to belong to a particular place, is to highlight individual experiences. By doing so, they aim to facilitate an understanding of why individuals may feel a sense of belonging, or hold multiple identities. This approach is seen in the ‘One Nation, Five Million Voices’ film utilised in this research. However, as we have seen throughout the discussion chapters, some participants challenged the credibility of such claims, viewing them as ‘inauthentic’ performances. Such ‘overt’ attempts by museums to challenge public conceptions of identity may therefore be rejected as deliberate attempts to promote a particular ideology, as we saw in the discussions in Chapter 8 and the responses of the BNP to the displays in the Museum of London. The findings here have indicated that individuals may be more likely to question the credibility of museums that address issues of migration and cultural difference than adopt alternative perspectives. However, this overt form of interpretation is different to the more subtle stories of migration interwoven throughout the pre-twentieth century displays of the National Museum of Scotland, as identified by Mason. While less likely to bring about radical new ways of thinking about issues of migration, diversity and identity, this subtle approach may still hold significant potential for museums operating in highly contentious political and social contexts, by minimising opportunities for accusations of political correctness and thus maintaining the ‘credibility’ of the museum. Approaches that challenge visitors, while useful in some contexts, can serve to further entrench positions in others, an issue that I expand upon later in this chapter.

9.2.6 Confirmation narratives
Throughout this research we have seen that those young people who already felt the need to demonstrate ‘inclusive attitudes’ as an important part of their self-image were the most likely to respond in a positive manner to attempts to re-imagine the ‘core’ in plural terms. These young people actively sought out stories of cultural difference and were fascinated and intrigued by opportunities to consider the question of what it meant to be Scottish or to belong to a particular place through a different perspective. These findings were promising and point to the ways in which museums can usefully contribute to debates on national identity and questions of belonging by encouraging
individuals to think critically about their own sense of identity and develop an awareness of how the experiences of others may differ from their own. Vitally, these individuals did not simply demonstrate dispassionate knowledge of the realities of cultural diversity as an observable feature of modern society, but recognised that these experiences of national belonging were just as valid as their own.

The findings of this study therefore support Mason’s suggestion that in order to facilitate changes in attitude towards migration visitors must already be inclined to ‘read for’ such stories within museums. The degree to which a visitor is already inclined to identify with such representations may vary considerably within different place contexts, depending on the degree of historical consciousness of migration and diversity (Macdonald 2006; Seixas 2006). For example, the findings here contradict current research in museums in postcolonial societies with well-established narratives of immigration (Smith, 2013; Schorch, 2014; Witcomb, 2009, 2013), suggesting that the paradigm of place may be more effective in these contexts. It is likely that similar responses to those found in this study may be seen in with other European countries, particularly in Scandinavia, where migration has been less prominent within established historical narratives than in postcolonial societies such as Canada, New Zealand or Australia. Considering the implication of these findings, the degree to which the ‘subtle’ approaches described by Mason in her proposition for a cosmopolitan museology are effective in national or indeed local contexts where stories of migration are not already well known is therefore questionable—while museums do have the potential to shape public understandings of migration, they cannot achieve this in isolation.

9.3 Implications for Scottish museum practice

The findings here have specific implications for Scottish museum practice. The specific political context within which this research has taken place points to the potential opportunities that may be found when discussions about national identity are not framed within attempts to address the ‘problems’ with the margins, but rather a result of necessary reflection from the core. The young people in this study were already engaged in questions of citizenship and belonging and therefore were willing to extend these discussions to critical reflection on why others may wish to ‘join the nation’. While not always ‘successful’, these discussions point to the importance of empathy as a means of altering existing attitudes.
It is noticeable however, that explicit discussions of national identity are largely absent from current museum programming at the time of writing, a state of affairs which is surprising given the heated debates surrounding Scottish identity and Scotland’s constitutional future in the public sphere. Research conducted with staff at the National Museum of Scotland in the run up to the Independence Referendum has highlighted the sensitive nature of these debates and staff expressed the desire to avoid accusations of promoting a particular political ideology (Whitehead et al. 2014). However, while this attitude is understandable, the significant public appetite for examining these issues suggests that museums could be more proactive in providing spaces for these discussions. Throughout this research many young people expressed frustration that they were unable to talk about constitutional issues within the school environment, either because teachers were unwilling to engage with the issue, or because there was no time within the existing curriculum. This situation may have changed substantially since the research was conducted. Recent research by Eichhorn et al. (2013, 2014) has shown an increase in the number of young people reporting that they had talked about the Referendum in school. Indeed, Eichhorn et al. argue that when compared with studies of over 18s in the Scottish Social Attitudes Survey, their research, undertaken as part of the Future of the UK and Scotland research programme, shows that young people are more politically engaged than older generations. Furthermore, their research demonstrates a substantial difference in the way in which this age group engages with information, with traditional forms of media eschewed in favour of social media. Given wider concerns within the museum sector about the lack of engagement with this age group, there is a case to be made for museums using this increased appetite for information, also witnessed in responses to this study, to address this. This is something that museums could usefully contribute to. In 2013 the National Museum of Scotland hosted an event targeted at schools for young people to debate Scotland’s constitutional future—more events of this nature are needed.

9.3.1 Beyond the ‘Tartan Turban’

There does appear to be a considerable gap between political and museum celebrations of the ‘tartan turban’ in Scottish society and public responses to such imagery, although we should of course be wary about generalising the findings of this study to make statements about the Scottish public as a whole. This ‘gap’ does not necessarily mean that we should do-away with such imagery in its entirety however, as we have seen that in some instances young people who had difficulties accepting certain migrant, ethnic or religious minority groups as Scottish, particularly Muslims, were more willing to
legitimise the identity claims of individuals from these backgrounds if they were deemed to be ‘committed’ to the nation through ‘performing’ in a manner that was recognisably Scottish. However, what was apparent in these discussions was that this ‘visual’ indicator of Scottishness needed to be supported by a much greater level of information for these individuals to shift their positions from outright rejection to a more reflexive assessment of the validity of such performances. This finding has important implications for the museum context, where the visual impact often takes precedent over textual or other forms of interpretation.

9.3.2 Migration and Historical Consciousness
The research has highlighted issues of historical consciousness in Scotland regarding public awareness of the longer history of population movement prior to the twentieth century. Despite current political rhetoric and educational initiatives such as the One Scotland campaign, the participants in this study had relatively little awareness of historical migration to Scotland. Although the global distribution of the Scottish Diaspora was a great source of pride for many young people in this study, participants saw Scotland as somewhere that historically migrants (willingly or unwillingly) left behind, rather than travelled to. This discrepancy points to wider issues regarding discourses of ‘national heritage’, as while stories of emigration and the success of Scots abroad are common within the public sphere, illustrated by the high profile ‘Homecoming’ campaigns of 2009 and 2014, immigration is still a relatively untold story in Scotland. There is clear evidence in the findings presented here that museums and other public institutions could do more to promote public understanding of the longstanding connections between Scotland and other countries, beyond the dominant narratives of emigration currently found within Scottish museums. While this emphasis on the Scottish Diaspora is understandable given the profound impact the Highland Clearances and later emigration had on Scotland’s history, more could be done to highlight the way in which migration to Scotland has influenced present-day society.

This change is necessary given the increased presence of migrant communities within Scotland in the last ten years, with the 2011 Scottish Census results showing a greater level of cultural, ethnic and religious diversity than ever before. These changes are only likely to continue, given the emphasis on growing Scotland’s population in current
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20 The subject of the Highland Clearances and subsequent waves of emigration from the nineteenth century onwards is a highly emotive one (See Basu 2009)
political strategy, as we saw in the introduction. These changes demand new approaches to the stories of migrants in Scottish museums. Recent research undertaken by the EUNAMUS project has highlighted the dissatisfaction of visitors from minority ethnic backgrounds with the representation of migrants and refugees in the National Museum of Scotland (Dodd et al., 2012). Criticisms centred on the way in which the stories of these groups were confined to contemporary history in favour of discussions of emigration throughout the displays. Respondents in their study expressed a desire for these stories to be integrated through history as well as discussed in the present. While Mason (2013) argues that stories of migration can be found throughout the museum, research with visitors indicates that more could be done to make visitors aware of these stories.

More also needs to be done to increase core funding for research and exhibitions of stories of cultural diversity within Scotland. The recent Migration Stories exhibition series at the Scottish National Portrait Gallery represented a welcome step towards increasing the profile of migrant communities within Scottish institutions. The aim of the programme was stated as follows:

Migrants both into and out of Scotland continue to shape the nation. Migration Stories explores the visual culture of Scotland’s migration history. Working with contemporary artists and local communities, the exhibitions...consider questions of Scottish identity, encompassing issues of place, belonging, exile and tradition (Scottish National Portrait Gallery, 2013; Scottish National Portrait Gallery, 2011).

The work was part of a wider project to re-evaluate the existing collections of the National Galleries of Scotland in a manner similar to the V&A’s Hidden Histories programme. However, while it was originally intended to be a long-running series showing the history of how emigration and immigration have shaped Scotland’s identity, the series was ended after just two exhibitions, which focused on the Scottish Pakistani and Scots Italian communities respectively. Here we see then the continued impact of the ‘cultural diversity initiative’ approach to these issues, with important projects cut when financial backing can no longer be found, a problem that is unlikely to subside within the current funding climate.
9.3.3 Expanding the historical narrative: Bruce, Burns and beyond

At the time of writing, debates are ongoing about the potential introduction of the new Scottish Studies subject area as a means of instilling confidence in Scottish pupils, through facilitating a pride in their identity, an assertion that resonates with the theoretical debates examined in Chapter 4. Many young people in this study expressed a desire to learn more about their local area and indeed gain a greater appreciation of Scottish history. This desire to engage critically with ‘one’s own location’ presents excellent opportunities for the exploration of stories of migration and diversity in Scotland and is an area to which museums could offer practical assistance to education professionals, through both formal learning programmes and the development of supplementary learning resources for use in the classroom.

A dominant feature of the discussions with the young people in this research was the desire for a greater focus on Scottish history within the curriculum. A number of participants expressed disappointment that they felt the only significant time period covered within the school curriculum was the Wars of Independence, a time period that they viewed as characteristic of a focus on the conflict between England and Scotland within discussions of Scottish heritage. It is therefore perhaps no surprise that many participants struggled to situate stories of pre-twentieth century migration within their existing knowledge of Scotland, resulting in ‘new’ information being overlooked or discredited in favour of established historical narratives.

A common view expressed by participants was that museums in Scotland should focus on key historical figures such as Robert Burns and Scottish scientific innovations, rather than stories of cultural difference that were not ‘unique’ to Scotland. This indicates that participants would be more likely to challenge or reject these themes within Scottish museums, an argument that is supported by research undertaken with adults from both migrant and non-migrant backgrounds in the National Museum of Scotland as part of the MeLa* Project (see Whitehead et al. 2014), which found that while participants from both groups placed great significance on historical events such as the Wars of Independence, they were less enthusiastic about displays relating to contemporary migration. These findings point to the importance of visitor expectations of museums and the type of material that should be included within them, an issue that will be returned to shortly.
9.3.4 Cross-border issues: sharing best practice, identifying common challenges

As stated above, the findings of this research may resonate most strongly with museums in places without an established narrative of migration. Useful insights can be gained into how Scottish museums might address issues of migration and diversity by looking at existing museum practice in the North East of England where, like Scotland, there has historically a lower rate of migration than in others parts of the UK, resulting in a significantly smaller proportion of visible ethnic minorities: 95 per cent of the population of the region defined themselves as ‘White’ in the 2011 Census (Office for National Statistics, 2012).

Destination Tyneside at Discovery Museum, Newcastle provides a useful case study for examining the issues raised by the current study. The gallery aims to ‘deconstruct and reframe the identity of Tyneside and encourage visitors to appreciate how much the area’s identity has been influenced by migrants’ (Little, 2013:88). The interpretation in the gallery takes a first-person approach, a strategy that aims to ‘engender an immediate and emotional connection to the stories being told’ (2013: 89). The gallery focuses on participatory approaches, specifically through encouraging individuals to undertake research on their own family history by using terminals to access material from the Tyne and Wear Archives and upload their own stories of place and identity.

Telling the story of migration to the region was a challenge for the curators. As Little puts it: ‘How do you challenge perceived notions of a well-established history in an area that is largely presented as homogenous and where negative views of migration are often expressed?’ (2013: 91). The curators therefore chose to re-frame stories of migration as not just concerning the movement of people to the UK, but within its borders throughout history. ‘Migrants’ in this context could be individuals from as nearby as Yorkshire or as far-away as China. Significantly, the curators specifically drew upon Massey’s (1995) argument that identity is a process of formation in their aim to ‘disrupt this notion of stability in a constructive way’ (Little 2013: 92). However, Little rightly raises the issue of whether visitors will be able to make bridges between historic stories of migration within the region and more recent changes brought about by immigration.

An evaluation of visitor responses carried out by researchers at Durham University (Alexander, 2013) has shown that the exhibition has had a mixed response from visitors:
“It educates people about the diversity of the region and challenges stereotypes about migration” (Male, 30-49, White)

“The films were very informative, not just about migration history, but about the lives and thoughts, and what those migrants had to go through all that time ago.”

“It changed my views on why people come to this country”

“We now have an understanding of the different cultures in this area” (Parent with children)

“We’ve got enough. No more. But I suppose it does make you think” (Male, 60+, English) (Alexander, 2013: n.p).

While these findings are promising, the final comment highlighted here shows that while visitors may understand the intended message of the gallery, they may still have difficulty accepting it. This visitor’s response, indicating that the gallery has made him think about issues more deeply, even if he does not agree with the museum’s ‘celebration’ of contemporary migration, points to the need for interpretative techniques that would provide him with space to think about these ideas further, rather than begrudgingly acknowledge other points of view. The way in which this might be achieved is examined in the next two sections.

9.4 Putting the visitor back in the debate
The underlying aim of this research was to understand the impact that museums may have on public attitudes towards migration, ethnic, cultural and religious difference. In assessing this impact it is important to take a step back and consider the different philosophical views of the role of the museum and its relationship with its visitors.

Cuno (2013) argues that the dominant critical approach to museums, influenced by Foucault and Gramsci, has overemphasised the museum’s role as an ideological instrument. In doing so, individual agency and experience has been overlooked:

What is so surprising about the writings of the museum critics...is how little regard they have for the individual agency of the museum visitor. They imagine her as unwittingly subject
to the ideological strategies of the museum, and through the
museum to those of the state and the political and social elite.
She has no independence of mind’ (2013: 51).

He advocates a return to ‘enlightenment ideas’ of objectivity and curiosity in the
conceptualisation of the relationship between the museum and its visitors, through what
he terms the ‘encyclopedic museum’, a label that he suggests could be used to describe
the British Museum or the Louvre. He defines the principles of this type of museum
thus:

The encyclopedic museum is precisely not an instrument of state
but is instead an argument against an essentialised, state-derived
cultural identity in favour of a cosmopolitan one…The
encyclopedic museum respects the individual agency of the
visitor, allowing her to follow her own interests and be surprised,
challenged, and inspired by what catches her eye and compels
her to wonder…

He sets out his expectations of museum visitors as follows:

We expect our visitors to determine their own experience. They
bring to the museum a range of preparedness, with specific
interests, curiosities, and assumptions about what they are going
to see. They go where they want to go, in any order they choose.
They linger over what they like and ignore what they don’t. They
read the well-intentioned labels or they don’t. They might accept
the offer of an audio guide or they might not. They stay as long
as they want and they leave… Visitors are encouraged to draw
connections between objects. But we cannot make this happen. It
is their experience, not ours…But we work to afford them the
chance to do so, by…organizing and presenting our collections
publicly in reasonable ways and in ways that might attract
visitors’ attention to the objects in themselves’ (2013:52-3).

Interestingly, this definition of the role of the museum resonates with the attitudes
expressed by staff at the National Museum of Scotland during research undertaken as
part of the MeLa* Project (Whitehead at al. 2014). Staff felt uncomfortable with
‘dictating’ visitor responses, instead viewing the museum as a resource to be exploited
by individuals when constructing their own sense of self. Despite this desire to avoid
promoting a particular political ideology, they did, however, hope that visitors to the
museum would understand the plural nature of Scottish identity and think critically
about their own definitions of Scottishness as a result of their visit. This approach is
understandable given the contentious political context surrounding the representation of
Scottish identity since Devolution. To a lesser extent, these attitudes are shared by Little and Watson (2014), who, although strong advocates for the active contribution of the museum to social justice, are careful to state that it is not the museum’s position to dictate identity.

Cuno, himself a museum practitioner, is correct to draw our attention to the way in which individuals bring their own experiences to the museum. He challenges the way in which the dominant arguments within the museum studies literature imply that visitors are not as ‘sophisticated’ as critics in their ability to deconstruct the discourses present within the museum. However, like Giddens, he overstates the agency of the individual and downplays the way in which social structures shape our responses to certain issues, bestowing some stories with value while marginalising others. This was a phenomenon that was clearly present in the discussions surrounding the image selection exercise in this study, where individual choices were heavily mediated by group expectations.

Although Cuno is correct to assert that museums are not—and should not be conceptualised as—straightforward instruments of the state (see Mason 2013, 2007; MacKenzie 2009; Whitehead et al 2012), we cannot overlook the hegemonic discourses that have historically informed their practices. However, I support Cuno’s assertion that in a liberal society we cannot use museums to tell people what to think. This is not to say that museums cannot take positions on issues and, as stated at the outset of this thesis, this research was shaped by a belief that museums have a moral obligation to engage in debates on migration, citizenship and belonging. However, this needs to occur in a manner that is respectful to the experiences and ideas that museums bring with them.

As already stated, this thesis does not seek to be an apologia for those who ‘resisted’ attempts to define the nation in plural terms. Rather, it aims to highlight the difficulties that some individuals may face when confronted with heterogeneous representations of nationhood. The issue at hand is how museums—or indeed any institution that seeks to address these issues—manage such encounters. As we have seen in the young people’s narratives reflected upon here, the difficulties experienced by individuals when negotiating ideas of heritage, identity and belonging can lead to moments where individuals acknowledge the issues with the views that they have expressed, recognising that particular assertions are problematic or simply not well thought through. We have witnessed many moments in the discussions where individuals have shifted their
narratives and revised their statements, not simply as a means of controlling their self-image, but as a means of re-evaluating their opinions and considering the possibility of an alternative perspective. Such ‘moments’ do not represent a ‘radical’ or permanent shift in attitude—this was after all just a few hours in a busy school year. Instead they are to be understood as experiences that may facilitate a ‘capacity for future change’, to use Rounds’ (2006) terms. They are experiences that may or may not be recalled when individuals encounter these issues in their daily lives.

From an educational stance, we can only hope that such moments experienced within a museum environment may encourage individuals to approach issues of identity and belonging in a more reflective and nuanced way and thus move beyond the polarised and instinctive responses too frequently seen in current public debates on immigration. But this is just one possible scenario that perhaps overstates the impact of this research on the young people who participated in it. What about those individuals who rejected any attempt to critically reflect on their attitudes? Those who refused to speak, folded their arms defiantly and stared out of the window during the discussions? And indeed, what about those who, despite critical reflection, remained absolute in their rejection of plural, or as they labelled them, ‘politically correct’ representations of the nation? For these young people, the ‘problem’ of immigration did not lie with them and their failure to adapt, as Younge (2012) proposes. Instead, they placed the blame at the foot of those who they perceived as trying to undermine the value of their Scottish identity; to undercut the importance of those things that gave them a sense of pride and to replace them with stories that they perceived as irrelevant or worse still threatening to their way of life. These young people chose to challenge the authority of those they felt promoted such views, rather than revise their own position.

These are important issues for museums that lead us to consider the expectations visitors have of museums and their ability to address contentious topics.

9.4.1 Balancing radical approaches with visitor expectations
Recent research into public attitudes to museums suggests that there is a potential gap between the radical stance taken by some theorists and museum workers on the role of the museum and public perceptions of what museums are for and the stories that they should be telling (Britain Thinks/Museum Association 2013). While those such as Sandell and Nightingale (2012) may wish to position the museums as an institution that campaigns for social justice, public expectations of museums may therefore be much more traditional.
The extensive work of Doering and Pekarik (1996) and the wider team of researchers at the Smithsonian provides a deeper understanding of visitor expectations and the impact these may have on their propensity to identify with the types of museum displays identified above. They issue the following words of caution to those who overstate the potential impact of the museum: ‘Those museum personnel who believe that a museum’s mission is to communicate or transmit specific messages, feelings, or other experiences will need to appreciate that in general only visitors already attuned to seeking these experiences are likely to find them’ (Pekarik & Schreiber 2012: 495).

They explain further:

People enter any environment with preconceived notions of how the world works and what they want out of an experience. Museum visitors have preconceived notions of the museum-going experience. Even those who do not go to museums probably have similar notions (2012:494).

They describe these notions as ‘schemas’, and explain that schemas structure how an individual behaves in particular situations. For this reason, the study of schemas is popular in cognitive psychology and studies of consumer behaviour. They argue that when individuals are in a museum, they expect to encounter certain types of stories and behave in certain ways. Exhibitions that disrupt these expectations therefore may be the most useful for challenging visitor attitudes. However, Pekarik and Schreiber are careful to state that while we might think that ‘unexpected’ encounters may catch the attention of the visitor and demand a re-evaluation of certain ideas or previously held information, our expectations of what we think should be in a museum may also lead to these encounters being overlooked or ignored by visitors in favour of experiences that resonate with their existing expectations. They therefore state that a positive visitor response to an ‘unexpected’ encounter is a possibility, not a guarantee (2012:494).

The degree to which visitors may engage with displays on migration and diversity in a meaningful way may therefore largely rest on visitor expectations regarding the content and political or social agenda of museums in their shaping responses. Are visitors attending ‘issue based exhibitions’ such as those discussed above, doing so as a deliberate act of ‘performing’ their open-mindedness and thus already pre-disposed to attitudinal change? And if this is the case, do such exhibitions have a greater ability to challenge negative attitudes by confirming visitors’ entrance narratives? Or, to take a
less optimistic view, are these museums less likely to be visited by those who hold oppositional views? This finding is problematic for those who advocate the importance of museums for bringing about intercultural understanding, as it suggests that those individuals who are the targets of such initiatives are more likely to challenge or avoid such exhibitions than engage with them. While the former offers potential for further dialogue, the latter presents challenges for museums in Scotland and indeed further afield who strive to foster ‘inclusive’ understandings of identity through cosmopolitan approaches.

9.4.2 Beyond the ‘happy hybrid citizen’: Creating opportunities for meaningful debate

While it is vital that museums address the issues that have arisen from ‘essentialist’ treatments of diversity by museums, a more pragmatic issue is also at stake here. The standardisation in museum approaches identified in Macdonald’s motif of the ‘happy hybrid citizen’ discussed in Chapter 2 also makes for a fairly uninspiring visitor experience. As Cathy Ross (2014), Curator of the Galleries of Modern London at the Museum of London reflects, what was once seen as innovative and inspiring practice during the development phase of an exhibition quickly becomes staid; the visitor may feel that they have seen it all before and thus take no notice of important ideas. This potential ‘weariness’ in visitor responses to displays addressing identity and diversity was a highly relevant issue within the narratives of the young people in this study. As identified throughout the discussion chapters, participants were very familiar with both the visual imagery and the thematic issues of what they termed ‘multiculturalism’ and, for the most part, were happy to accept images relating to cultural, ethnic and religious diversity as representative of the contemporary diversity of modern Scotland. However, they were also tired of surface level approaches to issues of diversity that focused too heavily on cultural differences. Similarly, those who labelled such images as ‘politically correct’ also resented the ‘heavy-handed’ approach of the visual iconography of multiculturalism, as seen in promotion of the ‘tartan turban’ in the public sphere by both politicians and museums, discussed in Chapter 1. For these participants, museum resources such as the ‘One Nation’ film, while pertaining to facilitate dialogue and debate, were still interpreted as promoting a ‘multicultural’ agenda that required a very specific set of responses, permitting alternative views only in so far as these views led to the ‘acceptance’ of diversity, an experience that they found patronising and frustrating.
The findings of this research do not suggest that individuals will not engage with exhibitions on ‘difficult’ topics when confronted with them. But this research does raise issues regarding the need to balance taking a stance on issues with the expectations of visitors. As Brown (2009) notes, the ‘heavy handed’ approach of museums such as the Museum of Tolerance on issues of prejudice can shut down conversation, rather than open up meaningful debate. Mason observes that it ‘is essential to remember that people have chosen to spend their precious free-time visiting museums and therefore any attempt to use museums to raise controversial or sensitive issues has to be thought of in the context of a leisure choice not in the way it might be addressed through the formal education system’ (2013:59).

The value of this research identified by both the teachers who witnessed it and many of the young people who participated in it was in the opportunity to talk through their ideas and to air their opinions and concerns, rather than simply learn the ‘correct’ response to issues of cultural difference i.e. racism = bad, multiculturalism = good. From my subjective perspective as a witness to these discussions, the moments of ‘break through’ appeared to be those points in the conversation when things got difficult. Those individuals who stuck with these difficult ideas and worked through them appeared to get the most satisfaction out of the research experience. I have the utmost respect for those individuals who put up with my probing questions, who squirmed in their seats and at times looked visibly distressed, but still committed to talking through these issues and attempted to resolve them. I am not sure I would have had the strength of character to put myself under scrutiny in this way. Unsurprisingly then, the more usual response to these tough questions was to walk away from this provocation, to shift the conversation to easier topics or simply cease participation.

The problem as I see it is this: if museums wish to alter attitudes towards migration and cultural diversity then they need to do so in ways that encourage those who might be sceptical of such ideas to engage critically. If these visitors view the museum as perpetuating a ‘politically correct’ agenda they are unlikely to be convinced to change their attitudes and will simply walk away. What impact can museums possibly have if they are simply preaching to the converted?

9.4.3 Opportunities in current museum practice
How then can museums usefully engage with these individuals, without creating situations that further alienate these individuals or result in negative attitudes towards minority groups becoming further entrenched? Furthermore, how can museums address
these challenging issues in a meaningful and respectful manner without visitors feeling patronised, or worse, simply walking away? This next section will examine two examples from museum practice that may be useful for addressing the issues raised by this thesis.

The use of interactives to encourage visitors to think more critically about their responses to particular issues is becoming more common place in museums with specific aims to contribute to social justice. The exhibition Identity: Yours, Mine, Ours at the Immigration Museum, Melbourne Australia, provides a useful model for museums who actively wish to challenge visitor attitudes. It aims to explore ‘who we are, who others think we are, and what it means to belong and not belong in Australia’, through examining ‘how our cultural heritage, languages, beliefs, and family connections influence our self-perceptions and our perceptions of other people – perceptions that can lead to discovery, confusion, prejudice and understanding….Visitors are encouraged to share their own stories, affirm their own identities and celebrate diversity in our community’ (Immigration Museum 2011). The content of the exhibition, which is delivered using a combination of traditional objects and multimedia displays, is highly personal, in-keeping with the nature of the theme. Both the physical exhibition and online material rely heavily on interaction, with visitors encouraged to share their responses to themes including:

- Respect
- Prejudice
- Belonging
- Pride
- Identity
- Diversity

Like Destination Tyneside, the exhibition features an interactive ‘Citizenship Test’. Both museums aim to encourage visitors to critically reflect on the conditions of citizenship and, in the case of existing citizens, whether they would pass the test (it is worth noting that when I undertook the test with colleagues from ICCHS I was the only one who passed). However, the interactive in Identity goes beyond a step beyond this, by combining sample questions from the real Australian test with visitor suggestions for new citizenship questions; visitors can choose which activity they wish to complete. The citizenship test follows a multiple choice format, with marks given at the end. The
alternative test asks visitors to contribute their own suggestions for questions, which can also be contributed online. Visitors are asked to rank the questions submitted by others according to how important they think these are for testing definitions of Australian citizenship. While many of the contributed questions encourage visitors to think about more radical aspects of Australian history, such as the treatment of Aboriginals by European settlers, there are also a number that focus on ‘trivia’. Interestingly, those questions that appear to categorise Australian identity in terms that would be familiar to those young people who stressed the importance of a ‘civic’ Scottish identity—commitment to values, knowledge of and adherence to laws etc—are ranked more highly than questions such as ‘Kylie Minogue and Jason Donavan starred in which TV show together?’.

Reflecting on the popularity of the interactive, the curator stated that she believed it was a simple and effective way of addressing questions of citizenship and belonging because it deals with the serious aspects of identity without being dull, while situating the terminal in an alcove allowed for more contemplative and meaningful responses (pers. comm). This is supported by research conducted with visitors by Smith, (2013) and Schorch (2014), whose research has provided some evidence that the exhibition may be achieving its aims. While Sandell’s study highlights many positive responses to the displays at St. Mungo’s amongst visitors within the museum setting, the longitudinal element of Schorch’s study allows for the examination of whether these professed changes in attitude were apparent once visitors returned to their daily lives. He suggests that ‘the exhibition moves beyond the orchestration of an abstract tolerance by unsettling the Self and destabilising stereotyped interpretations of ‘the Other’… [It] creates a place and space of encounter in which differences are humanised, thus facilitating understandings of broader contexts through individual experiences.’ (2014: 1). Significantly, Schorch identifies that ‘the life worlds of students, their personal backgrounds and schools, are intertwined with their interpretive engagements with the exhibition and need to be considered for museum practices and further research’ (2014:1), a statement that supports the position of this thesis. By studying how individuals conceptualise these issues beyond the museum, we can gain a greater appreciation of what they bring with them from their own experiences and how this might shape their responses to displays of this nature. This variety in experience however also encourages us to focus on the social context inhabited by both the Immigration Museum and its visitors.
While the approach adopted in *Identity: Yours Mine, Ours* may be effective in the Australian context, where stories of immigration are closely entwined with the broader narrative of the nation’s past, this may not be the case in Scotland, or indeed other European countries. In assessing the effectiveness of a particular interpretative approach, it is important to remember that there is not a ‘one size fits all’ solution to issues of identity, citizenship, place and belonging.

An example of a more ‘issue based’ approach can be seen in the Stapferhaus Lenzburg, in Switzerland. It aims to provide a space where visitors can contemplate difficult issues, without attempting to provide ‘ready-made’ answers. The ethos behind its exhibitions is to engage visitors as equals, rather than attempt to transform their attitudes or ‘lead’ them to certain positions. An example of this approach can be found in the exhibition *Entscheiden: Eine Ausstellung über das Leben im Supermarkt der Möglichkeiten* (Decisions: An Exhibition about Life in the Supermarket of Possibilities). The exhibition specifically examined the way in which we make decisions throughout our lives, highlighting the way in which the choices we make and the opinions we hold may shift in response to changes in social context. The exhibition used a combination of audio-visual material, interactives and provocative art works to encourage visitors to think about choices relating to areas such as their career, love-life and the way in which emotions and reason impact on our choices. Displays also examined the physical and mental processes behind decision-making and looked at the difficulties some individuals encounter when they are unable to make a decision.

At the start of the exhibition, visitors collected a ‘Decision Card’ from a shopping bag. Throughout the exhibition there were four digital interactive ‘decision-making stations’, which encouraged visitors to test their own decision making behaviour and take a stand on particular issues. The outcome of their decisions was recorded on a barcode, which visitors attached to their Decision Card. At the end of the exhibition, visitors went to the supermarket ‘checkout’ to scan their card and ‘pay’. They then received a receipt which provided an evaluation of their decision-making processes and provided tips for future decisions.

The approach taken by the Stapferhaus Lenzburg provides a ‘safe’ and above all fun environment within which visitors can negotiate their own identities. Such a strategy may address the issues raised in this study regarding individuals’ anxiety and thus go some way towards avoiding the entrenchment of oppositional positions.
For museums that actively aim to encourage visitors to re-evaluate their concepts of identity and belonging, the personal and direct approaches of both of these exhibitions may be more useful for addressing some of the issues identified in this study than the more subtle, ‘place-based’ approach. As stated above, these approaches may not be suitable for every museum however and the choice of interpretative strategy will be dependent on the aims of the museum and risks that they are willing to take.

9.5 Avenues for Future Research
This research points to a number of useful future avenues for research. The most obvious of these is the question of how do these findings relate to the experience of visitors in museums?

The insights gained from discussing individuals’ conceptualisations of heritage and identity beyond the museum have been very useful in providing an understanding of the preconceptions visitors may have before entering a museum. A longitudinal study, using the methods outlined here alongside visits to different museum displays may offer important critical insights into the way in which attitudes to issues of identity, diversity and belonging may change or be sustained over time.

The findings here are based on a particular age group and a specific national context. Questions must be asked therefore as to whether the insights gained here may be generalizable to other age groups and places. Are adults more or less likely to show an understanding and empathy towards stories of migration? How might these issues be negotiated in countries such as Canada or New Zealand, where the relevance of stories of contemporary migration must also be considered alongside the history of European migration and the population movements of indigenous peoples for example?

Beyond the Scottish context the development of the new UK Migration Museum, which has a strong focus on engagement with school groups across the UK appears to offer great potential for researchers interested in examining the issue of how place influences or indeed does not alter young people’s approach to these issues and what other factors intersect with place.

The work of existing research programmes such as MeLa highlight the on-going relevance of these issues for the sector and I hope to continue to contribute to these debates in my future research.
Appendix A: Sample Letter to Parents/Guardians

Dear Parent/Guardian

I am from the International Centre for Cultural and Heritage Studies at Newcastle University and I would like to include your child, along with his or her classmates, in a research project on Heritage and Identity in Scotland. If your child takes part in this project, he or she will participate in a short workshop during their [insert class] lesson time that explores these issues. Your child may also be asked to participate in a short individual follow up interview.

The workshop will involve watching a film and discussing ideas as a group using visual prompts. The workshop will be filmed and recorded in order to keep an accurate record of the discussion. Only my academic supervisors and I will have access to the film and audio track and these will be destroyed once the research project is completed. Those wishing not to be filmed may request to be seated off-screen during the research.

Your child's participation in this project is voluntary. In addition to your permission, your child will also be asked if he or she would like to take part in this project. Only those children who have parental permission and who want to participate will do so. Your child may stop participating at any time. The information obtained during this research project will be kept strictly confidential and will not become a part of your child's school record. Any sharing or publication of the research results will not identify any of the participants by name.

If you have any questions about this project please contact me using the information above.

Yours Sincerely

Katherine Lloyd

Please complete the form below and return to [Teacher] by [Date]

I do/do not (circle one) give permission for __________________________ (name of child) to participate in the research project described above.

___________________________________________
(Print) Parent/Guardian’s name

___________________________________________
Parent/Guardian’s signature

Date
Appendix B: Student Permission Form and Information leaflet

Student Permission Form

Please complete the form below so that I know whether you are able to take part in the study. Remember, you can change your mind at any time. Please let me or your teacher know if you have any questions of concerns.

Name of Student____________________________________

My Parent/Guardian has given permission for me to take part in this research

YES       NO  (Please circle one)

Please tick the appropriate statement:

I have read the information about the research and I do not want to take part

or

I have read the information about the research and I would like to take part

For students who wish to take part:

I understand that the workshop is being filmed and I give permission to be filmed

or

I understand that the workshop is being filmed and I do not want to be filmed

Follow up interviews in pairs:

I would be happy to be interviewed

or

I would not like to be interviewed
What will happen after the research?

I will compare your thoughts and opinions with other young people in Scotland.

I will use this information to write a thesis – a 100,000 word essay!

Will anyone know what I’ve said?

You will not be named in the research.

I’ll need to use a name to identify you. I will give you a code name. For example, rather than use the name Katherine, I might call you Claire. This means no one should be able to work out who you are.

The workshop is going to be filmed and recorded. But don’t worry, I am not going to put up films on YouTube or the recordings on my spice.

The only person who will have access to the film and recording will be me. They will be kept in a secure place and once I have finished the research I will delete the files.

I may need to ask my two supervisors (who are like my teachers) for help, but they will not be able to view the film or listen to the recordings without me.

If you don’t want to be filmed but still want to take part please let me know.

Who am I?

My name is Kat Lloyd. I am a student at Newcastle University.

I live in Edinburgh and I am really interested in Scotland. I have lived in lots of different places in the UK.

What am I doing?

I am currently doing a PhD. This is a university degree, usually done after 5 or 6 years at university. I am currently in the second year of my PhD.

To get my PhD, I need to do my own research project on an original topic.

For my project, I am looking at the opinions and experiences of young people in Scotland. The workshop will help me to do this.

I am doing this workshop with lots of different schools across Scotland.

I will compare your thoughts and ideas with other young people in Scotland.

Things to remember:

- The research is optional and you can stop taking part at any time.
- There are no right answers.
- You will not be named in the research.
- Only myself and my supervisors will see the film.
- If you have any other questions, you can email, phone or text me.

Is there a right answer?

No!

This is not a test and you won’t be marked.

You will not be judged by me or your teacher for anything you say during the workshop.

Do I have to take part?

I am very interested in what each of you have to say. But you do not have to take part.

You have already been given a letter to take home to your parents asking if it is ok for you to take part.

If your parents put a letter on your door, you have not returned it to the school please let me know.

If your parents have said they don’t want you to take part that’s ok.

If your parents have said it’s ok but you don’t want to take part that’s ok too.

If you don’t take part you will be given another activity to do.

What will the research be like?

You may have heard stories about “research”. You may have ideas about psychological tests or social experiments a bit like Big Brother.

This research will not be like that.

Researchers tend to not tell people too much about what they are going to ask them. This is because they don’t want to influence what you say, not because they’re trying to surprise you or catch you out.

There’s nothing to worry or be scared about.

For my research, we will be doing a short workshop, a bit like a normal classroom lesson. It will involve:

- Watching a short film
- Talking to each other about ideas
- Thinking about yourself
- Thinking about where you come from and where you live.

I will be filming and recording the workshop to help me remember what you said.

You may also be asked if you would like to be involved in a short interview, either by yourself or with a friend in a few weeks’ time. This is optional and you will get more information on the day of the workshop.
Appendix C: Focus Group Schedule

Introduction

Review ethics and permissions

Time (approximately 10 minutes)______________________________

Identity

Please put your name on the top of the piece of paper.

I’ve put some post-stick notes on the desk. For each question, could you write the number of the question in the corner of the post stick note. Write your answer on the post-stick notes and stick them onto the piece of paper. You can use more than one post stick note for each question, but make sure you write the number on each one. Keep the paper folded so no one can see your answers.

4. Write down on a post-stick note how you would describe yourself to someone you’d never met before. You can write down as many things as you want 5 minutes

5. Are any of the things that you have written down more important to you than the others?

Time (approximately 15 minutes) ______________________________

Watch film – One Nation Five Million Voices- 1 minute

6. These people were all answering the question ‘what is your identity?’ . They said things like Scottish, British, Scottish Glaswegian, Scottish Traveller, a Shetlander, Hebridean, English but feel Scottish. I’d now like you to write down your answer to the question.

7. Would anyone like to share what they’ve written with the group?

8. Did anyone find this easy? Why was this?

9. Did anyone find this difficult? Why was this?

10. If you met any of these people would you agree with how they described themselves?

11. Would you see them as similar to you or different?

12. What about the people you said they felt Scottish but they had English accents?

13. What about the girl who said she was Ethiopian and Scottish?

14. Do you know what languages the people were speaking? Do you know anyone who speaks Gaelic or Polish. Have you heard of Scots?

Time (approximately 15 minutes) __________________________

Photo activity 1

In a moment I’m going to ask you to look at some images. Imagine you’ve been asked to select some images to show someone who has never been to Scotland. You are going to use the images to tell the person about Scottish culture, history and daily life. I’d like you to select just 10 images that you feel summarise Scotland. Place a tick and your initials next to the image you’ve selected. You can talk about your decision with the people next to you. I’ve also put out some blank cards. If you think there is something important about life in Scotland that is not represented here put the word or phrase on them. Put the card on the table so other people can see if they would include it as well. You have 15 minutes to make your decisions.
Time (approximately 10 minutes) ______________________

10. Did you find that difficult or easy? Why? (Stereotypes?)

11. Were there any other pictures you wanted to include if you were allowed more than 10?

12. Why did you choose the images that you chose?

13. Would you have put something different if you knew the person was from Scotland?

Time (approximately 10 minutes) ______________________

**Photo activity 2**

Now I’d like you to spend a couple of minutes looking at the images you didn’t choose. I’d like you to put a cross (X) next to any images you don’t think are Scottish. I’d like you to put a question mark (?) next to any images that you’re not sure about. You put as many crosses or question marks as you want.

Time (approximately 20 minutes)_________________

14. Are there any images that you didn’t think were very Scottish?

15. Are there any images that you find difficult?

16. How do you feel about the pictures of people wearing kilts?

17. Which of these images would you include in a museum about Scotland?

18. How would you feel if you saw X in a museum display about Scotland?

19. How would you react if X was described as Scottish heritage/culture?

**Supplementary topics:**

Do you take part in activities you consider to be particularly Scottish at home or school?
Do they make you feel Scottish?

Does anyone own a kilt?

How do you feel about them being pipe bands, taking part in Burn’s Suppers etc?

What about those of you who don’t feel Scottish/were born elsewhere?

**Summary and Ethics**
Appendix D: Interview Schedule

Warm up question: Did you enjoy last week’s activity?

1. Tell me a little bit about where you’re from. Have you lived anywhere else?

2. Tell me a little bit about your family. Where are they from?

3. How do you feel about the place you are from?

4. Remind me of how you described yourself last week on your post-stick note. Do you still agree with that description? Was it easy or complicated? Why? What is it that makes you feel Scottish? Or another identity?

5. What makes someone Scottish?

6. How can someone prove/show they are Scottish?

7. If someone does activities that are traditionally seen as ‘Scottish’ does it make them Scottish? What sorts of activities would these include? Does it make them more Scottish than someone who doesn’t?

8. What do you think Scottish heritage is? What about Scottish culture? Is there a difference?

9. Why did you choose the 10 images that you chose last week? Do they have any personal significance for you? Were they things you thought other people would agree with or personal things? How important are things you chose to you as an individual? What sort of things would you put down if it was just about your life? What sort of things are important to you?

10. What do you consider to be your culture/heritage? How important is this culture and heritage to your identity?

11. How important is it that other people who are claim to be Scottish have similar ideas to you about culture and heritage?
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